Court File No. CV-16-11271-00CL

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
COMMERCIAL LIST

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF CERTAIN PROCEEDINGS TAKEN IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT WITH RESPECT TO HORSEHEAD HOLDING CORP., HORSEHEAD CORPORATION, HORSEHEAD METAL PRODUCTS, LLC, THE INTERNATIONAL METALS RECLAMATION COMPANY, LLC AND ZOCHEM INC. (collectively the "Debtors")

APPLICATION OF HORSEHEAD HOLDING CORP.
UNDER SECTION 46 OF THE
COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT

BRIEF OF AUTHORITIES OF THE APPLICANT

(Application returnable February 5, 2016)

AIRD & BERLIS LLP
Barristers & Solicitors
Brookfield Place
181 Bay Street, Suite 1800
Toronto, Ontario M5J 2T9

Sam Babe (LSUC # 49498B)
Tel: 416.865.7718
Fax: 416.863.1515
Email: sbabe@airdberlis.com

Lawyers for the Applicant

TO ATTACHED SERVICE LIST

SERVICE LIST

TO: **AIRD & BERLIS LLP**
Brookfield Place
1800 – 181 Bay Street
Toronto, ON M5J 2T9

Sam Babe (LSUC # 49498B)
Tel: 416.865.7718
Fax: 416.863.1515
Email: sbabe@airdberlis.com

Lawyers for the Applicant

AND TO: **RICHTER ADVISORY GROUP INC.**
3320 – 181 Bay Street
Toronto, ON M5J 2T3

Paul van Eyk
Tel: 416.485.4592
Email: PvanEyk@Richter.ca

Adam Sherman
Tel: 416.642.4836
Email: ASherman@Richter.ca

Pritesh Patel
Tel: 416.642.9421
Email: PPatel@Richter.ca

Proposed Information Officer

AND TO: **GOODMANS LLP**
Bay Adelaide Centre
333 Bay Street, Suite 3400
Toronto, ON M5H 2S7

Robert Chadwick
Tel: 416.597.4285
Fax: 416.979.1234
Email: rchadwick@goodmans.ca

Chris Armstrong
Tel: 416. 849.6013
Fax: 416.979.1234
Email: carmstrong@goodmans.ca

Caroline Descours
Tel: 416.597.6275
Fax: 416.979.1234
Email: cdescours@goodmans.ca

Lawyers for the Proposed Information Officer

AND TO: **CASSELS BROCK & BLACKWELL LLP**
Scotia Plaza
2100 - 40 King Street West
Toronto, ON M5H 3C2

Ryan C. Jacobs
Tel: 416.860.6465
Fax: 416.640.3189
Email: rjacobs@casselsbrock.com

Jane Dietrich
Tel: 416.860.5223
Fax: 416.640.3144
Email: jdietrich@casselsbrock.com

Natalie E. Levine
Tel: 416.860.6568
Fax: 416.640.3207
Email: nlevine@casselsbrock.com

Lawyers for the Ad Hoc Group of Senior Secured Noteholders, proposed Post-Petition Lenders and Cantor Fitzgerald Securities, as proposed DIP Agent

AND TO: **BLAKE, CASSELS & GRAYDON LLP**
199 Bay Street, Suite 4000
Toronto, ON M5L 1A9

Linc Rogers
Tel: 416.863.4168
Fax: 416.863.2653
Email: linc.rogers@blakes.com

Lawyers for PNC Bank, National Association

AND TO: **CALEYWRAY**
1600 – 65 Queen Street West
Toronto, ON M5H 2M5

Denis W. Ellickson
Tel: 416.775.4678
Fax: 416.366.3293
Email ellicksond@caleywray.com

Lawyers for Unifor Local 591G

AND TO: **LIFTOW LIMITED**
3150 American Drive
Mississauga, ON L4V 1B4

AND TO: **LIFTCAPITAL CORPORATION**
300 The East Mall, Suite 401
Toronto, ON M9B 6B7

AND TO: **FINANCIAL SERVICES COMMISSION OF ONTARIO (FSCO)**
PENSION DIVISION
5160 Yonge Street
P.O. Box 85, 4th Floor
Toronto, ON M2N 6L9

Deborah McPhail
Tel: 416.226.7764
Email: deborah.mcphail@fsco.gov.on.ca

AND TO: **DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE CANADA**
3400 – 130 King Street West
Toronto, ON M5X 1K6

Diane H.A. Winters
Tel: 416.973.3172
Fax: 416.973.0810
Email: diane.winters@justice.gc.ca

Edward Park
Tel: 416.973.3746
Email: edward.park@justice.gc.ca

Edward Harrison
Tel: 416.973.7126
Email: edward.harrison@justice.gc.ca

Lawyers for Canada Revenue Agency

AND TO: **MINISTRY OF FINANCE (ONTARIO)**
Legal Services Branch
777 Bay Street, 11th Floor
Toronto, ON M5G 2C8

Kevin O'Hara
Tel: 416.327.8463
Fax: 416.325.1460
Email: kevin.ohara@ontario.ca

INDEX

Court File No. CV-16-11271-00CL

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
COMMERCIAL LIST

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF CERTAIN PROCEEDINGS TAKEN IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT WITH RESPECT TO HORSEHEAD HOLDING CORP., HORSEHEAD CORPORATION, HORSEHEAD METAL PRODUCTS, LLC, THE INTERNATIONAL METALS RECLAMATION COMPANY, LLC AND ZOCHEM INC. (collectively the "Debtors")

APPLICATION OF HORSEHEAD HOLDING CORP.
UNDER SECTION 46 OF THE
COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT

BRIEF OF AUTHORITIES OF THE APPLICANT
I N D E X

Tab	Document
1.	*Lightsquared LP, Re*, (2012) 219 A.C.W.S. (3d) 23, 92 C.B.R. (5th) 321 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]
2.	*Massachusetts Elephant & Castle Group Inc., Re*, (2011) 205 A.C.W.S. (3d) 25, 81 C.B.R. (5th) 102 (Ont. S.C.J.)
3.	*Caesars Entertainment Operating Co., Re*, 2015 ONSC 712 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List])
4.	*Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd., Re*, 2000 CarswellOnt 704 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List])
5.	*Matlack Inc., Re*, 2001 CarswellOnt 1830 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List])
6.	*Lear Canada, Re*, 2009 CarswellOnt 4232 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List])
7.	*Roberts v. Picture Butte Municipal Hospital*, 1998 CarswellAlta 636 (AB Q.B.)
8.	*Re Xinergy Ltd.*, 2015 ONSC 2692 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List])
9.	*Indalex Ltd. (Re)*, 2009 CarswellOnt 1998 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List])

Tab 1

2012 ONSC 2994, 2012 CarswellOnt 8614, 219 A.C.W.S. (3d) 23, 92 C.B.R. (5th) 321

2012 ONSC 2994
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Lightsquared LP, Re

2012 CarswellOnt 8614, 2012 ONSC 2994, 219 A.C.W.S. (3d) 23, 92 C.B.R. (5th) 321

In the Matter of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C 36, as Amended Application of Lightsquared LP under Section 46 of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C 36, as Amended

In the Matter of Certain Proceedings Taken in the United States Bankruptcy Court with Respect to Lightsquared Inc., Lightsquared Investors Holdings Inc., One Dot Four Corp., One Dot Six Corp. Skyterra Rollup LLC, Skyterra Rollup Sub LLC, Skyterra Investors LLC, Tmi Communications Delaware, Limited Partnership, Lightsquared GP Inc., Lightsquared LP, ATC Technologies LLC, Lightsquared Corp., Lightsquared Finance Co., Lightsquared Network LLC, Lightsquared Inc., of Virginia, Lightsquared Subsidiary LLC, Lightsquared Bermuda Ltd., Skyterra Holdings (Canada) Inc., Skyterra (Canada) Inc. and One Dot Six TVCC Corp. (Collectively, the "Chapter 11 Debtors") (Applicants)

Morawetz J.

Heard: May 18, 2012
Judgment: May 18, 2012
Docket: CV-12-9719-00CL

Counsel: Shayne Kukulowicz, Jane Dietrich for Lightsquared LP
Brian Empey for Proposed Information Officer, Alvarez and Marsal Inc.

Subject: Insolvency; International

Related Abridgment Classifications
For all relevant Canadian Abridgment Classifications refer to highest level of case via History.

Headnote

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

Recognition of foreign proceedings — Related companies with some assets in Ontario entered bankruptcy protection in United States of America — Interim order was granted in Ontario putting stay of proceedings in place — Proposed foreign representative brought motion for various forms of relief including recognition of U.S. proceedings as foreign main proceedings — Motion granted — Foreign proceedings were considered foreign main proceedings, and required relief granted under Companies Creditors' Arrangement Act as set out in interim order — Foreign representative recognized as such, however, if matter were altered in American proceedings review could be necessary — When presumption in 45(2) of Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act is not operative, factors to consider in determining debtor's centre of interest should be that location is ascertainable to creditors, is where principle actors can be found, and

is where management of debtor takes place — Certain orders granted by U.S. court recognized — Proposed information officer appointed.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by *Morawetz J.*:

Lear Canada, Re (2009), 2009 CarswellOnt 4232, 55 C.B.R. (5th) 57 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Massachusetts Elephant & Castle Group Inc., Re (2011), 81 C.B.R. (5th) 102, 2011 CarswellOnt 6610, 2011 ONSC 4201 (Ont. S.C.J.) — considered

Statutes considered:

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

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

Pt. IV — referred to

ss. 44-49 — referred to

s. 45 — pursuant to

s. 45(1) "foreign main proceeding" — considered

s. 45(2) — considered

s. 46(1) — considered

s. 47(1) — considered

s. 47(2) — considered

s. 48(1) — considered

s. 49 — pursuant to

s. 49(1) — considered

s. 50 — considered

MOTION by proposed foreign representative for various forms of relief pursuant to *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*.

Morawetz J.:

1 On May 14, 2012, Lightsquared LP ("LSLP" or the "Applicant") and various of its affiliates (collectively, the "Chapter 11 Debtors") commenced voluntary reorganization proceedings (the "Chapter 11 Proceedings") in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York (the "U.S. Court") by each filing a voluntary petition for relief under Chapter 11 of Title 11 of the United States Code (the "Bankruptcy Code").

2 The Chapter 11 Debtors have certain material assets in other jurisdictions, including Ontario and indicated at an interim hearing held on May 15, 2012 that they would be seeking an order from the U.S. Court authorizing LSLP to act as the Foreign Representative of the Chapter 11 Debtors, in any judicial or other proceeding, including these proceedings (the "Foreign Representative Order").

3 At the conclusion of the interim hearing of May 15, 2012, I granted the Interim Initial Order to provide for a stay of proceedings and other ancillary relief. A full hearing was scheduled for May 18, 2012.

4 At the hearing on May 18, 2012, the record demonstrated that LSLP had been authorized to act as Foreign Representative by order of The Honorable Shelley C. Chapman dated May 15, 2012. This authority was granted on an interim basis pending a final hearing scheduled for June 11, 2012.

5 LSLP brought this application pursuant to ss. 44-49 of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA"), seeking the following orders:

(a) an Initial Recognition Order, *inter alia*:

(i) declaring that LSLP is a "foreign representative" pursuant to s. 45 of the CCAA;

(ii) declaring that the Chapter 11 Proceeding is recognized as a "foreign main proceeding" under the CCAA; and

(iii) granting a stay of proceedings against the Chapter 11 Debtors; and

(b) a "Supplemental Order" pursuant to s. 49 of the CCAA, *inter alia*:

(i) recognizing in Canada and enforcing certain orders of the U.S. Court made in the Chapter 11 Proceedings;

(ii) appointing Alvarez and Marsal Canada Inc. ("A&M") as the Information Officer in respect of this proceeding (in such capacity, the "Information Officer");

(iii) staying any claims against or in respect of the Chapter 11 Debtors, the business and property of the Chapter 11 Debtors and the Directors and Officers of the Chapter 11 Debtors;

(iv) restraining the right of any person or entity to, among other things, discontinue or terminate any supply of products or services to Chapter 11 Debtors;

(v) granting a super priority charge up to the maximum amount of $200,000, over the Chapter 11 Debtors' property, in favour of the Information Officer and its counsel, as security for their professional fees and disbursements incurred in respect of these proceedings (the "Administration Charge").

6 Counsel to LSLP submitted that this relief was required in order to:

(i) alleviate any potential harm to the Chapter 11 Debtors or their Canadian assets during the interim period;

(ii) ensure the protection of the Chapter 11 Debtors' Canadian assets during the course of the Chapter 11 Proceedings; and

(iii) ensure that this court and the Canadian stakeholders are kept properly informed of the Chapter 11 Proceedings.

7 The Chapter 11 Debtors are in the process of building a fourth generation long-term evolution open wireless broadband network that incorporates satellite coverage throughout North America and offers users, wherever they may be located, the speed, value and reliability of universal connectivity.

8 The Chapter 11 Debtors consist of approximately 20 entities. All but four of these entities have their head office or headquarter location in the United States.

9 Two of the Chapter 11 Debtors are incorporated pursuant to the laws of Ontario, being SkyTerra Holdings (Canada) Inc. ("SkyTerra Holdings") and SkyTerra (Canada) Inc. ("SkyTerra Canada"). One of the Chapter 11 Debtors is incorporated pursuant to the laws of Nova Scotia, being Lightsquared Corp. "LC" and together with SkyTerra Holdings and SkyTerra Canada, the "Canadian Debtors"). Each of the Canadian Debtors is a wholly-owned subsidiary, directly or indirectly, of the Applicant.

10 Other than the Canadian Debtors and Lightsquared Bermuda Ltd., all of the Chapter 11 Debtors are incorporated pursuant to the laws of the United States.

11 The operations of the Canadian Debtors were summarized by LSLP as follows:

(a) SkyTerra Canada: this entity was created to hold certain regulated assets which, by law, are required to be held by Canadian corporations. SkyTerra Canada holds primarily three categories of assets: (i) the MSAT — 1 satellite; (ii) certain Industry Canada licences; (iii) contracts with the Applicant's affiliates and third parties. SkyTerra Canada has no third party customers or employees at the present time and is wholly dependent on the Applicant for the funding of its operations;

(b) SkyTerra Holdings: this entity has no employees or operational functions. Its sole function is to hold shares of SkyTerra Canada; and

(c) LC: this entity was created for the purposes of providing mobile satellite services to customers located in

Canada based on products and services that were developed by the Chapter 11 Debtors for the United States market. LC holds certain Industry Canada licences and authorizations as well as certain ground-related assets. LC employs approximately 43 non-union employees out of its offices in Ottawa, Ontario. LC is wholly dependent on the Applicant for all or substantially all of the funding of its operations.

12 Counsel to LSLP also submitted that the Chapter 11 Debtors, including the Canadian Debtors, are managed in the United States as an integrated group from a corporate, strategic and management perspective. In particular:

(a) corporate and other major decision-making occurs from the consolidated offices in New York, New York and Ruston, Virginia;

(b) all of the senior executives of the Chapter 11 Debtors, including the Canadian Debtors, are residents of the United States;

(c) the majority of the management of the Chapter 11 Debtors, including the Canadian Debtors, is shared;

(d) the majority of employee administration, human resource functions, marketing and communication decisions are made, and related functions taken, on behalf of all of the Chapter 11 Debtors, including the Canadian Debtors, in the United States;

(e) the Chapter 11 Debtors, including the Canadian Debtors, also share a cash-management system that is overseen by employees of the United States-based Chapter 11 Debtors and located primarily in the United States; and

(f) other functions shared between the Chapter 11 Debtors, including the Canadian Debtors, and primarily managed from the United States include, pricing decisions, business development decisions, accounts payable, accounts receivable and treasury functions.

13 Counsel further submits that the Canadian Debtors are wholly dependent on the Applicant and other members of the Chapter 11 Debtors located in the United States for all or substantially all of their funding requirements.

14 Further, the Canadian Debtors have guaranteed the credit facilities which were extended to LSLP as borrower and such guarantee is allegedly secured by a priority interest on the assets of the Canadian Debtors. As such, counsel submits that the majority of the creditors of the Chapter 11 Debtors are also common.

15 The Interim Initial Order granted on May 15, 2012, reflected an exercise of both statutory jurisdiction and the court's inherent juridical discretion. In arriving at the decision to grant interim relief, I was satisfied that it was appropriate to provide such relief in order to alleviate any potential harm to the Chapter 11 Debtors or their Canadian assets during the interim period.

16 The issue for consideration on this motion is whether the court should recognize the Chapter 11 Proceedings as a "foreign main proceeding" pursuant to the CCAA and grant the Initial Recognition Order sought by the Applicant and, if so, whether the court should also grant the Supplemental Order under s. 49 of the CCAA to (i) recognize and enforce in Canada certain orders of the U.S. Court made in the Chapter 11 Proceedings; (ii) appoint A&M as Information Officer in respect of these proceedings; and (iii) grant an Administration Charge over the Chapter 11 Debtors' property.

17 Section 46 (1) of the CCAA provides that a "foreign representative" may apply to the court for recognition of a "foreign proceeding" in respect of which he or she is a "foreign representative".

18 Court proceedings under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code have consistently been found to be "foreign proceedings" for the purposes of the CCAA. In this respect, see *Massachusetts Elephant & Castle Group Inc., Re* (2011), 81 C.B.R. (5th) 102 (Ont. S.C.J.) and *Lear Canada, Re* (2009), 55 C.B.R. (5th) 57 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]).

19 I accept that the Chapter 11 Proceedings are "foreign proceedings" for the purposes of the CCAA and that LSLP is a "foreign representative".

20 However, it is noted that the status of LSLP as a foreign representative is subject to further consideration by the U.S. Court on June 11, 2012. If, for whatever reason, the status of LSLP is altered by the U.S. Court, it follows that this issue will have to be reviewed by this court.

21 LSLP submits that the Chapter 11 Proceedings should be declared a "foreign main proceeding". Under s. 47 (1) of the CCAA, it is necessary under s. 47 (2) to determine whether the foreign proceeding is a "foreign main proceeding" or a "foreign non-main proceeding".

22 Section 45 (1) of the CCAA defines a "foreign main proceeding" as a "foreign proceeding in a jurisdiction where the debtor company has the centre of its main interests".

23 Section 45 (2) of the CCAA provides that for the purposes of Part IV of the CCAA, in the absence of proof to the contrary, a debtor company's registered office is deemed to be the centre of its main interests ("COMI").

24 In this case, the registered offices of the Canadian Debtors are in Canada. Counsel to the Applicant submits, however, that the COMI of the Canadian Debtors is not in the location of the registered offices.

25 In circumstances where it is necessary to go beyond the s. 45 (2) registered office presumption, in my view, the following principal factors, considered as a whole, will tend to indicate whether the location in which the proceeding has been filed is the debtor's centre of main interests. The factors are:

(i) the location is readily ascertainable by creditors;

(ii) the location is one in which the debtor's principal assets or operations are found; and

(iii) the location is where the management of the debtor takes place.

26 In most cases, these factors will all point to a single jurisdiction as the centre of main interests. In some cases, there may be conflicts among the factors, requiring a more careful review of the facts. The court may need to give greater or less weight to a given factor, depending on the circumstances of the particular case. In all cases, however, the review is designed to determine that the location of the proceeding, in fact, corresponds to where the debtor's true seat or principal place of business actually is, consistent with the expectations of those who dealt with the enterprise prior to commencement of the proceedings.

27 When the court determines that there is proof contrary to the presumption in s. 45 (2), the court should, in my view, consider these factors in determining the location of the debtor's centre of main interests.

28 The above analysis is consistent with preliminary commentary in the Report of UNCITRAL Working Group V (Insolvency Law) of its 41st Session (New York, 30 April — 4 May, 2012) (Working Paper AICN.9/742, paragraph 52. In my view, this approach provides an appropriate framework for the COMI analysis and is intended to be a refinement of the views I previously expressed in *Massachusetts Elephant & Castle Group Inc., Re, supra.*

29 Part IV of the CCAA does not specifically take into account corporate groups. It is therefore necessary to consider the COMI issue on an entity-by-entity basis.

30 In this case, the foreign proceeding was filed in the United States and based on the facts summarized at [11] — [14], LSLP submits that the COMI of each of the Canadian Debtors is in the United States.

31 After considering these facts and the factors set out in [25] and [26], I am persuaded that the COMI of the Canadian Debtors is in the United States. It follows, therefore, that in this case, the "foreign proceeding" is a "foreign main proceeding".

32 Having recognized the "foreign proceeding" as a "foreign main proceeding", subsection 48 (1) of the CCAA requires the court to grant certain enumerated relief subject to any terms and conditions it considers appropriate. This relief is set out in the Initial Recognition Order, which relief is granted in the form submitted.

33 Additionally, s. 50 of the CCAA provides the court with the jurisdiction to make any order under Part IV of the CCAA on the terms and conditions it considers appropriate in the circumstances.

34 The final issue to consider is whether the court should grant the Supplemental Order sought by the Applicant under s. 49 of the CCAA and (i) recognize and enforce in Canada certain orders of the U.S. Court made in the Chapter 11 Proceedings; (ii) appoint A&M as Information Officer in respect of these proceedings; and (iii) grant an Administration Charge over the Chapter 11 Debtors' property.

35 If an order recognizing the "foreign proceedings" has been made (foreign main or foreign non-main), subsection 49 (1) of the CCAA provides the authority for the court, if it is satisfied that it is necessary for the protection of the debtor

company's property or the interests of a creditor or creditors, to make any order that it considers appropriate.

36 In this case, the Applicant is requesting recognition of the first day orders granted in the U.S. Court. Based on the record, I am satisfied that it is appropriate to recognize these orders.

37 Additionally, I am satisfied that the appointment of A&M as Information Officer will help to facilitate these proceedings and the dissemination of information concerning the Chapter 11 Proceedings and this relief is appropriate on the terms set forth in the draft order. The proposed order also provides that the Information Officer be entitled to the benefit of an Administration Charge, which charge shall not exceed an aggregate amount of $200,000, as security for their professional fees and disbursements. I am satisfied that the inclusion of this Administration Charge in the draft order is appropriate.

38 The ancillary relief requested in the draft order is also appropriate in the circumstances.

39 Accordingly, the Supplemental Order is granted in the form presented. The Supplemental Order contains copies of the first day orders granted in the U.S. Court.

40 Finally, on an ongoing basis, it would be appreciated if counsel would, in addition to filing the required paper record, also file an electronic copy by way of a USB key directly with the Commercial List Office.

Motion granted.

Tab 2

2011 ONSC 4201
Ontario Superior Court of Justice

Massachusetts Elephant & Castle Group Inc., Re

2011 CarswellOnt 6610, 2011 ONSC 4201, 205 A.C.W.S. (3d) 25, 81 C.B.R. (5th) 102

In the Matter of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as Amended

And In the Matter of Certain Proceedings Taken in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Massachusetts Eastern Division with Respect to the Companies Listed on Schedule "A" Hereto (The "Chapter 11 Debtors") Under Section 46 of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as Amended

MASSACHUSETTS ELEPHANT & CASTLE GROUP, INC. (Applicant)

Morawetz J.

Heard: July 4, 2011
Oral reasons: July 4, 2011
Written reasons: July 11, 2011
Docket: CV-11-9279-00CL

Counsel: Kenneth D. Kraft, Sara-Ann Wilson for Applicant
Heather Meredith for GE Canada Equipment Financing GP

Subject: Insolvency; Corporate and Commercial

Related Abridgment Classifications
For all relevant Canadian Abridgment Classifications refer to highest level of case via History.

Headnote

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

Recognition of foreign main proceeding — Debtor companies were integrated business involving locations in U.S. and Canada — Each of debtors, including debtor companies with registered offices in Canada (Canadian Debtors), were managed centrally from U.S. — Debtors brought proceedings in U.S. pursuant to Chapter 11 of United States Bankruptcy Code — U.S Court appointed applicant as foreign representative of Chapter 11 Debtors — Applicant applied to have U.S. Chapter 11 proceedings recognized as foreign main proceeding in Canada under Companies' Creditors Arrangements Act (Act) — Application granted — It was appropriate to recognize foreign proceeding — Foreign proceeding in present case was foreign main proceeding — "Foreign main proceeding" is defined in s. 45(1) of Act as foreign proceeding in jurisdiction where debtor company has centre of its main interest (COMI) — There was sufficient evidence to rebut presumption in s. 45(2) of Act that COMI is registered office of debtor company — For purposes of application, each entity making up Chapter 11 Debtors, including Canadian Debtors, had their COMI in U.S. — Location of debtors' headquarters or head office functions or nerve centre was in U.S. — Debtor's management

was located in U.S. — Significant creditor did not oppose relief sought — Mandatory stay ordered under s. 48(1) of Act — Discretionary relief recognizing various orders of U.S. Court, appointing information officer, and limiting quantum of administrative charge, was appropriate and was granted.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by *Morawetz J.*:

Angiotech Pharmaceuticals Inc., Re (2011), 2011 BCSC 115, 2011 CarswellBC 124, 76 C.B.R. (5th) 317 (B.C. S.C. [In Chambers]) — considered

Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd., Re (2000), 5 B.L.R. (3d) 75, 18 C.B.R. (4th) 157, 2000 CarswellOnt 704 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Lear Canada, Re (2009), 2009 CarswellOnt 4232, 55 C.B.R. (5th) 57 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Magna Entertainment Corp., Re (2009), 2009 CarswellOnt 1267, 51 C.B.R. (5th) 82 (Ont. S.C.J.) — referred to

Statutes considered:

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

ss. 1101-1174 — referred to

Business Corporations Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. B.16
Generally — referred to

Canada Business Corporations Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-44
Generally — referred to

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

Pt. IV — referred to

s. 44 — considered

s. 45 — considered

s. 45(1) — considered

s. 45(2) — considered

s. 46 — considered

s. 46(1) — considered

s. 46(2) — referred to

ss. 46-49 — referred to

s. 47(1) — considered

s. 47(2) — considered

s. 48 — considered

s. 48(1) — considered

s. 49 — considered

s. 50 — considered

s. 61 — considered

s. 61(2) — considered

APPLICATION for order recognizing U.S. Chapter 11 Proceeding as foreign main proceeding under *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, and other relief.

***Morawetz J.*:**

1 Massachusetts Elephant & Castle Group, Inc. ("MECG" or the "Applicant") brings this application under Part IV of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, ("*CCAA*"). MECG seeks orders pursuant to sections 46 — 49 of the *CCAA* providing for:

(a) an Initial Recognition Order declaring that:

(i) MECG is a foreign representative pursuant to s. 45 of the *CCAA* and is entitled to bring its application pursuant s. 46 of the *CCAA*;

(ii) the Chapter 11 Proceeding (as defined below) in respect of the Chapter 11 Debtors (as set out in Schedule "A") is a "foreign main proceeding" for the purposes of the *CCAA*; and

(iii) any claims, rights, liens or proceedings against or in respect of the Chapter 11 Debtors, the directors and officers of the Chapter 11 Debtors and the Chapter 11 Debtors' property are stayed; and

(b) a Supplemental Order:

(i) recognizing in Canada and enforcing certain orders of the U.S. Court (as defined below) made in the Chapter 11 Proceeding (as defined below);

(ii) granting a super-priority change over the Chapter 11 Debtors' property in respect of administrative fees and expenses; and

(iii) appointing BDO Canada Limited ("BDO") as Information Officer in respect of these proceedings (the "Information Officer").

2 On June 28, 2011, the Chapter 11 Debtors commenced proceedings (the "Chapter 11 Proceeding") in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Massachusetts Eastern Division (the "U.S. Court"), pursuant to Chapter 11 of the *United States Bankruptcy Code*, 11 U.S.C. § 1101-1174 ("*U.S. Bankruptcy Code*").

3 On June 30, 2011, the U.S. Court made certain orders at the first-day hearing held in the Chapter 11 Proceeding, including an order appointing the Applicant as foreign representative in respect of the Chapter 11 Proceeding.

4 The Chapter 11 Debtors operate and franchise authentic, full-service British-style restaurant pubs in the United States and Canada.

5 MECG is the lead debtor in the Chapter 11 Proceeding and is incorporated in Massachusetts. All of the Chapter 11 Debtors, with the exception of Repechage Investments Limited ("Repechage"), Elephant & Castle Group Inc. ("E&C Group Ltd.") and Elephant & Castle Canada Inc. ("E&C Canada") (collectively, the "Canadian Debtors") are incorporated in various jurisdictions in the United States.

6 Repechage is incorporated under the *Canada Business Corporations Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-44, ("*CBCA*") with its registered office in Toronto, Ontario. E&C Group Ltd. is also incorporated under the *CBCA* with a registered office located in Halifax, Nova Scotia. E&C Canada Inc. is incorporated under the *Business Corporations Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. B. 16, and its registered office is in Toronto. The mailing office for E&C Canada Inc. is in Boston, Massachusetts at the location of the corporate head offices for all of the debtors, including Repechage and E&C Group Ltd.

7 In order to comply with s. 46(2) of the *CCAA*, MECG filed the affidavit of Ms. Wilson to which was attached certified copies of the applicable Chapter 11 orders.

8 MECG also included in its materials the declaration of Mr. David Dobbin filed in support of the first-day motions in the Chapter 11 Proceeding. Mr. Dobbin, at paragraph 19 of the declaration outlined the sale efforts being entered into by MECG. Mr. Dobbin also outlined the purpose of the Chapter 11 Proceeding, namely, to sell the Chapter 11 Debtors' businesses as a going concern on the most favourable terms possible under the circumstances and keep the Chapter 11 Debtors' business intact to the greatest extent possible during the sales process.

9 The issues for consideration are whether this court should grant the application for orders pursuant to ss. 46 — 49 of the *CCAA* and recognize the Chapter 11 Proceeding as a foreign main proceeding.

10 The purpose of Part IV of the *CCAA* is set out in s. 44:

44. The purpose of this Part is to provide mechanisms for dealing with cases of cross-border insolvencies and to promote

(a) cooperation between the courts and other competent authorities in Canada with those of foreign jurisdictions in cases of cross-border insolvencies;

(b) greater legal certainty for trade and investment;

(c) the fair and efficient administration of cross-border insolvencies that protects the interests of creditors and other interested persons, and those of debtor companies;

(d) the protection and the maximization of the value of debtor company's property; and

(e) the rescue of financially troubled businesses to protect investment and preserve employment.

11 Section 46(1) of the *CCAA* provides that "a foreign representative may apply to the court for recognition of the foreign proceeding in respect of which he or she is a foreign representative."

12 Section 47(1) of the *CCAA* provides that there are two requirements for an order recognizing a foreign proceeding:

(a) the proceeding is a foreign proceeding, and

(b) the applicant is a foreign representative in respect of that proceeding.

13 Canadian courts have consistently recognized proceedings under Chapter 11 of the *U.S. Bankruptcy Code* to be foreign proceedings for the purposes of the *CCAA*. In this respect, see: *Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd., Re* (2000), 5 B.L.R. (3d) 75 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]); *Magna Entertainment Corp., Re* (2009), 51 C.B.R. (5th) 82 (Ont. S.C.J.); *Lear Canada, Re* (2009), 55 C.B.R. (5th) 57 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]).

14 Section 45(1) of the *CCAA* defines a foreign representative as:

a person or body, including one appointed on an interim basis, who is authorized, in a foreign proceeding in respect of a debtor company, to

(a) monitor the debtor company's business and financial affairs for the purpose of reorganization; or

(b) act as a representative in respect of the foreign proceeding.

15 By order of the U.S. Court dated June 30, 2011, the Applicant has been appointed as a foreign representative of the Chapter 11 Debtors.

16 In my view, the Applicant has satisfied the requirements of s. 47(1) of the CCAA. Accordingly, it is appropriate that

this court recognize the foreign proceeding.

17 Section 47(2) of the *CCAA* requires the court to specify in its order whether the foreign proceeding is a foreign main proceeding or a foreign non-main proceeding.

18 A "foreign main proceeding" is defined in s. 45(1) of the *CCAA* as "a foreign proceeding in a jurisdiction where the debtor company has the centre of its main interest" ("COMI").

19 Part IV of the *CCAA* came into force in September 2009. Therefore, the experience of Canadian courts in determining the COMI has been limited.

20 Section 45(2) of the *CCAA* provides that, in the absence of proof to the contrary, the debtor company's registered office is deemed to be the COMI. As such, the determination of COMI is made on an entity basis, as opposed to a corporate group basis.

21 In this case, the registered offices of Repechage and E&C Canada Inc. are in Ontario and the registered office of E&C Group Ltd. is in Nova Scotia. The Applicant, however, submits that the COMI of the Chapter 11 Debtors, including the Canadian Debtors, is in the United States and the recognition order should be granted on that basis.

22 Therefore, the issue is whether there is sufficient evidence to rebut the s. 45(2) presumption that the COMI is the registered office of the debtor company.

23 In this case, counsel to the Applicant submits that the Chapter 11 Debtors have their COMI in the United States for the following reasons:

> (a) the location of the corporate head offices for all of the Chapter 11 Debtors, including the Canadian Debtors, is in Boston, Massachusetts;
>
> (b) the Chapter 11 Debtors including the Canadian Debtors function as an integrated North American business and all decisions for the corporate group, including in respect to the operations of the Canadian Debtors, is centralized at the Chapter 11 Debtors head office in Boston;
>
> (c) all members of the Chapter 11 Debtors' management are located in Boston;
>
> (d) virtually all human resources, accounting/finance, and other administrative functions associated with the Chapter 11 Debtors are located in the Boston offices;
>
> (e) all information technology functions of the Chapter 11 Debtors, with the exception of certain clerical functions which are outsourced, are provided out of the United States; and
>
> (f) Repechage is also the parent company of a group of restaurants that operate under the "Piccadilly" brand which

operates only in the U.S.

24 Counsel also submits that the Chapter 11 Debtors operate a highly integrated business and each of the debtors, including the Canadian Debtors, are managed centrally from the United States. As such, counsel submits it is appropriate to recognize the Chapter 11 Proceeding as a foreign main proceeding.

25 On the other hand, Mr. Dobbin's declaration discloses that nearly one-half of the operating locations are in Canada, that approximately 43% of employees work in Canada, and that GE Canada Equipment Financing G.P. ("GE Canada") is a substantial lender to MECG. GE Canada does not oppose this application.

26 Counsel to the Applicant referenced *Angiotech Pharmaceuticals Inc., Re*, 2011 CarswellBC 124 (B.C. S.C. [In Chambers]) where the court listed a number of factors to consider in determining the COMI including:

(a) the location where corporate decisions are made;

(b) the location of employee administrations, including human resource functions;

(c) the location of the debtor's marketing and communication functions;

(d) whether the enterprise is managed on a consolidated basis;

(e) the extent of integration of an enterprise's international operations;

(f) the centre of an enterprise's corporate, banking, strategic and management functions;

(g) the existence of shared management within entities and in an organization;

(h) the location where cash management and accounting functions are overseen;

(i) the location where pricing decisions and new business development initiatives are created; and

(j) the seat of an enterprise's treasury management functions, including management of accounts receivable and accounts payable.

27 It seems to me that, in considering the factors listed in *Re Angiotech*, the intention is not to provide multiple criteria, but rather to provide guidance on how the single criteria, *i.e.* the centre of main interest, is to be interpreted.

28 In certain circumstances, it could be that some of the factors listed above or other factors might be considered to be more important than others, but nevertheless, none is necessarily determinative; all of them could be considered, depending on the facts of the specific case.

29 For example:

(a) the location from which financing was organized or authorized or the location of the debtor's primary bank would only be important where the bank had a degree of control over the debtor;

(b) the location of employees might be important, on the basis that employees could be future creditors, or less important, on the basis that protection of employees is more an issue of protecting the rights of interested parties and therefore is not relevant to the COMI analysis;

(c) the jurisdiction whose law would apply to most disputes may not be an important factor if the jurisdiction was unrelated to the place from which the debtor was managed or conducted its business.

30 However, it seems to me, in interpreting COMI, the following factors are usually significant:

(a) the location of the debtor's headquarters or head office functions or nerve centre;

(b) the location of the debtor's management; and

(c) the location which significant creditors recognize as being the centre of the company's operations.

31 While other factors may be relevant in specific cases, it could very well be that they should be considered to be of secondary importance and only to the extent they relate to or support the above three factors.

32 In this case, the location of the debtors' headquarters or head office functions or nerve centre is in Boston, Massachusetts and the location of the debtors' management is in Boston. Further, GE Canada, a significant creditor, does not oppose the relief sought. All of this leads me to conclude that, for the purposes of this application, each entity making up the Chapter 11 Debtors, including the Canadian Debtors, have their COMI in the United States.

33 Having reached the conclusion that the foreign proceeding in this case is a foreign main proceeding, certain mandatory relief follows as set out in s. 48(1) of the *CCAA*:

48. (1) Subject to subsections (2) to (4), on the making of an order recognizing a foreign proceeding that is specified to be a foreign main proceeding, the court shall make an order, subject to any terms and conditions it considers appropriate,

(a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, for any period that the court considers necessary, all proceedings taken or that might be taken against the debtor company under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*;

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

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

(d) prohibiting the debtor company from selling or otherwise disposing of, outside the ordinary course of its business, any of the debtor company's property in Canada that relates to the business and prohibiting the debtor company from selling or otherwise disposing of any of its other property in Canada.

34 The relief provided for in s. 48 is contained in the Initial Recognition Order.

35 In addition to the mandatory relief provided for in s. 48, pursuant to s. 49 of the *CCAA*, further discretionary relief can be granted if the court is satisfied that it is necessary for the protection of the debtor company's property or the interests of a creditor or creditors. Section 49 provides:

> 49. (1) If an order recognizing a foreign proceeding is made, the court may, on application by the foreign representative who applied for the order, if the court is satisfied that it is necessary for the protection of the debtor company's property or the interests of a creditor or creditors, make any order that it considers appropriate, including an order
>
> (a) if the foreign proceeding is a foreign non-main proceeding, referred to in subsection 48(1);
>
> (b) respecting the examination of witnesses, the taking of evidence or the delivery of information concerning the debtor company's property, business and financial affairs, debts, liabilities and obligations; and
>
> (c) authorizing the foreign representative to monitor the debtor company's business and financial affairs in Canada for the purpose of reorganization.

36 In this case, the Applicant applies for orders to recognize and give effect to a number of orders of the U.S. Court in the Chapter 11 Proceeding (collectively, the "Chapter 11 Orders") which are comprised of the following:

(a) the Foreign Representative Order;

(b) the U.S. Cash Collateral Order;

(c) the U.S. Prepetition Wages Order;

(d) the U.S. Prepetition Taxes Order;

(e) the U.S. Utilities Order;

(f) the U.S. Cash Management Order;

(g) the U.S. Customer Obligations Order; and

(h) the U.S. Joint Administration Order.

37 In addition, the requested relief also provides for the appointment of BDO as an Information Officer; the granting of an Administration Charge not to exceed an aggregate amount of $75,000 and other ancillary relief.

38 In considering whether it is appropriate to grant such relief, portions of s. 49, s. 50 and 61 of the *CCAA* are relevant:

50. An order under this Part may be made on any terms and conditions that the court considers appropriate in the circumstances.

. . . . .

61. (1) Nothing in this Part prevents the court, on the application of a foreign representative or any other interested person, from applying any legal or equitable rules governing the recognition of foreign insolvency orders and assistance to foreign representatives that are not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act.

(2) Nothing in this Part prevents the court from refusing to do something that would be contrary to public policy.

39 Counsel to the Applicant advised that he is not aware of any provision of any of the U.S. Orders for which recognition is sought that would be inconsistent with the provisions of the CCAA or which would raise the public policy exception as referenced in s. 61(2). Having reviewed the record and having heard submissions, I am satisfied that the supplementary relief, relating to, among other things, the recognition of Chapter 11 Orders, the appointment of BDO and the quantum of the Administrative charge, all as set out in the Supplemental Order, is appropriate in the circumstances and is granted.

40 The requested relief is granted. The Initial Recognition Order and the Supplemental Order have been signed in the form presented.

Schedule "A"

1. Massachusetts Elephant & Castle Group Inc.
2. Repechage Investments Limited
3. Elephant & Castle Group Inc.
4. The Elephant and Castle Canada Inc.
5. Elephant & Castle, Inc. (a Texas Corporation)
6. Elephant & Castle Inc. (a Washington Corporation)
7. Elephant & Castle International, Inc.
8. Elephant & Castle of Pennsylvania, Inc.
9. E & C Pub, Inc.
10. Elephant & Castle East Huron, LLC
11. Elephant & Castle Illinois Corporation
12. E&C Eye Street, LLC
13. E & C Capital, LLC
14. Elephant & Castle (Chicago) Corporation

Application granted.

End of Document

Tab 3

2015 ONSC 712
Ontario Superior Court of Justice

Caesars Entertainment Operating Co., Re

2015 CarswellOnt 3284, 2015 ONSC 712, [2015] O.J. No. 1201, 23 C.B.R. (6th) 154, 251 A.C.W.S. (3d) 553

In the Matter of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C 36, as Amended

In the Matter of the Caesars Entertainment Operating Company, Inc. and the Debtors Listed on Schedule "A" (Collectively, the "Chapter 11 Debtors") Application of Caesars Entertainment Windsor Limited under Section 46 of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act

G.B. Morawetz R.S.J.

Heard: January 19, 2015
Judgment: January 19, 2015
Docket: CV-15-10837

Counsel: Katherine McEachern, Matthew Kanter for Caesars Entertainment Operating Company, Inc. et al.
Robin B. Schwill for Ontario Lottery and Gaming Corporation

Subject: Civil Practice and Procedure; Insolvency

Related Abridgment Classifications
For all relevant Canadian Abridgment Classifications refer to highest level of case via History.

Headnote

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Practice and procedure in courts — Costs — Miscellaneous

Foreign proceeding — Casino/entertainment company CE Inc. and certain subsidiaries filed voluntary petitions in Illinois for Chapter 11 proceedings under U.S. Bankruptcy Code — Three days earlier, competing involuntary petition in respect of CE Inc., but not subsidiaries, had been filed by creditors in Delaware — Delaware court ordered stay of Illinois proceeding pending determination of proper venue — CW Ltd., Ontario corporation, was indirect subsidiary of CE Inc — CW Ltd. intended to continue operating casino in Canada and had no intention to restructure — CW Ltd. brought application in Ontario under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA) for order recognizing Illinois proceeding as foreign main proceeding, declaring CW Ltd. to be foreign representative, and staying proceedings against all Chapter 11 debtors — CW Ltd. also sought Supplemental Order recognizing certain orders made in Illinois, staying proceedings against Chapter 11 debtors, and other relief — Application granted — Chapter 11 proceeding was foreign proceeding for purposes of CCAA — Under s. 45(1) of CCAA, foreign main proceeding was foreign proceeding in debtor's "centre of main interest" (COMI) — In absence of proof to contrary, debtor company's registered office is deemed to be COMI — While CW Ltd. was incorporated and had its registered head office in Ontario, COMI for Chapter 11 Debtors was U.S. — Of 173 Chapter 11 debtors, CW Ltd. was only one not incorporated in U.S. — Chapter

11 proceeding recognized as foreign main proceeding — Foreign representative did not have to be appointed by court — Authorization by CE Inc. and own shareholder was enough to give CW Ltd. such status — In order to maintain status quo and allow CW Ltd. to continue its business during Chapter 11 proceeding, relief in Supplemental Order also granted, except for stay of actions against officers and directors of Chapter 11 debtors.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by *G.B. Morawetz R.S.J.*:

Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd., Re (2000), 5 B.L.R. (3d) 75, 18 C.B.R. (4th) 157, 2000 CarswellOnt 704 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Digital Domain Media Group Inc., Re (2012), 2012 CarswellBC 3210, 2012 BCSC 1565, 95 C.B.R. (5th) 318 (B.C. S.C. [In Chambers]) — referred to

Lear Canada, Re (2009), 2009 CarswellOnt 4232, 55 C.B.R. (5th) 57 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Lightsquared LP, Re (2012), 2012 ONSC 2994, 2012 CarswellOnt 8614, 92 C.B.R. (5th) 321 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — followed

MtGox Co., Re (2014), 20 C.B.R. (6th) 307, 2014 CarswellOnt 13871, 2014 ONSC 5811, 122 O.R. (3d) 465 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Statutes considered:

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

Pt. IV — referred to

s. 44 — considered

s. 45 — considered

s. 45(1) — considered

s. 46 — considered

s. 46(1) — considered

s. 47(1) — considered

s. 48 — considered

s. 48(1) — considered

s. 49 — considered

s. 49(1) — considered

s. 50 — considered

APPLICATION by subsidiary of foreign debtor company for order declaring it to be foreign representative, recognizing foreign main proceeding, staying proceedings, and other relief under *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*.

***G.B. Morawetz R.S.J.*:**

Introduction and Facts

1 On January 15, 2015, Caesars Entertainment Operating Company Inc. ("CEOC") and certain of its subsidiaries (collectively, the "Chapter 11 Debtors") commenced voluntary reorganization proceedings (the "Chapter 11 Proceeding") in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Illinois (the "Illinois Court") by each filing a voluntary petition for relief under chapter 11 of title 11 of the United States Code, 11 U.S.C. §§ 101 — 1532 (the "Bankruptcy Code").

2 Caesars Windsor Entertainment Limited ("CEWL" or the "Applicant"), an Ontario corporation, is an indirect subsidiary of CEOC. CEWL is a Chapter 11 Debtor.

3 Pursuant to a written resolution (the "Foreign Representation Resolution") of its sole shareholder, Caesars World, Inc. ("Caesars World") CEWL has been authorized to act as the foreign representative of all of the Chapter 11 Debtors for the purposes of recognizing the Chapter 11 Proceeding in Canada, and has been authorized to commence this Application for recognition of the Chapter 11 Proceeding as a foreign proceeding. CEOC has confirmed its authorization of CEWL to act as foreign representative on behalf of the Chapter 11 Debtors.

4 CEWL manages Caesars Windsor Hotel and Casino in Windsor, Ontario (the "Windsor Casino"), for and on behalf of the Ontario Lottery and Gaming Corporation ("OLG").

5 In order to (a) ensure the protection of the Chapter 11 Debtors' Canadian assets and (b) enable the Chapter 11 Debtors, including CEWL, to operate their businesses in the ordinary course during the Chapter 11 Proceeding, CEWL seeks the following orders pursuant to sections 44 and 49 of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C., 1985 c. C-36 (the "CCAA"):

> a. an "Initial Recognition Order," *inter alia*: (i) declaring that CEWL is a "foreign representative" pursuant to section 45 of the CCAA; (ii) declaring that the Chapter 11 Proceeding is recognized as a "foreign main proceeding" under the CCAA; and (iii) granting a stay of proceedings against the Chapter 11 Debtors; and
>
> b. a "Supplemental Order" pursuant to section 49 of the CCAA, *inter alia*: (i) recognizing in Canada and enforcing certain "first day" orders of the Illinois Court made in the Chapter 11 Proceeding (the "First Day Orders"); (ii) staying any claims, rights, liens or proceedings against or in respect of the Chapter 11 Debtors, the business and property of the Chapter 11 Debtors and the directors and officers of the Chapter 11 Debtors; and (iii) restraining the

right of any person or entity to, among other things, discontinue or terminate any supply of products or services to the Chapter 11 Debtors.

6 CEWL submits that the requested orders are necessary and appropriate in the circumstances of this case.

7 On January 12, 2015, a competing involuntary petition in respect of CEOC was filed in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware (the "Delaware Court"). By order of the Delaware Court, the Chapter 11 Proceeding in the Illinois Court has been stayed pending a determination of the proper venue for the Chapter 11 case of CEOC and its subsidiaries (the "Delaware Stay Order"). However, as more fully detailed below, the Delaware Stay Order has permitted the Illinois Court to enter the First Day Orders. CEWL seeks recognition of these First Day Orders in order to ensure stability and the status quo pending the outcome of the venue dispute, and will return to this Court to advise of the outcome of that dispute and to seek any further orders as may be advisable or appropriate in the circumstances.

8 The Chapter 11 Debtors are part of a geographically diversified casino-entertainment group of companies (collectively, "Caesars") headed by Caesars Entertainment Corporation ("CEC"), a U.S. publicly traded company that owns, operates or manages 50 casinos in five countries in three continents, with properties in the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, South Africa, and Egypt. CEC is not a Chapter 11 Debtor.

9 CEC is the majority shareholder of CEOC, a Chapter 11 Debtor. The remaining Chapter 11 Debtors, including CEWL, are direct and indirect subsidiaries of CEOC. The Chapter 11 Debtors are the primary operating units of the Caesars gaming enterprise.

10 On January 12, 2015, certain petitioning creditors filed an involuntary petition against CEOC under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code (but not as against the other Chapter 11 Debtors, including CEWL). That involuntary petition has not been resolved.

11 Meanwhile, the Chapter 11 Debtors commenced their own voluntary proceedings in the Illinois Court on January 15, 2015. Hearings were conducted in both the Delaware Court and the Illinois Court on January 15, 2015, which have culminated in the entering of the Delaware Stay Order, and the First Day Orders.

12 Notwithstanding the stay, the Delaware Court has permitted CEOC to obtain the First Day Orders from the Illinois Court, which are currently in effect pending litigation over the appropriate venue for the Chapter 11 case of CEOC and its subsidiaries. As such, while any further steps in the Chapter 11 Proceeding in the Illinois Court beyond the First Day Orders are currently stayed, the Applicant submits it is necessary to obtain recognition of the First Day Orders in Canada pending further developments in the Delaware Court. CEWL will advise the Court of any further developments in respect of the venue litigation, and will seek such further orders as may be advisable in the circumstances.

13 CEWL is the only one of the 173 Chapter 11 Debtors that is not incorporated in the United States. It is a wholly-owned indirect subsidiary of CEOC.

14 The almost exclusive function of CEWL is to manage the Windsor Casino pursuant to an operating agreement dated as of December 14, 2006 (the "Operating Agreement") between Caesars Entertainment Windsor Holding, Inc. (now CEWL) and the Ontario Lottery and Gaming Corporation ("OLG").

15 CEWL supplies the management services set out in the Operating Agreement to OLG, in consideration for an operating fee. CEWL does not have an ownership interest in the Windsor Casino.

16 CEWL operates the Windsor Casino under Caesars' trademarks and branding. The trademarks have been licenced to OLG by Caesars World, a U.S.-based Chapter 11 Debtor and, in turn, sublicensed by OLG.

17 CEWL's primary assets in Canada consist of (a) its rights under the Operating Agreement and (b) cash on deposit from time to time in its corporate bank accounts.

18 Windsor Casino Limited ("WCL") is a wholly-owned subsidiary of CEWL. WCL employs the approximately 2,800 employees who work at the Windsor Casino. Certain of the WCL employees are unionized members of Unifor Local 444 (the "Union"). Neither CEWL nor WCL administers a defined benefit pension plan although WCL does administer a defined contribution pension plan. WCL is not a Chapter 11 Debtor and as such is not a subject of this Application.

19 CEWL intends to operate the Windsor Casino pursuant to the Operating Agreement in the normal course through the Chapter 11 Proceeding. It is not currently contemplated that the Chapter 11 Debtors will restructure any of the business or operations of CEWL or WCL, or compromise any of their obligations.

20 The Record establishes that the Chapter 11 Debtors, including CEWL, are managed from the United States as an integrated group from a corporate, strategic, financial, and management perspective. In particular:

> a. pursuant the USD, CEWL's corporate decision-making (including with respect to the Operating Agreement and the Chapter 11 Proceeding) is done by its sole shareholder, Caesars World, a Florida corporation;
>
> b. the Chief Executive Officer and President of CEWL (who is resident in Windsor, Ontario), reports to the Chairman of the Board of CEWL (the "Chairman"). The Chairman, who is also an officer of CEOC, resides in the United States and works from the Caesars head office in Las Vegas, Nevada;
>
> c. certain centralized services critical to CEWL's functioning, including the administration of the Caesars brand and intellectual property rights, services related to online hotel booking, and administration of the loyalty "Total Rewards" program for customers are administered and handled from the United States;
>
> d. the majority of the strategic marketing and communications decisions regarding the brand and loyalty programs are made, and related functions taken, on behalf of all Chapter 11 Debtors, including CEWL, in the United States;
>
> e. management fees earned by CEWL under the Operating Agreement may be paid by way of dividend from time to time to CEWL's U.S. corporate partners; and
>
> f. strategic and directional decisions for CEWL are ultimately made in the United States.

21 CEWL is party to a unanimous shareholder declaration (the "USD") that grants CEWL's sole shareholder, Caesar's World, all the rights, powers and liabilities of the directors of CEWL. The Foreign Representation Resolution authorized CEWL to file as a Chapter 11 Debtor and to act as the foreign representative of all of the Chapter 11 Debtors for the purposes of recognizing the Chapter 11 Proceeding in Canada. By letter dated January 16, 2015, CEOC confirmed CEWL's authorization to act as foreign representative for the Chapter 11 Debtors.

Issues

22 The issues on this Application are:

a. Should this Court recognize the Chapter 11 Proceeding as a foreign main proceeding pursuant to sections 46 through 48 of the CCAA and grant the Initial Recognition Order sought by the Applicant?

b. Should this Court grant the Supplemental Order sought by the Applicant under section 49 of the CCAA?

Analysis

23 Subsection 46(1) of the CCAA provides that a foreign representative may apply to the Court for recognition of a foreign proceeding in respect of which he or she is a foreign representative.

24 CEWL has been authorized to act as foreign representative of the Chapter 11 Debtors pursuant to the Foreign Representative Resolution executed by CEWL's sole shareholder. CEOC, for itself and on behalf of its subsidiaries, has written to CEWL confirming its authorization to act as foreign representative of the Chapter 11 Debtors. It is CEWL's position that this authorization is sufficient for purposes of subsection 45(1) of the CCAA.

25 There is no language in Part IV of the CCAA that requires a foreign representative to be appointed by order of the court in the foreign proceeding.

26 I accept that for the purposes of this application that CEWL is a "foreign representative".

27 In response to an application brought by a foreign representative under subsection 46(1) of the CCAA, subsection 47(1) of the CCAA provides that the Court shall grant an order recognizing the foreign proceeding if the proceeding is a foreign proceeding and the applicant is a foreign representative in respect of that proceeding.

28 Canadian courts have consistently held that court proceedings under chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code constitute "foreign proceedings" for the purposes of the CCAA (see: *Digital Domain Media Group Inc., Re*, 2012 BCSC 1565 (B.C.

S.C. [In Chambers]) at para. 15; and *Lightsquared LP, Re*, 2012 ONSC 2994, 92 C.B.R. (5th) 321 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at para. 18). I am satisfied that the Chapter 11 Proceeding is a "foreign proceeding".

29 CEWL submits that it is appropriate for this Court to recognize the Chapter 11 Proceeding as a foreign main proceeding.

30 If the foreign proceeding is recognized as a foreign main proceeding, there is an automatic stay provided in section 48(1) of the CCAA against proceedings concerning the debtor's property, debts, liabilities or obligations and prohibitions against selling or disposing of property in Canada.

31 Subsection 45(1) of the CCAA provides that a "foreign main proceeding" is a foreign proceeding in the jurisdiction of the debtor company's centre of main interests ("COMI")."

32 For the purposes of Part IV of the CCAA, in the absence of proof to the contrary, a debtor company's registered office is deemed to be the COMI.

33 In *Lightsquared*, the Court found that the following principal factors, considered as a whole, will tend to indicate whether the location in which the proceeding has been filed is the debtor's COMI:

a. the location is readily ascertainable by creditors;

b. the location is one in which the debtor's principal assets or operations are found; and

c. the locations where the management of the debtor takes place.

(see: *Lightsquared LP, Re, supra* at para. 25; and *MtGox Co., Re*, 2014 ONSC 5811, 245 A.C.W.S. (3d) 280 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at para. 21)

34 While CEWL is incorporated in Ontario and has its registered head office in Ontario, the Applicant submits that Ontario is not its centre of main interests.

35 I am satisfied that the COMI for the Chapter 11 Debtors is the United States. In arriving at this decision, I have taken into account that CEWL is the only Chapter 11 Debtor that is not incorporated in a U.S. jurisdiction. All of the other 172 Chapter 11 Debtors have their head office or headquarters located in the United States. In addition:

a. the Chapter 11 Debtors operate as an functionally integrated group from a corporate, strategic, financial and management perspective;

b. pursuant to the USD, CEWL's corporate decisions are made by its sole shareholder, Caesars World, a Florida

corporation;

c. CEWL's Chief Executive Officer and President report to the Chairman, who resides in the United States and works from the Caesars head office in Las Vegas, Nevada;

d. centralized services critical to CEWL's operations, including the administration of the Caesars brand and intellectual property rights, services related to online hotel booking, the Windsor Casino website, and administration of the "Total Rewards" loyalty program are operated from the United States;

e. strategic and directional decisions for CEWL are ultimately made in the United States.

36 In the result, I am satisfied that the Chapter 11 Proceeding should be recognized as a "foreign main proceeding".

37 The relief requested in the Initial Recognition Order is granted.

38 In the context of cross-border insolvencies, Canadian courts have consistently encouraged comity and cooperation between courts in various jurisdictions in order to enable enterprises to restructure on a cross-border basis (see: *Lear Canada, Re* (2009), 55 C.B.R. (5th) 57, 2009 CarswellOnt 4232 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at paras. 11 and 17; and *Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd., Re* (2000), 18 C.B.R. (4th) 157, 2000 CarswellOnt 704 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) at para. 9).

39 Having reviewed the Record, I am satisfied, based on the facts in Mr. James Smith's affidavit and for the reasons set out in the Applicant's factum, that it is appropriate for the Court in this case to exercise its authority under sections 49(1) and 50 of the CCAA to grant the relief sought in the Supplemental Order, in order to maintain the status quo and protect the assets of the Chapter 11 Debtors, while permitting CEWL to continue operating its business as usual in Canada during the Chapter 11 Proceeding.

Disposition

40 In the result, the Application is granted. The Initial Recognition Order and the Supplemental Order have been signed, with the Supplemental Order having been modified to exclude a stay of actions against directors and officers of the Chapter 11 Debtors, as I consider such requested relief to be beyond the scope of appropriate relief in the Supplemental Order at this time.

Schedule "A" — List of Chapter 11 Debtors

Legal Name	*State of Formation*
CZL Development Company, LLC	Delaware
Harrah's Iowa Arena Management, LLC	Delaware
PHW Manager, LLC	Nevada
190 Flamingo, LLC	Nevada
AJP Holdings, LLC	Delaware
AJP Parent, LLC	Delaware
B I Gaming Corporation	Nevada
Bally's Midwest Casino, Inc.	Delaware
Bally's Park Place, Inc.	New Jersey
Benco, Inc.	Nevada

Biloxi Hammond, LLC	Delaware
Biloxi Village Walk Development, LLC	Delaware
BL Development Corp.	Minnesota
Boardwalk Regency Corporation	New Jersey
Caesars Entertainment Canada Holding, Inc.	Nevada
Caesars Entertainment Finance Corp.	Nevada
Caesars Entertainment Golf, Inc.	Nevada
Caesars Entertainment Retail, Inc.	Nevada
Caesars India Sponsor Company, LLC	Nevada
Caesars Marketing Services Corporation (f/k/a Harrah's Marketing Services Corporation)	Nevada
Caesars New Jersey, Inc.	New Jersey
Caesars Palace Corporation	Delaware
Caesars Palace Realty Corporation	Nevada
Caesars Palace Sports Promotions, Inc.	Nevada
Caesars Riverboat Casino, LLC	Indiana
Caesars Trex, Inc.	Delaware
Caesars United Kingdom, Inc.	Nevada
Caesars World Marketing Corporation	New Jersey
Caesars World Merchandising, Inc.	Nevada
Caesars World, Inc.	Florida
California Clearing Corporation	California
Casino Computer Programming, Inc.	Indiana
Chester Facility Holding Company, LLC	Delaware
Consolidated Supplies, Services and Systems	Nevada
DCH Exchange, LLC	Nevada
DCH Lender, LLC	Nevada
Desert Palace, Inc.	Nevada
Durante Holdings, LLC	Nevada
East Beach Development Corporation	Mississippi
GCA Acquisition Subsidiary, Inc.	Minnesota
GNOC, Corp.	New Jersey
Grand Casinos of Biloxi, LLC (f/k/a Grand Casinos of Mississippi, Inc. - Biloxi)	Minnesota
Grand Casinos of Mississippi, LLC — Gulfport	Mississippi
Grand Casinos, Inc.	Minnesota
Grand Media Buying, Inc.	Minnesota
Harrah South Shore Corporation	California
Harrah's Arizona Corporation	Nevada
Harrah's Bossier City Investment Company, L.L.C.	Louisiana
Harrah's Bossier City Management Company, LLC	Nevada
Harrah's Chester Downs Investment Company, LLC	Delaware
Harrah's Chester Downs Management Company, LLC	Nevada
Harrah's Illinois Corporation	Nevada
Harrah's Interactive Investment Company	Nevada
Harrah's International Holding Company, Inc.	Delaware
Harrah's Investments, Inc. (f/k/a Harrah's Wheeling Corporation)	Nevada
Harrah's Management Company	Nevada
Harrah's MH Project, LLC	Delaware
Harrah's NC Casino Company, LLC	North Carolina
Harrah's North Kansas City LLC (f/k/a Harrah's North Kansas City Corporation)	Missouri
Harrah's Operating Company Memphis, LLC	Delaware
Harrah's Pittsburgh Management Company	Nevada
Harrah's Reno Holding Company, Inc.	Nevada
Harrah's Shreveport Investment Company, LLC	Nevada
Harrah's Shreveport Management Company, LLC	Nevada

Harrah's Shreveport/Bossier City Holding Company, LLC	Delaware
Harrah's Shreveport/Bossier City Investment Company, LLC	Delaware
Harrah's Southwest Michigan Casino Corporation	Nevada
Harrah's Travel, Inc.	Nevada
Harrah's West Warwick Gaming Company, LLC	Delaware
Harveys BR Management Company, Inc.	Nevada
Harveys C.C. Management Company, Inc.	Nevada
Harveys Iowa Management Company, Inc.	Nevada
Harveys Tahoe Management Company, Inc.	Nevada
H-BAY, LLC	Nevada
HBR Realty Company, Inc.	Nevada
HCAL, LLC	Nevada
HCR Services Company, Inc.	Nevada
HEI Holding Company One, Inc.	Nevada
HEI Holding Company Two, Inc.	Nevada
HHLV Management Company, LLC	Nevada
Hole in the Wall, LLC	Nevada
Horseshoe Entertainment	Louisiana
Horseshoe Gaming Holding, LLC	Delaware
Horseshoe GP, LLC	Nevada
Horseshoe Hammond, LLC	Indiana
Horseshoe Shreveport, L.L.C.	Louisiana
HTM Holding, Inc.	Nevada
Koval Holdings Company, LLC	Delaware
Koval Investment Company, LLC	Nevada
Las Vegas Golf Management, LLC	Nevada
Las Vegas Resort Development, Inc.	Nevada
Martial Development Corp.	New Jersey
Nevada Marketing, LLC	Nevada
New Gaming Capital Partnership	Nevada
Ocean Showboat, Inc.	New Jersey
Players Bluegrass Downs, Inc.	Kentucky
Players Development, Inc.	Nevada
Players Holding, LLC	Nevada
Players International, LLC	Nevada
Players LC, LLC	Nevada
Players Maryland Heights Nevada, LLC	Nevada
Players Resources, Inc.	Nevada
Players Riverboat II, LLC	Louisiana
Players Riverboat Management, LLC	Nevada
Players Riverboat, LLC	Nevada
Players Services, Inc.	New Jersey
Reno Crossroads LLC	Delaware
Reno Projects, Inc.	Nevada
Rio Development Company, Inc.	Nevada
Robinson Property Group Corp.	Mississippi
Roman Entertainment Corporation of Indiana	Indiana
Roman Holding Corporation of Indiana	Indiana
Showboat Atlantic City Mezz 1, LLC	Delaware
Showboat Atlantic City Mezz 2, LLC	Delaware
Showboat Atlantic City Mezz 3, LLC	Delaware
Showboat Atlantic City Mezz 4, LLC	Delaware
Showboat Atlantic City Mezz 5, LLC	Delaware
Showboat Atlantic City Mezz 6, LLC	Delaware

Showboat Atlantic City Mezz 7, LLC	Delaware
Showboat Atlantic City Mezz 8, LLC	Delaware
Showboat Atlantic City Mezz 9, LLC	Delaware
Showboat Atlantic City Operating Company, LLC	New Jersey
Showboat Atlantic City Propco, LLC	Delaware
Showboat Holding, Inc.	Nevada
Southern Illinois Riverboat/Casino Cruises, Inc.	Illinois
Tahoe Garage Propco, LLC	Delaware
TRB Flamingo, LLC	Nevada
Trigger Real Estate Corporation	Nevada
Tunica Roadhouse Corporation (f/k/a Sheraton Tunica Corporation)	Delaware
Village Walk Construction, LLC	Delaware
Winnick Holdings, LLC	Delaware
Winnick Parent, LLC	Delaware
3535 LV Corp. (f/k/a Harrah's Imperial Palace)	Nevada
Caesars License Company, LLC (f/k/a Harrah's License Company, LLC)	Nevada
FHR Corporation	Nevada
FHR Parent, LLC	Delaware
Flamingo-Laughlin Parent, LLC	Delaware
Flamingo-Laughlin, Inc. (f/k/a Flamingo Hilton-Laughlin, Inc.)	Nevada
Harrah's New Orleans Management Company	Nevada
LVH Corporation	Nevada
Parball Corporation	Nevada
Caesars Escrow Corporation (f/k/a Harrah's Escrow Corporation)	Delaware
Caesars Operating Escrow LLC (f/k/a Harrah's Operating Escrow LLC)	Delaware
Corner Investment Company Newco, LLC	Delaware
Harrah's Maryland Heights Operating Company	Nevada
BPP Providence Acquisition Company, LLC	Delaware
Caesars Air, LLC	Delaware
Caesars Baltimore Development Company, LLC	Delaware
Caesars Massachusetts Acquisition Company, LLC	Delaware
Caesars Massachusetts Development Company, LLC	Delaware
Caesars Massachusetts Investment Company, LLC	Delaware
Caesars Massachusetts Management Company, LLC	Delaware
CG Services, LLC	Delaware
Christian County Land Acquisition Company, LLC	Delaware
CZL Management Company, LLC	Delaware
HIE Holdings Topco, Inc.	Delaware
PH Employees Parent LLC	Delaware
PHW Investments, LLC	Delaware
Caesars Entertainment Operating Company, Inc. (f/k/a Harrah's Operating Company, Inc.)	Delaware
Caesars Entertainment Windsor Limited (f/k/a Caesars Entertainment Windsor Holding, Inc.)	Canada
Octavius Linq Holding Co., LLC	Delaware
Caesars Baltimore Acquisition Company, LLC	Delaware
Caesars Baltimore Management Company, LLC	Delaware
PHW Las Vegas, LLC	Nevada
3535 LV Parent, LLC	Delaware
Bally's Las Vegas Manager, LLC	Delaware
Cromwell Manager, LLC	Delaware
JCC Holding Company II Newco, LLC	Delaware
Laundry Parent, LLC	Delaware
LVH Parent, LLC	Delaware
Parball Parent, LLC	Delaware
The Quad Manager, LLC	Delaware

Des Plaines Development Limited Partnership	Delaware

Application granted.

End of Document

Tab 4

2000 CarswellOnt 704
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd., Re

2000 CarswellOnt 704, [2000] O.J. No. 786, 18 C.B.R. (4th) 157, 5 B.L.R. (3d) 75, 95 A.C.W.S. (3d) 608

In the Matter of Section 18.6 of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended

In the Matter of Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd.

Farley J.

Heard: February 25, 2000
Judgment: February 25, 2000
Docket: 00-CL-3667

Counsel: *Derrick Tay*, for Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd.
Paul Macdonald, for Citibank North America Inc., Lenders under the Post-Petition Credit Agreement.

Subject: Corporate and Commercial; Insolvency

Related Abridgment Classifications
For all relevant Canadian Abridgment Classifications refer to highest level of case via History.

Headnote

Corporations --- Arrangements and compromises — Under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Arrangements — Effect of arrangement — Stay of proceedings

Solvent corporation applied for interim order under s. 18.6 of Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act for stay of actions and enforcements against corporation in respect of asbestos tort claims — Application granted — Application was to be reviewed in light of doctrine of comity, inherent jurisdiction, and aspect of liberal interpretation of Act generally — Proceedings commenced by corporation's parent corporation in United States and other United States related corporations for protection under c. 11 of United States Bankruptcy Code in connection with mass asbestos tort claims constituted foreign proceeding for purposes of s. 18.6 of Act — Insolvency of debtor in foreign proceeding was not condition precedent for proceeding to be foreign proceeding under definition of s. 18.6 of Act — Corporation was entitled to avail itself of provisions of s. 18.6 of Act — Relief requested was not of nature contrary to provisions of Act — Recourse may be had to s. 18.6 of Act in case of solvent debtor — Chapter 11 proceedings in United States were intended to resolve mass asbestos-related tort claims that seriously threatened long-term viability of corporation's parent — Corporation was significant participant in overall international operation and interdependence existed between corporation and its parent as to facilities and services — Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C. 1982, c. 11 — Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, s. 18.6.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by *Farley J.*:

Arrowmaster Inc. v. Unique Forming Ltd. (1993), 17 O.R. (3d) 407, 29 C.P.C. (3d) 65 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — applied

ATL Industries Inc. v. Han Eol Ind. Co. (1995), 36 C.P.C. (3d) 288 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — applied

Hongkong Bank of Canada v. Chef Ready Foods Ltd. (1990), 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 84, 4 C.B.R. (3d) 311, (sub nom. *Chef Ready Foods Ltd. v. Hongkong Bank of Canada)* [1991] 2 W.W.R. 136 (B.C. C.A.) — referred to

Hunt v. T & N plc (1993), [1994] 1 W.W.R. 129, 21 C.P.C. (3d) 269, (sub nom. *Hunt v. Lac d'Amiante du Québec Ltée)* 37 B.C.A.C. 161, (sub nom. *Hunt v. Lac d'Amiante du Québec Ltée)* 60 W.A.C. 161, (sub nom. *Hunt v. T&N plc)* [1993] 4 S.C.R. 289, (sub nom. *Hunt v. T&N plc)* 109 D.L.R. (4th) 16, 85 B.C.L.R. (2d) 1, (sub nom. *Hunt v. Lac d'Amiante du Québec Ltée)* 161 N.R. 81 (S.C.C.) — referred to

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

Loewen Group Inc. v. Continental Insurance Co. of Canada (1997), 48 C.C.L.I. (2d) 119, 44 B.C.L.R. (3d) 387 (B.C. S.C.) — considered

Microbiz Corp. v. Classic Software Systems Inc. (1996), 45 C.B.R. (3d) 40 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — referred to

Morguard Investments Ltd. v. De Savoye (1990), 46 C.P.C. (2d) 1, 15 R.P.R. (2d) 1, 76 D.L.R. (4th) 256, 122 N.R. 81, [1991] 2 W.W.R. 217, 52 B.C.L.R. (2d) 160, [1990] 3 S.C.R. 1077 (S.C.C.) — applied

Olympia & York Developments Ltd. v. Royal Trust Co. (1993), 20 C.B.R. (3d) 165 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — considered

Pacific National Lease Holding Corp. v. Sun Life Trust Co., 34 C.B.R. (3d) 4, 10 B.C.L.R. (3d) 62, [1995] 10 W.W.R. 714, (sub nom. *Pacific National Lease Holding Corp., Re)* 62 B.C.A.C. 151, (sub nom. *Pacific National Lease Holding Corp., Re)* 103 W.A.C. 151 (B.C. C.A.) — referred to

Roberts v. Picture Butte Municipal Hospital (1998), 64 Alta. L.R. (3d) 218, 23 C.P.C. (4th) 300, 227 A.R. 308, [1999] 4 W.W.R. 443 (Alta. Q.B.) — considered

Taylor v. Dow Corning Australia Pty. Ltd. (December 19, 1997), Doc. 8438/95 (Australia Vic. Sup. Ct.) — referred to

Tradewell Inc. v. American Sensors & Electronics Inc. (U.S. S.D. N.Y. 1997)

Westar Mining Ltd., Re, 70 B.C.L.R. (2d) 6, 14 C.B.R. (3d) 88, [1992] 6 W.W.R. 331 (B.C. S.C.) — referred to

Statutes considered:

Bankruptcy Amendment Code, (U.S.), 1994
Generally — considered

Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C. 1982
Chapter 11 — considered

s. 524(g) — considered

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3
Pt XIII [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 118] — referred to

s. 267 "debtor" [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 118] — considered

ss. 267-275 [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 118] — referred to

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act and the Income Tax Act, Act to amend the, S.C. 1997, c. 12
Generally — referred to

Business Corporations Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. B.16
Generally — referred to

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36
s. 2 "debtor company" — considered

s. 3 — considered

s. 4 — considered

s. 5 — considered

s. 17 — referred to

s. 18.6 [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — considered

s. 18.6(1) "foreign proceeding" [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — considered

s. 18.6(2) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — considered

s. 18.6(3) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — considered

s. 18.6(4) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — considered

s. 18.6(8) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — considered

APPLICATION by solvent corporation for interim order under s. 18.6 of *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act.*

***Farley J.*:**

1 I have had the opportunity to reflect on this matter which involves an aspect of the recent amendments to the insolvency legislation of Canada, which amendments have not yet been otherwise dealt with as to their substance. The applicant, Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd. ("BW Canada"), a solvent company, has applied for an interim order under s. 18.6 of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA"):

> (a) that the proceedings commenced by BW Canada's parent U.S. corporation and certain other U.S. related corporations (collectively "BWUS") for protection under Chapter 11 of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code in connection with mass asbestos claims before the U.S. Bankruptcy Court be recognized as a "foreign proceeding" for the purposes of s. 18.6;
>
> (b) that BW Canada be declared a company which is entitled to avail itself of the provisions of s. 18.6;
>
> (c) that there be a stay against suits and enforcements until May 1, 2000 (or such later date as the Court may order) as to asbestos related proceedings against BW Canada, its property and its directors;
>
> (d) that BW Canada be authorized to guarantee the obligations of its parent to the DIP Lender (debtor in possession lender) and grant security therefor in favour of the DIP Lender; and
>
> (e) and for other ancillary relief.

2 In Chapter 11 proceedings under the U.S. Bankruptcy Code, the U.S. Bankruptcy Court in New Orleans issued a temporary restraining order on February 22, 2000 wherein it was noted that BW Canada may be subject to actions in Canada similar to the U.S. asbestos claims. U.S. Bankruptcy Court Judge Brown's temporary restraining order was directed against certain named U.S. resident plaintiffs in the asbestos litigation:

> . . . and towards all plaintiffs and potential plaintiffs in Other Derivative Actions, that they are hereby restrained further prosecuting Pending Actions or further prosecuting or commencing Other Derivative Actions against Non-Debtor Affiliates, until the Court decides whether to grant the Debtors' request for a preliminary injunction.

Judge Brown further requested the aid and assistance of the Canadian courts in carrying out the U.S. Bankruptcy Court's orders. The "Non-Debtor Affiliates" would include BW Canada.

3 Under the 1994 amendments to the U.S. Bankruptcy Code, the concept of the establishment of a trust sufficient to meet the court determined liability for a mass torts situations was introduced. I am advised that after many years of successfully resolving the overwhelming majority of claims against it on an individual basis by settlement on terms BWUS considered reasonable, BWUS has determined, as a result of a spike in claims with escalating demands when it was expecting a decrease in claims, that it is appropriate to resort to the mass tort trust concept. Hence its application earlier this week to Judge Brown with a view to eventually working out a global process, including incorporating any Canadian claims. This would be done in conjunction with its joint pool of insurance which covers both BWUS and BW Canada. Chapter 11 proceedings do not require an applicant thereunder to be insolvent; thus BWUS was able to make an application with a view towards the 1994 amendments (including s. 524(g)). This subsection would permit the U.S. Bankruptcy Court on confirmation of a plan of reorganization under Chapter 11 with a view towards rehabilitation in the sense of avoiding insolvency in a mass torts situation to:

> . . . enjoin entities from taking legal action for the purpose of directly or indirectly collecting, recovering, or receiving payment or recovery with respect to any claims or demand that, under a plan of reorganization, is to be paid in whole or in part by a trust.

4 In 1997, ss. 267-275 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, as amended ("BIA") and s. 18.6 of the CCAA were enacted to address the rising number of international insolvencies ("1997 Amendments"). The 1997 Amendments were introduced after a lengthy consultation process with the insolvency profession and others. Previous to the 1997 Amendments, Canadian courts essentially would rely on the evolving common law principles of comity which permitted the Canadian court to recognize and enforce in Canada the judicial acts of other jurisdictions.

5 La Forest J in *Morguard Investments Ltd. v. De Savoye* (1990), 76 D.L.R. (4th) 256 (S.C.C.), at p. 269 described the principle of comity as:

> "Comity" in the legal sense, is neither a matter of absolute obligation, on the one hand, nor of mere courtesy and goodwill, upon the other. But it is the recognition which one nation allows within its territory to the legislative, executive or judicial acts of another nation, having due regard both to international duty and convenience, and to the rights of its own citizens or of other persons who are under the protections of its laws . . .

6 In *ATL Industries Inc. v. Han Eol Ind. Co.* (1995), 36 C.P.C. (3d) 288 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]), at pp. 302-3 I noted the following:

> Allow me to start off by stating that I agree with the analysis of MacPherson J. in *Arrowmaster Inc. v. Unique Forming Ltd.* (1993), 17 O.R. (3d) 407 (Gen. Div.) when in discussing *Morguard Investments Ltd. v. De Savoye*, [1990] 3 S.C.R. 1077, 76 D.L.R. (4th) 256, 52 B.C.L.R. (2d) 160, 122 N.R. 81, [1991] 2 W.W.R. 217, 46 C.P.C. (2d) 1, 15 R.P.R. (2d) 1, he states at p.411:
>
> > The leading case dealing with the enforcement of "foreign" judgments is the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada in *Morguard Investments, supra*. The question in that case was whether, and the circumstances in which, the judgment of an Alberta court could be enforced in British Columbia. A unanimous court, speaking through La Forest J., held in favour of enforceability and, in so doing, discussed in some detail the doctrinal principles governing inter-jurisdictional enforcement of orders. I think it fair to say that the overarching theme of La Forest J.'s reasons is the necessity and desirability, in a mobile global society, for governments and courts to respect the orders made by courts in foreign jurisdictions with comparable legal systems, including substantive laws and rules of procedure. He expressed this theme in these words, at p. 1095:
> >
> > > Modern states, however, cannot live in splendid isolation and do give effect to judgments given in other countries in certain circumstances. Thus a judgment *in rem*, such as a decree of divorce granted by the courts of one state to persons domiciled there, will be recognized by the courts of other states. In certain circumstances, as well, our courts will enforce personal judgments given in other states. Thus, we saw, our courts will enforce an action for breach of contract given by the courts of another country if the defendant was present there at the time of the action or has agreed to the foreign court's exercise of jurisdiction. *This, it was thought, was in conformity with the requirements of comity, the informing principle of private international law, which has been stated to be the deference and respect due by other states to the actions of a state legitimately taken within its territory. Since the state where the judgment was given has power over the litigants, the judgments of its courts should be respected.* (emphasis added in original)
> >
> > *Morguard Investments* was, as stated earlier, a case dealing with the enforcement of a court order across provincial boundaries. However, the historical analysis in La Forest J.'s judgment, of both the United Kingdom and Canadian jurisprudence, and the doctrinal principles enunciated by the court are equally applicable, in my view, in a situation where the judgment has been rendered by a court in a foreign jurisdiction. This should not be an absolute rule - there will be some foreign court orders that should not be enforced in Ontario, perhaps because the substantive law in the foreign country is so different from Ontario's or perhaps because the legal process that generates the foreign

order diverges radically from Ontario's process. (my emphasis added)

Certainly the substantive and procedural aspects of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code including its 1994 amendments are not so different and do not radically diverge from our system.

7 After reviewing La Forest J.'s definition of comity, I went on to observe at p. 316:

> As was discussed by J.G. Castel, *Canadian Conflicts of Laws*, 3rd ed. (Toronto: Butterworths, 1994) at p. 270, there is a presumption of validity attaching to a foreign judgment unless and until it is established to be invalid. It would seem that the same type of evidence would be required to impeach a foreign judgment as a domestic one: fraud practiced on the court or tribunal: see *Sun Alliance Insurance Co. v. Thompson* (1981), 56 N.S.R. (2d) 619, 117 A.P.R. 619 (T.D.), Sopinka, supra, at p. 992.

La Forest J. went on to observe in *Morguard* at pp. 269-70:

> In a word, the rules of private international law are grounded in the need in modern times to facilitate the flow of wealth, skills and people across state lines in a fair and orderly manner.
>
> . . . . .
>
> Accommodating the flow of wealth, skills and people across state lines has now become imperative. Under these circumstances, our approach to the recognition and enforcement of foreign judgments would appear ripe for reappraisal.

See also *Hunt v. T & N plc* (1993), 109 D.L.R. (4th) 16 (S.C.C.), at p. 39.

8 While *Morguard* was an interprovincial case, there is no doubt that the principles in that case are equally applicable to international matters in the view of MacPherson J. and myself in *Arrowmaster* (1993), 17 O.R. (3d) 407 (Ont. Gen. Div.), and *ATL* respectively. Indeed the analysis by La Forest J. was on an international plane. As a country whose well-being is so heavily founded on international trade and investment, Canada of necessity is very conscious of the desirability of invoking comity in appropriate cases.

9 In the context of cross-border insolvencies, Canadian and U.S. Courts have made efforts to complement, coordinate and where appropriate accommodate the proceedings of the other. Examples of this would include *Olympia & York Developments Ltd.*, *Ever fresh Beverages Inc.* and *Loewen Group Inc. v. Continental Insurance Co. of Canada* (1997), 48 C.C.L.I. (2d) 119 (B.C. S.C.). Other examples involve the situation where a multi-jurisdictional proceeding is specifically connected to one jurisdiction with that jurisdiction's court being allowed to exercise principal control over the insolvency process: see *Roberts v. Picture Butte Municipal Hospital* (1998), 23 C.P.C. (4th) 300 (Alta. Q.B.), at pp. 5-7 [[1998] A.J. No. 817]; *Microbiz Corp. v. Classic Software Systems Inc.* (1996), 45 C.B.R. (3d) 40 (Ont. Gen. Div.), at p. 4; *Tradewell Inc. v. American Sensors Electronics, Inc.*, 1997 WL 423075 (S.D.N.Y. 1997).

10 In *Roberts*, Forsythe J. at pp. 5-7 noted that steps within the proceedings themselves are also subject to the dictates of comity in recognizing and enforcing a U.S. Bankruptcy Court stay in the *Dow Corning* litigation [*Taylor v. Dow Corning Australia Pty. Ltd.* (December 19, 1997), Doc. 8438/95 (Australia Vic. Sup. Ct.)] as to a debtor in Canada so as to promote greater efficiency, certainty and consistency in connection with the debtor's restructuring efforts. Foreign claimants were provided for in the U.S. corporation's plan. Forsyth J. stated:

> Comity and cooperation are increasingly important in the bankruptcy context. *As internationalization increases, more parties have assets and carry on activities in several jurisdictions. Without some coordination there would be multiple proceedings, inconsistent judgments and general uncertainty.*
>
> *. . . I find that common sense dictates that these matters would be best dealt with by one court, and in the interest of promoting international comity it seems the forum for this case is in the U.S. Bankruptcy Court.* Thus, in either case, whether there has been an attornment or not, I conclude it is appropriate for me to exercise my discretion and apply the principles of comity and grant the Defendant's stay application. I reach this conclusion based on all the circumstances, including the clear wording of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code provision, the similar philosophies and procedures in Canada and the U.S., the Plaintiff's attornment to the jurisdiction of the U.S. Bankruptcy Court, and the incredible number of claims outstanding . . . (emphasis added)

11 The CCAA as remedial legislation should be given a liberal interpretation to facilitate its objectives. See *Hongkong Bank of Canada v. Chef Ready Foods Ltd.* (1990), 4 C.B.R. (3d) 311 (B.C. C.A.), at p. 320; *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]).

12 David Tobin, the Director General, Corporate Governance Branch, Department of Industry in testifying before the Standing Committee on Industry regarding Bill C-5, An Act to amend the BIA, the CCAA and the Income Tax Act, stated at 1600:

> Provisions in Bill C-5 attempt to actually codify, which has always been the practice in Canada. They include the Court recognition of foreign representatives; Court authority to make orders to facilitate and coordinate international insolvencies; provisions that would make it clear that foreign representatives are allowed to commence proceedings in Canada, as per Canadian rules - however, they clarify that foreign stays of proceedings are not applicable but a foreign representative can apply to a court for a stay in Canada; and Canadian creditors and assets are protected by the bankruptcy and insolvency rules.

The philosophy of the practice in international matters relating to the CCAA is set forth in *Olympia & York Developments Ltd. v. Royal Trust Co.* (1993), 20 C.B.R. (3d) 165 (Ont. Gen. Div.), at p. 167 where Blair J. stated:

> The Olympia & York re-organization involves proceedings in three different jurisdictions: Canada, the United States and the United Kingdom. Insolvency disputes with international overtones and involving property and assets in a multiplicity of jurisdictions are becoming increasingly frequent. Often there are differences in legal concepts - sometimes substantive, sometimes procedural - between the jurisdictions. The Courts of the various jurisdictions should seek to cooperate amongst themselves, in my view, in facilitating the trans-border resolution of such disputes as a whole, where that can be done in a fashion consistent with their own fundamental principles of jurisprudence. The interests of international cooperation and comity, and the interests of developing at least some degree of certitude in international business and commerce, call for nothing less.

Blair J. then proceeded to invoke inherent jurisdiction to implement the Protocol between the U.S. Bankruptcy Court and the Ontario Court. See also my endorsement of December 20, 1995, in *Everfresh Beverages Inc.* where I observed: "I would think that this Protocol demonstrates the 'essence of comity' between the Courts of Canada and the United States of America." *Everfresh* was an example of the effective and efficient use of the Cross-Border Insolvency Concordat, adopted by the Council of the International Bar Association on May 31, 1996 (after being adopted by its Section on Business Law Council on September 17, 1995), which Concordat deals with, inter alia, principal administration of a debtor's reorganization and ancillary jurisdiction. See also the UNCITRAL Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency.

13 Thus it seems to me that this application by BW Canada should be reviewed in light of (i) the doctrine of comity as analyzed in *Morguard, Arrowmaster* and *ATL, supra*, in regard to its international aspects; (ii) inherent jurisdiction; (iii) the aspect of the liberal interpretation of the CCAA generally; and (iv) the assistance and codification of the 1997 Amendments.

"Foreign proceeding" is defined in s. 18.6(1) as:

> In this section,
>
> > "foreign proceeding" means a judicial or administrative proceeding commenced outside Canada in respect of a debtor under a law relating to bankruptcy or insolvency and dealing with the collective interests of creditors generally; . . .

Certainly a U.S. Chapter 11 proceeding would fit this definition subject to the question of "debtor". It is important to note that the definition of "foreign proceeding" in s. 18.6 of the CCAA contains no specific requirement that the debtor be insolvent. In contrast, the BIA defines a "debtor" in the context of a foreign proceeding (Part XIII of the BIA) as follows:

> s. 267 In this Part,
>
> > "debtor" means an *insolvent person* who has property in Canada, a *bankrupt* who has property in Canada or a *person who has the status of a bankrupt* under foreign law in a foreign proceeding and has property in Canada; . . . (emphasis added)

I think it a fair observation that the BIA is a rather defined code which goes into extensive detail. This should be contrasted with the CCAA which is a very short general statute which has been utilized to give flexibility to meet what might be described as the peculiar and unusual situation circumstances. A general categorization (which of course is never completely accurate) is that the BIA may be seen as being used for more run of the mill cases whereas the CCAA may be seen as facilitating the more unique or complicated cases. Certainly the CCAA provides the flexibility to deal with the thornier questions. Thus I do not think it unusual that the draftees of the 1997 Amendments would have it in their minds that the provisions of the CCAA dealing with foreign proceedings should continue to reflect this broader and more flexible approach in keeping with the general provisions of the CCAA, in contrast with the corresponding provisions under the BIA. In particular, it would appear to me to be a reasonably plain reading interpretation of s. 18.6 that recourse may be had to s. 18.6 of the CCAA in the case of a solvent debtor. Thus I would conclude that the aspect of insolvency is not a condition precedent vis-a-vis the "debtor" in the foreign proceedings (here the Chapter 11 proceedings) for the proceedings in Louisiana to be a foreign proceeding under the definition of s. 18.6. I therefore declare that those proceedings are to be recognized as a "foreign proceeding" for the purposes of s. 18.6 of the CCAA.

14 It appears to me that my conclusion above is reinforced by an analysis of s. 18.6(2) which deals with concurrent filings by a debtor under the CCAA in Canada and corresponding bankruptcy or insolvency legislation in a foreign jurisdiction. This is not the situation here, but it would be applicable in the *Loewen* case. That subsection deals with the coordination of proceedings as to a "debtor company" initiated pursuant to the CCAA and the foreign legislation.

> s. 18.6(2). The court may, in respect of a *debtor company*, make such orders and grant such relief as it considers appropriate to facilitate, approve or implement arrangements that will result in a coordination of proceedings under the Act with any foreign proceeding. (emphasis added)

15 The definition of "debtor company" is found in the general definition section of the CCAA, namely s. 2 and that definition incorporates the concept of insolvency. Section 18.6(2) refers to a "debtor company" since only a "debtor company" can file under the CCAA to propose a compromise with its unsecured or secured creditors: ss. 3, 4 and 5 CCAA. See also s. 18.6(8) which deals with currency concessions "[w]here a compromise or arrangement is proposed in respect of a debtor company . . . ". I note that "debtor company" is not otherwise referred to in s. 18.6; however "debtor" is referred to in both definitions under s. 18.6(1).

16 However, s. 18.6(4) provides a basis pursuant to which a company such as BW Canada, a solvent corporation, may seek judicial assistance and protection in connection with a foreign proceeding. Unlike s. 18.6(2), s. 18.6(4) does not contemplate a full filing under the CCAA. Rather s. 18.6(4) may be utilized to deal with situations where, notwithstanding that a full filing is not being made under the CCAA, ancillary relief is required in connection with a foreign proceeding.

> s. 18.6(4) Nothing in this section prevents the court, on the application of a foreign representative or *any other interested persons*, from applying such legal or equitable rules governing the recognition of foreign insolvency orders and assistance to foreign representatives as are not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act. (emphasis added)

BW Canada would fit within "any interested person" to bring the subject application to apply the principles of comity and cooperation. It would not appear to me that the relief requested is of a nature contrary to the provisions of the CCAA.

17 Additionally there is s. 18.6(3) whereby once it has been established that there is a foreign proceeding within the meaning of s. 18.6(1) (as I have concluded there is), then this court is given broad powers and wide latitude, all of which is consistent with the general judicial analysis of the CCAA overall, to make any order it thinks appropriate in the circumstances.

> s. 18.6(3) An order of the court under this Section may be made on such terms and conditions as the court considers appropriate in the circumstances.

This subsection reinforces the view expressed previously that the 1997 Amendments contemplated that it would be inappropriate to pigeonhole or otherwise constrain the interpretation of s. 18.6 since it would be not only impracticable but also impossible to contemplate the myriad of circumstances arising under a wide variety of foreign legislation which deal generally and essentially with bankruptcy and insolvency but not exclusively so. Thus, the Court was entrusted to exercise its discretion, but of course in a judicial manner.

18 Even aside from that, I note that the Courts of this country have utilized inherent jurisdiction to fill in any gaps in the legislation and to promote the objectives of the CCAA. Where there is a gap which requires bridging, then the question to be considered is what will be the most practical common sense approach to establishing the connection between the parts of the legislation so as to reach a just and reasonable solution. See *Westar Mining Ltd., Re* (1992), 14 C.B.R. (3d) 88 (B.C. S.C.), at pp. 93-4; *Pacific National Lease Holding Corp. v. Sun Life Trust Co.* (1995), 34 C.B.R. (3d) 4 (B.C. C.A.), at p. 2; *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd.* at p. 30.

19 The Chapter 11 proceedings are intended to resolve the mass asbestos related tort claims which seriously threaten the long term viability of BWUS and its subsidiaries including BW Canada. BW Canada is a significant participant in the overall Babcock & Wilcox international organization. From the record before me it appears reasonably clear that there is an interdependence between BWUS and BW Canada as to facilities and services. In addition there is the fundamental element of financial and business stability. This interdependence has been increased by the financial assistance given by the BW Canada

guarantee of BWUS' obligations.

20 To date the overwhelming thrust of the asbestos related litigation has been focussed in the U.S. In contradistinction BW Canada has not in essence been involved in asbestos litigation to date. The 1994 amendments to the U.S. Bankruptcy Code have provided a specific regime which is designed to deal with the mass tort claims (which number in the hundreds of thousands of claims in the U.S.) which appear to be endemic in the U.S. litigation arena involving asbestos related claims as well as other types of mass torts. This Court's assistance however is being sought to stay asbestos related claims against BW Canada with a view to this stay facilitating an environment in which a global solution may be worked out within the context of the Chapter 11 proceedings trust.

21 In my view, s. 18.6(3) and (4) permit BW Canada to apply to this Court for such a stay and other appropriate relief. Relying upon the existing law on the recognition of foreign insolvency orders and proceedings, the principles and practicalities discussed and illustrated in the Cross-Border Insolvency Concordat and the UNCITRAL Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvencies and inherent jurisdiction, all as discussed above, I would think that the following may be of assistance in advancing guidelines as to how s. 18.6 should be applied. I do not intend the factors listed below to be exclusive or exhaustive but merely an initial attempt to provide guidance:

(a) The recognition of comity and cooperation between the courts of various jurisdictions are to be encouraged.

(b) Respect should be accorded to the overall thrust of foreign bankruptcy and insolvency legislation in any analysis, unless in substance generally it is so different from the bankruptcy and insolvency law of Canada or perhaps because the legal process that generates the foreign order diverges radically from the process here in Canada.

(c) All stakeholders are to be treated equitably, and to the extent reasonably possible, common or like stakeholders are to be treated equally, regardless of the jurisdiction in which they reside.

(d) The enterprise is to be permitted to implement a plan so as to reorganize as a global unit, especially where there is an established interdependence on a transnational basis of the enterprise and to the extent reasonably practicable, one jurisdiction should take charge of the principal administration of the enterprise's reorganization, where such principal type approach will facilitate a potential reorganization and which respects the claims of the stakeholders and does not inappropriately detract from the net benefits which may be available from alternative approaches.

(e) The role of the court and the extent of the jurisdiction it exercises will vary on a case by case basis and depend to a significant degree upon the court's nexus to that enterprise; in considering the appropriate level of its involvement, the court would consider:

(i) the location of the debtor's principal operations, undertaking and assets;

(ii) the location of the debtor's stakeholders;

(iii) the development of the law in each jurisdiction to address the specific problems of the debtor and the enterprise;

(iv) the substantive and procedural law which may be applied so that the aspect of undue prejudice may be analyzed;

(v) such other factors as may be appropriate in the instant circumstances.

(f) Where one jurisdiction has an ancillary role,

(i) the court in the ancillary jurisdiction should be provided with information on an ongoing basis and be kept apprised of developments in respect of that debtor's reorganizational efforts in the foreign jurisdiction;

(ii) stakeholders in the ancillary jurisdiction should be afforded appropriate access to the proceedings in the principal jurisdiction.

(g) As effective notice as is reasonably practicable in the circumstances should be given to all affected stakeholders, with an opportunity for such stakeholders to come back into the court to review the granted order with a view, if thought desirable, to rescind or vary the granted order or to obtain any other appropriate relief in the circumstances.

22 Taking these factors into consideration, and with the determination that the Chapter 11 proceedings are a "foreign proceeding" within the meaning of s. 18.6 of the CCAA and that it is appropriate to declare that BW Canada is entitled to avail itself of the provisions of s. 18.6, I would also grant the following relief. There is to be a stay against suits and enforcement as requested; the initial time period would appear reasonable in the circumstances to allow BWUS to return to the U.S. Bankruptcy Court. Assuming the injunctive relief is continued there, this will provide some additional time to more fully prepare an initial draft approach with respect to ongoing matters. It should also be recognized that if such future relief is not granted in the U.S. Bankruptcy Court, any interested person could avail themselves of the "comeback" clause in the draft order presented to me and which I find reasonable in the circumstances. It appears appropriate, in the circumstances that BW Canada guarantee BWUS' obligations as aforesaid and to grant security in respect thereof, recognizing that same is permitted pursuant to the general corporate legislation affecting BW Canada, namely the *Business Corporations Act* (Ontario). I note that there is also a provision for an "Information Officer" who will give quarterly reports to this Court. Notices are to be published in the Globe & Mail (National Edition) and the National Post. In accordance with my suggestion at the hearing, the draft order notice has been revised to note that persons are alerted to the fact that they may become a participant in these Canadian proceedings and further that, if so, they may make representations as to pursuing their remedies regarding asbestos related claims in Canada as opposed to the U.S. As discussed above the draft order also includes an appropriate "comeback" clause. This Court (and I specifically) look forward to working in a cooperative judicial way with the U.S. Bankruptcy Court (and Judge Brown specifically).

23 I am satisfied that it is appropriate in these circumstances to grant an order in the form of the revised draft (a copy of which is attached to these reasons for the easy reference of others who may be interested in this area of s. 18.6 of the CCAA).

24 Order to issue accordingly.

Application granted.

APPENDIX

Court File No. 00-CL-3667

SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
COMMERCIAL LIST

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE FARLEY — FRIDAY, THE 25{ TH} DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2000

IN THE MATTER OF S. 18.6 OF THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED
AND IN THE MATTER OF BABCOCK & WILCOX CANADA LTD.

INITIAL ORDER

THIS MOTION made by the Applicant Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd. for an Order substantially in the form attached to the Application Record herein was heard this day, at 393 University Avenue, Toronto, Ontario.

ON READING the Notice of Application, the Affidavit of Victor J. Manica sworn February 23, 2000 (the "Manica Affidavit"), and on notice to the counsel appearing, and upon being advised that no other person who might be interested in these proceedings was served with the Notice of Application herein.

SERVICE

1. *THIS COURT ORDERS* that the time for service of the Notice of Application and the Affidavit in support of this Application be and it is hereby abridged such that the Application is properly returnable today, and, further, that any requirement for service of the Notice of Application and of the Application Record upon any interested party, other than the parties herein mentioned, is hereby dispensed with.

RECOGNITION OF THE U.S. PROCEEDINGS

2. *THIS COURT ORDERS AND DECLARES* that the proceedings commenced by the Applicant's United States corporate parent and certain other related corporations in the United States for protection under Chapter 11 of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code in connection with asbestos claims before the U.S. Bankruptcy Court (the "U.S. Proceedings") be and hereby is recognized as a "foreign proceeding" for purposes of Section 18.6 of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c.C-36, as amended, (the "CCAA").

APPLICATION

3. *THIS COURT ORDERS AND DECLARES* that the Applicant is a company which is entitled to relief pursuant to s. 18.6 of the CCAA.

PROTECTION FROM ASBESTOS PROCEEDINGS

4. *THIS COURT ORDERS* that until and including May 1, 2000, or such later date as the Court may order (the "Stay Period"), no suit, action, enforcement process, extra-judicial proceeding or other proceeding relating to, arising out of or in any way connected to damages or loss suffered, directly or indirectly, from asbestos, asbestos contamination or asbestos related diseases ("Asbestos Proceedings") against or in respect of the Applicant, its directors or any property of the Applicant, wheresoever located, and whether held by the Applicant in whole or in part, directly or indirectly, as principal or nominee, beneficially or otherwise shall be commenced, and any Asbestos Proceedings against or in respect of the Applicant, its directors or the Applicant's Property already commenced be and are hereby stayed and suspended.

5. *THIS COURT ORDERS* that during the Stay Period, the right of any person, firm, corporation, governmental authority or other entity to assert, enforce or exercise any right, option or remedy arising by law, by virtue of any agreement or by any other means, as a result of the making or filing of these proceedings, the U.S. Proceedings or any allegation made in these proceedings or the U.S. Proceedings be and is hereby restrained.

DIP FINANCING

6. *THIS COURT ORDERS* that the Applicant is hereby authorized and empowered to guarantee the obligations of its parent, The Babcock & Wilcox Company, to Citibank, N.A., as Administrative Agent, the Lenders, the Swing Loan Lender, and

Issuing Banks (as those terms are defined in the Post-Petition Credit Agreement (the "Credit Agreement")) dated as of February 22, 2000 (collectively, the "DIP Lender"), and to grant security (the "DIP Lender's Security") for such guarantee substantially on the terms and conditions set forth in the Credit Agreement.

7. *THIS COURT ORDERS* that the obligations of the Applicant pursuant to the Credit Agreement, the DIP Lender's Security and all the documents delivered pursuant thereto constitute legal, valid and binding obligations of the Applicant enforceable against it in accordance with the terms thereof, and the payments made and security granted by the Applicant pursuant to such documents do not constitute fraudulent preferences, or other challengeable or reviewable transactions under any applicable law.

8. *THIS COURT ORDERS* that the DIP Lender's Security shall be deemed to be valid and effective notwithstanding any negative covenants, prohibitions or other similar provisions with respect to incurring debt or the creation of liens or security contained in any existing agreement between the Applicant and any lender and that, notwithstanding any provision to the contrary in such agreements,

(a) the execution, delivery, perfection or registration of the DIP Lender's Security shall not create or be deemed to constitute a breach by the Applicant of any agreement to which it is a party, and

(b) the DIP Lender shall have no liability to any person whatsoever as a result of any breach of any agreement caused by or resulting from the Applicant entering into the Credit Agreement, the DIP Lender's Security or other document delivered pursuant thereto.

REPORT AND EXTENSION OF STAY

9. As part of any application by the Applicant for an extension of the Stay Period:

(a) the Applicant shall appoint Victor J. Manica, or such other senior officer as it deems appropriate from time to time, as an information officer (the "Information Officer");

(b) the Information Officer shall deliver to the Court a report at least once every three months outlining the status of the U.S. Proceeding, the development of any process for dealing with asbestos claims and such other information as the Information Officer believes to be material (the "Information Reports"); and

(c) the Applicant and the Information Officer shall incur no liability or obligation as a result of the appointment of the Information Officer or the fulfilment of the duties of the Information Officer in carrying out the provisions of this Order and no action or other proceedings shall be commenced against the Applicant or Information Officer as an result of or relating in any way to the appointment of the Information Officer or the fulfilment of the duties of the Information Officer, except with prior leave of this Court and upon further order securing the solicitor and his own client costs of the Information Officer and the Applicant in connection with any such action or proceeding.

SERVICE AND NOTICE

10. *THIS COURT ORDERS* that the Applicant shall, within fifteen (15) business days of the date of entry of this Order, publish a notice of this Order in substantially the form attached as Schedule "A" hereto on two separate days in the Globe & Mail (National Edition) and the National Post.

11. *THIS COURT ORDERS* that the Applicant be at liberty to serve this Order, any other orders in these proceedings, all other proceedings, notices and documents by prepaid ordinary mail, courier, personal delivery or electronic transmission to any interested party at their addresses as last shown on the records of the Applicant and that any such service or notice by courier, personal delivery or electronic transmission shall be deemed to be received on the next business day following the date of forwarding thereof, or if sent by ordinary mail, on the third business day after mailing.

MISCELLANEOUS

12. *THIS COURT ORDERS* that notwithstanding anything else contained herein, the Applicant may, by written consent of its counsel of record herein, agree to waive any of the protections provided to it herein.

13. *THIS COURT ORDERS* that the Applicant may, from time to time, apply to this Court for directions in the discharge of its powers and duties hereunder or in respect of the proper execution of this Order.

14. *THIS COURT ORDERS* that, notwithstanding any other provision of this Order, any interested person may apply to this Court to vary or rescind this order or seek other relief upon 10 days' notice to the Applicant 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.

15. *THIS COURT ORDERS AND REQUESTS* the aid and recognition of any court or any judicial, regulatory or administrative body in any province or territory of Canada (including the assistance of any court in Canada pursuant to Section 17 of the CCAA) and the Federal Court of Canada and any judicial, regulatory or administrative tribunal or other court constituted pursuant to the Parliament of Canada or the legislature of any province and any court or any judicial, regulatory or administrative body of the United States and the states or other subdivisions of the United States and of any other nation or state to act in aid of and to be complementary to this Court in carrying out the terms of this Order.

Schedule "A"

NOTICE

RE: IN THE MATTER OF S. 18.6 OF THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED (the "CCAA")

AND IN THE MATTER OF BABCOCK & WILCOX CANADA LTD.

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that this notice is being published pursuant to an Order of the Superior Court of Justice of Ontario made February 25, 2000. The corporate parent of Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd. and certain other affiliated corporations in the United States have filed for protection in the United States under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code to seek, as the result of recent, sharp increases in the cost of settling asbestos claims which have seriously threatened the Babcock & Wilcox Enterprise's long term health, protection from mass asbestos claims to which they are or may become subject. Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd. itself has not filed under Chapter 11 but has sought and obtained an interim order under Section 18.6 of the CCAA affording it a stay against asbestos claims in Canada. Further application may be made to the Court by Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd. to ensure fair and equal access for Canadians with asbestos claims against Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd. to the process established in the United States. Representations may also be made by parties who would prefer to pursue their remedies in Canada.

Persons who wish to be a party to the Canadian proceedings or to receive a copy of the order or any further information should contact counsel for Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd., Derrick C. Tay at Meighen Demers (Telephone (416) 340-6032

and Fax (416) 977-5239).

DATED this day of, 2000 at Toronto, Canada

Tabular or graphic material set at this point is not displayable.

Tab 5

2001 CarswellOnt 1830
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Matlack Inc., Re

2001 CarswellOnt 1830, [2001] O.J. No. 6121, [2001] O.T.C. 382, 26 C.B.R. (4th) 45

In the Matter of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, Section 18.6 as Amended

In the Matter of an Application of Matlack, Inc. and the Other Parties Set Out in Schedule "A" Ancillary to Proceedings Under Chapter 11 of the United States Bankruptcy Code

Matlack, Inc. and the Other Parties Set Out in Schedule "A", Applicant

Farley J.

Heard: April 19, 2001
Judgment: April 19, 2001
Docket: 01-CL-4109

Counsel: *E. Bruce Leonard, Shahana Kar*, for Applicant, Matlack Inc.

Subject: Insolvency; International; Corporate and Commercial

Related Abridgment Classifications
For all relevant Canadian Abridgment Classifications refer to highest level of case via History.

Headnote

Bankruptcy --- Bankruptcy and insolvency jurisdiction — Jurisdiction of courts — Jurisdiction of bankruptcy court — Territorial jurisdiction — Foreign bankruptcies

Foreign bankrupt was carrier based in Pennsylvania and operated leased facility in Ontario — Bankrupt obtained relief pursuant to Chapter 11 of United States Bankruptcy Code which precluded creditors from commencing or continuing proceedings against bankrupt — Canadian creditor seized and intended to sell bankrupt's assets to satisfy bankrupt's obligations — Bankrupt brought application for order for recognition of proceedings commenced pursuant to Chapter 11 to be recognized as "foreign proceeding" for purpose of Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, for stay of proceedings commence by creditor and for ancillary relief — Application granted — Coordinated reorganization of bankrupt was in interest of all creditors as would ensure that all creditors were treated equitably and fairly — Based on principles of comity court had jurisdiction to stay proceedings commenced against bankrupt — Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 — Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C. 1982, Chapter 11.

Corporations --- Foreign and extra-provincial corporations — Carrying on business — Comity of nations (common law) — General principles

Foreign bankrupt was carrier based in Pennsylvania and operated leased facility in Ontario — Bankrupt obtained relief pursuant to Chapter 11 of United States Bankruptcy Code which precluded creditors from commencing or continuing proceedings against bankrupt — Canadian creditor seized and intended to sell bankrupt's assets to satisfy bankrupt's obligations — Bankrupt brought application for order for recognition of proceedings commenced pursuant to Chapter 11 to be recognized as "foreign proceeding" for purpose of Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, for stay of proceedings commence by creditor and for ancillary relief — Application granted — Coordinated reorganization of bankrupt was in interest of all creditors as would ensure that all creditors were treated equitably and fairly — Based on principles of comity court had jurisdiction to stay proceedings commenced against bankrupt — Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 — Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C. 1982, Chapter 11.

Corporations --- Arrangements and compromises — Under Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Arrangements — Effect of arrangement — Stay of proceedings

Foreign bankrupt was carrier based in Pennsylvania and operated leased facility in Ontario — Bankrupt obtained relief pursuant to Chapter 11 of United States Bankruptcy Code which precluded creditors from commencing or continuing proceedings against bankrupt — Canadian creditor seized and intended to sell bankrupt's assets to satisfy bankrupt's obligations — Bankrupt brought application for order for recognition of proceedings commenced pursuant to Chapter 11 to be recognized as "foreign proceeding" for purpose of Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, for stay of proceedings commence by creditor and for ancillary relief — Application granted — Coordinated reorganization of bankrupt was in interest of all creditors as would ensure that all creditors were treated equitably and fairly — Based on principles of comity court had jurisdiction to stay proceedings commenced against bankrupt — Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 — Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C. 1982, Chapter 11.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by *Farley J.*:

Arrowmaster Inc. v. Unique Forming Ltd. (1993), 17 O.R. (3d) 407, 29 C.P.C. (3d) 65 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — considered

ATL Industries Inc. v. Han Eol Ind. Co. (1995), 36 C.P.C. (3d) 288 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — considered

Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd., Re (2000), 5 B.L.R. (3d) 75, 18 C.B.R. (4th) 157 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered

Borden & Elliot v. Winston Industries Inc. (November 1, 1983), Doc. 352/83 (Ont. H.C.) — considered

Grace Canada Inc., Re (April 4, 2001), Farley J. (Ont. S.C.)

GST Telecommunications Inc., Re (May 18, 2000), Ground J. (Ont. S.C.) — considered

Hunt v. T & N plc (1993), [1994] 1 W.W.R. 129, 21 C.P.C. (3d) 269, (sub nom. *Hunt v. Lac d'Amiante du Québec Ltée)* 37 B.C.A.C. 161, (sub nom. *Hunt v. Lac d'Amiante du Québec Ltée)* 60 W.A.C. 161, (sub nom. *Hunt v. T&N plc)* [1993] 4 S.C.R. 289, (sub nom. *Hunt v. T&N plc)* 109 D.L.R. (4th) 16, 85 B.C.L.R. (2d) 1, (sub nom. *Hunt v. Lac d'Amiante du Québec Ltée)* 161 N.R. 81 (S.C.C.) — applied

Microbiz Corp. v. Classic Software Systems Inc. (1996), 45 C.B.R. (3d) 40, 1996 CarswellOnt 4988, [1996] O.J.

No. 5094 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — considered

Morguard Investments Ltd. v. De Savoye (1990), 46 C.P.C. (2d) 1, 15 R.P.R. (2d) 1, 76 D.L.R. (4th) 256, 122 N.R. 81, [1991] 2 W.W.R. 217, 52 B.C.L.R. (2d) 160, [1990] 3 S.C.R. 1077, 1990 CarswellBC 283, 1990 CarswellBC 767 (S.C.C.) — considered

Roberts v. Picture Butte Municipal Hospital (1998), 64 Alta. L.R. (3d) 218, 23 C.P.C. (4th) 300, 227 A.R. 308, [1999] 4 W.W.R. 443, 1998 CarswellAlta 646, [1998] A.J. No. 817 (Alta. Q.B.) — considered

Statutes considered:

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

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

s. 18.6 [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — pursuant to

s. 18.6(1) "foreign proceeding" [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — considered

s. 18.6(4) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — considered

s. 18.6(5) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — considered

APPLICATION by foreign bankrupt for recognition of proceedings commenced pursuant to Chapter 11 of United States *Bankruptcy Code* to be recognized as "foreign proceeding" for purpose of *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, for stay of proceedings commenced by creditor and for ancillary relief.

Endorsement. ***Farley J.:***

1 This was an application pursuant to section 18.6 of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA") for recognition of the proceedings commenced by the applicants in the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware for relief under Chapter 11 of the United States Bankruptcy Code be recognized as a "foreign proceeding" for the purposes of the CCAA and to have this Court issue a stay of proceedings compatible with the Chapter 11 stay and for ancillary relief. That Order is granted with the usual comeback clause and subject to its expiry being May 11, 2001 unless otherwise extended.

2 The one applicant Matlack, Inc. ("Matlack") is a Pennsylvania corporation which is in the business of transporting chemical products throughout the United States, Mexico and Canada. It has developed a substantial Canadian business over the past 20 years and it currently operates a large leased facility in Ontario from which its Canadian licensed fleet services customers throughout Ontario and Quebec. Matlack's Canadian operations are fully integrated into Matlack's North American enterprise from both an operational and financial standpoint.

3 On March 29, 2001, Matlack and its affiliated applicants filed for relief under Chapter 11 and obtained relief precluding

creditors subject to the U.S. Bankruptcy Court from commencing or continuing proceedings against the applicants. It is in the interests of all creditors and stakeholders of Matlack that its reorganization proceed in a coordinated and integrated fashion. The objective of such coordination is to ensure that creditors are treated as equitably and fairly as possible, *wherever they are located.* Harmonization of proceedings in the U.S. and in Canada will create the most stable conditions under which a successful reorganization can be achieved and will allow for judicial supervision of all of Matlack's assets and enterprise throughout the two jurisdictions. I note that a Canadian creditor of Matlack has recently seized some of Matlack's assets and intends to sell same in satisfaction of Matlack's obligations to it. It would seem to me that in the context of the proceedings, such a seizure would be of a preferential nature and thus unfair and prejudicial to the interests of Matlack's creditors generally.

4 Canadian courts have consistently recognized and applied the principles of comity. See *Morguard Investments Ltd. v. DeSavoye* (1990), 76 D.L.R. (4th) 256; *Arrowmaster Inc. v. Unique Forming Ltd.* (1993), 17 O.R. (3d) 407 (Ont. Gen. Div.); *ATL Industries Inc. v. Han Eol Ind. Co.* (1995), 36 C.P.C. (3d) 288 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]); *Re Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd.* (2000), 18 C.B.R. (4th) 157 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), at pp. 160-2.

5 In an increasingly commercially integrated world, countries cannot live in isolation and refuse to recognize foreign judgments and orders. The Court's recognition of a foreign proceeding should depend on whether there is a real and substantial connection between the matter and the jurisdiction. The determination of whether a sufficient connection exists between a jurisdiction and a matter should be based on considerations of order, predictability and fairness rather than on a mechanical analysis of connections between the matter and the jurisdiction. See *Morguard supra*; *Hunt v. T & N plc* (1993), 109 D.L.R. (4th) 16 (S.C.C.).

6 I concur with what Forsyth J. stated in *Roberts v. Picture Butte Municipal Hospital* (1998), [1999] 4 W.W.R. 443, 64 Alta. L.R. (3d) 218, [1998] A.J. No. 817 (Alta. Q.B.), at pp. 5-7 (A.J.):

> Comity and cooperation are increasingly important in the bankruptcy context. *As internationalization increases, more parties have assets and carry on activities in several jurisdictions. Without some coordination, there would be multiple proceedings, inconsistent judgments and general uncertainty.*
>
> *...I find that common sense dictates that these matters would be best dealt with by one Court, and in the interest of promoting international comity it seems the forum for this case is the U.S. Bankruptcy Court.* Thus, in either case, whether there has been attornment or not, I conclude it is appropriate for me to exercise my discretion and apply the principles of comity and grant the Defendant's stay application. I reach this conclusion based on all the circumstances, including the clear wording of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code provision, the similar philosophies and procedures in Canada and the U.S., the Plaintiff's attornment to the jurisdiction of the U.S. Bankruptcy Court, and the incredible number of claims outstanding... (emphasis added)

7 Based on principles of comity, where appropriate this Court has the jurisdiction to stay proceedings commenced against a party that has filed for bankruptcy protection in the U.S. An Ontario Court can accept the jurisdiction of a U.S. Bankruptcy Court over moveable property in Ontario of an American company which has become subject to a Chapter 11 order. See *Roberts, supra*; *Borden & Elliot v. Winston Industries Inc.* (November 1, 1983), Doc. 352/83 (Ont. H.C.).

8 Where a cross-border insolvency proceeding is most closely connected to one jurisdiction, it is appropriate for the Court in that jurisdiction to exercise principal control over the insolvency process in light of the principles of comity and in order to avoid a multiplicity of proceedings. See *Microbiz Corp. v. Classic Software Systems Inc.* (1996), [1996] O.J. No. 5094 (Ont.

Gen. Div.).

9 Section 18.6(1) of the CCAA provides the following definition:

> "foreign proceeding" means a judicial or administrative proceeding commenced outside Canada in respect of a debtor under a law relating to bankruptcy or insolvency and dealing with the collective interests of creditors generally;

The U.S. Bankruptcy Code's Chapter 11 proceedings would be such a foreign proceeding.

10 As I indicated in *Babcock*, *supra*, at p. 166: "Section 18.6(4) may be utilized to deal with situations where, notwithstanding that a full filing is not being made under the CCAA, ancillary relief is required in connection with a foreign proceeding". Accordingly, it is appropriate for Matlack to be granted ancillary relief in recognizing the Chapter 11 proceedings and in enforcing the stay of proceedings resulting therefrom. In addition this Court can also grant relief pursuant to section 18.6(5). A stay in Canada would promote a stable atmosphere with a view to the reorganization of Matlack and its affiliates while allowing creditors, *wherever situate*, to be treated as equitably as possible. The stay would also assist with respect to claimants in Canada attempting to seize assets so as to get a leg up on the other creditors. See *Babcock*, *supra*, at pp. 165-6. Aside from the *Babcock* case, see also *Re GST Telecommunications Inc.* (May 18, 2000), Ground J. and *Re Grace Canada Inc.* (April 4, 2001), Farley J.

11 It would also seem to me that the relief requested is appropriate and in accordance with the principles set down in the Transnational Insolvency Project of the American Law Institute ("ALI"). This Project involved jurists, practitioners and academics from the NAFTA countries — the U.S., Mexico and Canada — and was completed as to the Restatement of the Law in 2000 after six years of analysis.[1] As a disclaimer, I should note that it was my privilege to tag along on this Project with the other participants who are recognized as outstanding in their fields.

12 The Project continues with the development of implementation and practical aids. Most recently this consists of the *Guidelines Applicable to Court-to-Court Communications on Cross-Border Cases*. I understand that Judge Mary Walrath is handling the Chapter 11 case. It will be my pleasure to work in coordination with her on this cross-border proceeding. To assist further with the handling of these matters, I would approve the proposed Protocol from the Canadian side, including what I understand may be the first opportunity to incorporate the *Communication Guidelines*, such to be effective if, as and when Judge Walrath is satisfied with same from the U.S. side.

13 A copy of the ALI Guidelines and the Matlack Protocol are annexed to these reasons for the benefit of other counsel involved in anything similar.

14 Order to issue accordingly.

The American Law Institute

TRANSNATIONAL INSOLVENCY PROJECT

2001 CarswellOnt 1830, [2001] O.J. No. 6121, [2001] O.T.C. 382, 26 C.B.R. (4th) 45

PRINCIPLES OF COOPERATION IN TRANSNATIONAL INSOLVENCY CASES AMONG THE MEMBERS OF THE NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Submitted by the Council to the Members of The American Law Institute for Discussion at the Seventy-Seventh Annual Meeting on May 15, 16, 17, and 18, 2000

The Executive Office

THE AMERICAN LAW INSTITUTE

4025 Chestnut Street

Philadelphia, Pa. 19104-3099

Amended — February 12, 2001

Appendix 2

Guidelines Applicable to Court-to-Court Communications in Cross-Border Cases

Introduction:

One of the most essential elements of cooperation in cross-border cases is communication among the administrating authorities of the countries involved. Because of the importance of the courts in insolvency and reorganization proceedings, it is even more essential that the supervising courts be able to coordinate their activities to assure the maximum available benefit for the stakeholders of financially troubled enterprises.

These Guidelines are intended to enhance coordination and harmonization of insolvency proceedings that involve more than one country through communications among the jurisdictions involved. Communications by judges directly with judges or administrators in a foreign country, however, raise issues of credibility and proper procedures. The context alone is likely to create concern in litigants unless the process is transparent and clearly fair. Thus, communication among courts in cross-border cases is both more important and more sensitive than in domestic cases. These Guidelines encourage such communications while channeling them through transparent procedures. The Guidelines are meant to permit rapid cooperation in a developing insolvency case while ensuring due process to all concerned.

The Guidelines at this time contemplate application only between Canada and the United States, because of the very different rules governing communications with Principles of Cooperation courts and among courts in Mexico. Nonetheless, a Mexican Court might choose to adopt some or all of these Guidelines for communications by a sindico with foreign administrators or courts.

A Court intending to employ the Guidelines — in whole or part, with or without modifications — should adopt them formally before applying them. A Court may wish to make its adoption of the Guidelines contingent upon, or temporary until, their adoption by other courts concerned in the matter. The adopting Court may want to make adoption or continuance conditional upon adoption of the Guidelines by the other Court in a substantially similar form, to ensure that judges, counsel, and parties are not subject to different standards of conduct.

The Guidelines should be adopted following such notice to the parties and counsel as would be given under local procedures with regard to any important procedural decision under similar circumstances. If communication with other courts is urgently needed, the local procedures, including notice requirements, that are used in urgent or emergency situations should be employed, including, if appropriate, an initial period of effectiveness, followed by further consideration of the Guidelines at a later time. Questions about the parties entitled to such notice (for example, all parties or representative parties or representative counsel) and the nature of the court's consideration of any objections (for example, with or without a hearing) are governed by the Rules of Procedure in each jurisdiction and are not addressed in the Guidelines.

The Guidelines are not meant to be static, but are meant to be adapted and modified to fit the circumstances of individual cases and to change and evolve as the international insolvency community gains experience from working with them. They are to apply only in a manner that is consistent with local procedures and local ethical requirements. They do not address the details of notice and procedure that depend upon the law and practice in each jurisdiction. However, the Guidelines represent approaches that are likely to be highly useful in achieving efficient and just resolutions of cross-border insolvency issues. Their use, with such modifications and under such circumstances as may be appropriate in a particular case, is therefore recommended.

Guideline 1

Except in circumstances of urgency, prior to a communication with another Court, the Court should be satisfied that such a communication is consistent with all applicable Rules of Procedure in its country. Where a Court intends to apply these Guidelines (in whole or in part and with or without modifications), the Guidelines to be employed should, wherever possible, be formally adopted before they are applied. Coordination of Guidelines between courts is desirable and officials of both courts may communicate in accordance with Guideline 8(d) with regard to the application and implementation of the Guidelines.

Guideline 2

A Court may communicate with another Court in connection with matters relating to proceedings before it for the purposes of coordinating and harmonizing proceedings before it with those in the other jurisdiction.

Guideline 3

A Court may communicate with an Insolvency Administrator in another jurisdiction or an authorized Representative of the Court in that jurisdiction in connection with the coordination and harmonization of the proceedings before it with the proceedings in the other jurisdiction.

Guideline 4

A Court may permit a duly authorized Insolvency Administrator to communicate with a foreign Court directly, subject to the approval of the foreign Court, or through an Insolvency Administrator in the other jurisdiction or through an authorized Representative of the foreign Court on such terms as the Court considers appropriate.

Guideline 5

A Court may receive communications from a foreign Court or from an authorized Representative of the foreign Court or from a foreign Insolvency Administrator and should respond directly if the communication is from a foreign Court (subject to

Guideline 7 in the case of two-way communications) and may respond directly or through an authorized Representative of the Court or through a duly authorized Insolvency Administrator if the communication is from a foreign Insolvency Administrator, subject to local rules concerning ex parte communications.

Guideline 6

Communications from a Court to another Court may take place by or through the Court:

(a) Sending or transmitting copies of formal orders, judgments, opinions, reasons for decision, endorsements, transcripts of proceedings, or other documents directly to the other Court and providing advance notice to counsel for affected parries in such manner as the Court considers appropriate;

(b) Directing counsel or a foreign or domestic Insolvency Administrator to transmit or deliver copies of documents, pleadings, affidavits, factums, briefs, or other documents that are filed or to be filed with the Court to the other Court in such fashion as may be appropriate and providing advance notice to counsel for affected parties in such manner as the Court considers appropriate;

(c) Participating in two-way communications with the other Court by telephone or video conference call or other electronic means in which case Guideline 7 shall apply.

Guideline 7

In the event of communications between the Courts in accordance with Guidelines 2 and 5 by means of telephone or video conference call or other electronic means, unless otherwise directed by either of the two Courts:

(a) Counsel for all affected parties should be entitled to participate in person during the communication and advance notice of the communication should be given to all parties in accordance with the Rules of Procedure applicable in each Court;

(b) The communication between the Courts should be recorded and may be transcribed. A written transcript may be prepared from a recording of the communication which, with the approval of both Courts, should be treated as an official transcript of the communication;

(c) Copies of any recording of the communication, of any transcript of the communication prepared pursuant to any Direction of either Court, and of any official transcript prepared from a recording should be filed as part of the record in the proceedings and made available to counsel for all parties in both Courts subject to such Directions as to confidentiality as the Courts may consider appropriate.

(d) The time and place for communications between the Courts should be to the satisfaction of both Courts. Personnel other than Judges in each Court may communicate fully with each other to establish appropriate arrangements for the communication without the necessity for participation by counsel unless otherwise ordered by either of the Courts.

Guideline 8

In the event of communications between the Court and an authorized Representative of the foreign Court or a foreign Insolvency Administrator in accordance with Guidelines 3 and 5 by means of telephone or video conference call or other electronic means, unless otherwise directed by the Court:

(a) Counsel for all affected parties should be entitled to participate in person during the communication and advance notice of the communication should be given to all parties in accordance with the Rules of Procedure applicable in each Court;

(b) The communication should be recorded and may be transcribed. A written transcript may be prepared from a recording of the communication which, with the approval of the Court, can be treated as an official transcript of the communication;

(c) Copies of any recording of the communication, of any transcript of the communication prepared pursuant to any Direction of the Court, and of any official transcript prepared from a recording should be filed as part of the record in the proceedings and made available to the other Court and to counsel for all parties in both Courts subject to such Directions as to confidentiality as the Court may consider appropriate;

(d) The time and place for the communication should be to the satisfaction of the Court. Personnel of the Court other than Judges may communicate fully with the authorized Representative of the foreign Court or the foreign Insolvency Administrator to establish appropriate arrangements for the communication without the necessity for participation by counsel unless otherwise ordered by the Court.

Guideline 9

A Court may conduct a joint hearing with another Court. In connection with any such joint hearing, the following should apply, unless otherwise ordered or unless otherwise provided in any previously approved Protocol applicable to such joint hearing:

(a) Each Court should be able to simultaneously hear the proceedings in the other Court.

(b) Evidentiary or written materials filed or to be filed in one Court should, in accordance with the Directions of that Court, be transmitted to the other Court to made available electronically in a publicly accessible system in advance of the hearing. Transmittal of such material to the other Court or its public availability in an electronic system should not subject the party filing the material in one Court to the jurisdiction of the other Court.

(c) Submissions or applications by the representative or any party should be made only to the Court in which the representative making the submissions is appearing unless the representative is specifically given permission by the other Court to make submission to it.

(d) Subject to Guideline 7(b), the Court should be entitled to communicate with the other Court in advance of a joint hearing, with or without counsel being present, to establish Guidelines for the orderly making of submissions and rendering of decisions by the Courts, and to coordinate and resolve any procedural, administrative, or preliminary matters relating to the joint hearing.

(e) Subject to Guideline 7(b), the Court, subsequent to the joint hearing, should be entitled to communicate with the other Court, with or without counsel present, for the purpose of determining whether coordinated orders could be made by both Courts and to coordinate and resolve any procedural or nonsubstantive matters relating to the joint hearing.

Guideline 10

The Court should, except upon proper objection on valid grounds and then only to the extent of such objection, recognize and accept as authentic the provisions of statutes, statutory or administrative regulations, and rules of court of general application applicable to the proceedings in the other jurisdiction without the need for further proof of exemplification thereof.

Guideline 11

The Court should, except upon proper objection on valid grounds and then only to the extent of such objection, accept that Orders made in the proceedings in the other jurisdiction were duly and properly made or entered on or about their respective dates and accept that such Orders require no further proof or exemplification for purposes of the proceedings before it, subject to all such proper reservations as in the opinion of the Court are appropriate regarding proceedings by way of appeal or review that are actually pending in respect of any such Orders.

Guideline 12

The Court may coordinate proceedings before it with proceedings in another jurisdiction by establishing a Service List which may include parties that are entitled to receive notice of proceedings before the Court in the other jurisdiction ("Non-Resident Parties"). All notices, applications, motions, and other materials served for purposes of the proceedings before the Court may be ordered to also be provided to or served on the Non-Resident Parties by making such materials available electronically in a publicly accessible system or by facsimile transmission, certified or registered mail or delivery by courier, or in such other manner as may be directed by the Court in accordance with the procedures applicable in the Court.

Guideline 13

The Court may issue an Order or issue Directions permitting the foreign Insolvency Administrator or a representative of creditors in the proceedings in the other jurisdiction or an authorized Representative of the Court in the other jurisdiction to appear and be heard by the Court without thereby becoming subject to the jurisdiction of the Court.

Guideline 14

The Court may direct that any stay of proceedings affecting the parties before it shall, subject to further order of the Court, not apply to applications or motions brought by such parties before the other Court or that relief be granted to permit such parties to bring such applications or motions before the other Court on such terms and conditions as it considers appropriate. Court-to-Court communications in accordance with Guidelines 6 and 7 hereof may take place if an application of motion brought before the Court affects or might affect issues or proceedings in the Court in the other jurisdiction.

Guideline 15

A Court may communicate with a Court in another jurisdiction or with an authorized Representative of such Court in the manner prescribed by these Guidelines for purposes of coordinating and harmonizing proceedings before it with proceedings in the other jurisdiction regardless of the form of the proceedings before it or before the other Court wherever there is commonality among the issues and/or the parties in the proceedings. The Court should, absent compelling reasons to the contrary, so communicate with the Court in the other jurisdiction where the interests of justice so require.

Guideline 16

Directions issued by the Court under these Guidelines are subject to such amendments, modifications, and extensions as may be considered appropriate by the Court for the purposes described above and to reflect the changes and developments from time to time in the proceedings before it and before the other Court. Any Directions may be supplemented, modified, and restated from time to time and such modifications, amendments, and restatements should become effective upon being accepted by both Courts. If either Court intends to supplement, change, or abrogate Directions issued under these Guidelines in the absence of joint approval by both Courts, the Court should give the other Courts involved reasonable notice of its intention to do so.

Guideline 17

Arrangements contemplated under these Guidelines do not constitute a compromise or waiver by the Court of any powers, responsibilities, or authority and do not constitute a substantive determination of any matter in controversy before the Court or before the other Court nor a waiver by any of the parties of any of their substantive rights and claims or a diminution of the effect of any of the Orders made by the Court or the other Court.

— UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

In re: MATLACK SYSTEMS, INC., *et al.*, Debtors

ONTARIO SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE (COMMERCIAL LIST)

IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT, RSC 1985, c. C-36, SECTION 18.6 AS AMENDED

IN THE MATTER OF AN APPLICATION OF MATLACK, INC. AND THE OTHER PARTIES SET OUT IN SCHEDULE "A" ANCILLARY TO PROCEEDINGS UNDER CHAPTER 11 OF THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY CODE

MATLACK, INC. AND THE OTHER PARTIES SET OUT IN SCHEDULE "A" Applicant

Chapter 11

Case No. 01-01114 (MFW)

Jointly Administered

CROSS-BORDER INSOLVENCY PROTOCOL

RE MATLACK, INC. AND AFFILIATES

This Cross-Border Insolvency Protocol (the "Protocol") shall govern the conduct of all parties in interest in a proceeding brought by Matlack, Inc. and certain other parties in the Ontario Superior Court of Justice and a proceeding brought by Matlack Systems, Inc. and certain other parties in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware as Case No. 01-01114.

A. Background

1 Matlack Systems, Inc., a Delaware corporation ("MSI"), is the parent company of a multinational transportation business that operates, through its various affiliates, in the United States, Canada and Mexico.

2 MSI and certain of its affiliates (collectively, the "Matlack Companies") have commenced reorganization cases (collectively, the "U.S. Cases") under Chapter 11 of the United States Bankruptcy Code in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware (the "U.S. Bankruptcy Court"). The Matlack Companies are continuing in possession of their respective properties and are operating and managing their businesses, as debtors in possession, pursuant to sections 1107 and 1108 of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code. An Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors has been appointed in the U.S. Cases (the "Creditor's Committee").

3 One of the Matlack Companies, Matlack, Inc. (for ease of reference, "Matlack Canada"), a United States affiliate of MSI, has assets and carries on business in Canada. The Matlack Companies have commenced proceedings (collectively, the "Canadian Case") under section 18.6 of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* (the "CCAA") in the Ontario Superior Court of Justice (the "Canadian Court"). The Matlack Companies have sought an Order of the Canadian Court (as initially made under the CCAA and as subsequently amended or modified, the "CCAA Order") under which (a) the U.S. Cases have been determined to be "foreign proceedings" for the purposes of section 18.6 of the CCAA; and (b) a stay was granted against actions, enforcements, extra-judicial proceedings or other proceeding until and including August 15, 2001 against the Matlack Companies and their property.

4 The Matlack Companies are parties to both the Canadian Case and the U.S. Cases. For convenience, the U.S. Cases and the Canadian Case are referred to herein collectively as the "Insolvency Proceedings" and the U.S. Bankruptcy Court and the Canadian Court are referred to herein collectively as the "Courts".

B. Purpose and Goals

5 While the Insolvency Proceedings are pending in the United States and Canada for the Matlack Companies, the implementation of basic administrative procedures is necessary to coordinate certain activities in the Insolvency Proceedings, to protect the rights of parties thereto, the creditors of the Matlack Companies and to ensure the maintenance of the Courts' independent jurisdiction and comity. Accordingly, this Protocol has been developed to promote the following mutually desirable goals and objectives in both the U.S. Cases and the Canadian Case:

- harmonize and coordinate activities in the Insolvency Proceedings before the U.S. Court and the Canadian Court;
- promote the orderly and efficient administration of the Insolvency Proceedings to, among other things, maximize the efficiency of the Insolvency Proceedings, reduce the costs associated therewith and avoid duplication of effort;
- honor the independence and integrity of the Courts and other courts and tribunals of the United States and Canada;
- promote international cooperation and respect for comity among the Courts, the parties to the Insolvency Proceedings and the creditors of the Matlack Companies and other parties interested in or affected by the Insolvency Proceedings;
- facilitate the fair, open and efficient administration of the Insolvency Proceedings for the benefit of all of the Debtors, creditors and other interested parties, wherever located; and
- implement a framework of general principles to address basic administrative issues arising out of the cross-border nature of the Insolvency Proceedings.

C. Comity and Independence of the Courts

6 The approval and implementation of this Protocol shall not divest or diminish the U.S. Court's and the Canadian Court's independent jurisdiction over the subject matter of the U.S. Cases and the Canadian Case, respectively. By approving and implementing this Protocol, neither the U.S. Court, the Canadian Court, the Matlack Companies nor any creditors or interested parties shall be deemed to have approved or engaged in any infringement on the sovereignty of the United States or Canada.

7 The U.S. Court shall have sole and exclusive jurisdiction and power over the conduct and hearing of the U.S. Cases. The Canadian Court shall have sole and exclusive jurisdiction and power over the conduct and hearing of the Canadian Cases.

8 In accordance with the principles of comity and independence established in Paragraph 6 and 7 above, nothing contained herein shall be construed to:

- increase, decrease or otherwise modify the independence, sovereignty or jurisdiction of the U.S. Court, the Canadian Court or any other court or tribunal in the United States or Canada, including the ability of any such court or tribunal to provide appropriate relief under applicable law on an *ex parte* or "limited notice" basis;

- require the Matlack Companies or any Creditor's Committee or Estate Representatives to take any action or refrain from taking, any action that would result in a breach of any duty imposed on them by any applicable law;

- authorize any action that requires the specific approval of one or both of the Courts under the U.S. Bankruptcy Code or the CCAA after appropriate notice and a hearing (except to the extent that such action is specifically described in this Protocol); or

- preclude any creditor or other interested party from asserting such party's substantive rights under the applicable laws of the United States, Canada or any other jurisdiction including, without limitation, the rights of interested parties or affected persons to appeal from the decisions taken by one or both of the Courts.

9 The Matlack Companies, the Creditor's Committee, the Estate Representatives and their respective employees, members, agents and professionals shall respect and comply with the duties imposed upon them by the U.S. Bankruptcy Code, the CCAA, the CCAA Order and any other applicable laws.

D. Cooperation

10 To assist in the efficient administration of the Insolvency Proceedings, the Matlack Companies, the Creditor's Committee and the Estate Representatives shall (a) cooperate with each other in connection with actions taken in both the U.S. Bankruptcy Court and the Canadian Court, and (b) take any other appropriate steps to coordinate the administration of the U.S. Cases and the Canadian Case for the benefit of the Matlack Companies' respective estates and stakeholders.

11 To harmonize and coordinate the administration of the Insolvency Proceedings, the U.S. Bankruptcy Court and the Canadian Court each shall use its best efforts to coordinate activities with and defer to the judgment of the other Court, where appropriate and feasible. The U.S. Bankruptcy Court and the Canadian Court may communicate with one another in

accordance with the Guidelines for Court-to-Court Communication in Cross-Border Cases developed by the American Law Institute and attached as Schedule "1" to this Protocol with respect to any matter relating to the Insolvency Proceedings and may conduct joint hearings with respect to any matter relating to the conduct, administration, determination or disposition of any aspect of the U.S. Cases and the Canadian Case, in circumstances where both Courts consider such joint hearings to be necessary or advisable and, in particular, to facilitate or coordinate with the proper and efficient conduct of the U.S. Cases and the Canadian Case.

12 Notwithstanding the terms of paragraph 11 above, this Protocol recognizes that the U.S. Bankruptcy Court and the Canadian Court are independent Courts and, accordingly, although the Courts will seek to cooperate and coordinate with each other in good faith, each of the Courts shall at all times exercise its independent jurisdiction and authority with respect to (a) matters presented to such Court and (b) the conduct of the parties appearing in such matters.

E. Retention and Compensation of Professionals

13 Except as provided in paragraph 16 below, any estate representatives appointed in the U.S. Cases, including any examiners or trustees appointed in accordance with section 1104 of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code and any Canadian professionals retained by the Estate Representatives (collectively, the "Estate Representatives"), shall be subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the U.S. Court with respect to (a) the Estate Representatives' tenure in office; (b) the retention and compensation of the Estate Representatives; (c) the Estate Representatives' liability, if any, to any person or entity, including the Matlack Companies and any third parties, in connection with the U.S. Case; and (d) the hearing and determination of any other matters relating to the Estate Representatives arising in the U.S. Cases under the U.S. Bankruptcy Code or other applicable laws of the United States. The Estate Representatives and their U.S. counsel and other U.S. professionals shall not be required to seek approval of their retention in the Canadian Court. Additionally, the Estate Representatives and their U.S. counsel and other U.S. professionals (a) shall be compensated for their services in accordance with the U.S. Bankruptcy Code and other applicable laws of the United States or orders of the U.S. Bankruptcy Court, and (b) shall not be required to seek approval of their compensation in the Canadian Court.

14 Any Canadian professionals retained by or with the approval of the Matlack Companies for purposes of the Canadian Case, including Canadian professionals retained by the Creditor's Committee (collectively, the "Canadian Professionals"), shall be subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Canadian Court. Accordingly, the Canadian Professionals (a) shall be subject to the procedures and standards for retention and compensation applicable in Canada, and (b) shall not be required to seek approval of their retention or compensation in the U.S. Court.

15 Any United States professionals retained by the Matlack Companies and any United States professionals retained by the Creditor's Committee (collectively, the "U.S. Professionals") shall be subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the U.S. Bankruptcy Court. Accordingly, the U.S. Professionals (a) shall be subject to the procedures and standards for retention and compensation applicable in the U.S. Bankruptcy Court under the U.S. Bankruptcy Code and any other applicable laws of the United States or orders of the U.S. Bankruptcy Court, and (b) shall not be required to seek approval of their retention or compensation in the Canadian Court.

F. Rights to Appear and Be Heard

16 The Matlack Companies, their creditors and other interested parties in the Insolvency Proceedings, including the Creditor's Committee and the U.S. Trustee, shall have the right and standing to (a) appear and be heard in either the U.S.

Court or the Canadian Court in the Insolvency Proceedings to the same extent as creditors and other interested parties domiciled in the forum country, subject to any local rules or regulations generally applicable to all parties appearing in the forum, and (b) file notices of appearance or other processes with the Clerk of the U.S. Bankruptcy Court or the Canadian Court in the Insolvency Proceedings; *provided, however*, that any appearance or filing may subject a creditor or an interested party to the jurisdiction of the Court in which the appearance or filing occurs; provided further, that appearance by the Creditor's Committee in the Canadian Case shall not form a basis for personal jurisdiction in Canada over the members of the Creditor's Committee. Notwithstanding the foregoing, and in accordance with paragraph 13 above, the Canadian Court shall have jurisdiction over the Estate Representatives and the U.S. Trustee with respect to the particular matters as to which the Estate Representatives or the U.S. Trustee appear before the Canadian Court.

G. Notice

17 Notice of any motion, application or other pleading or paper filed in one or both of the Insolvency Proceedings and notice of any related hearings or other proceedings mandated by applicable law in connection with the Insolvency Proceedings, or this Protocol shall be given by appropriate means (including, where circumstances warrant, by courier, telecopier or other electronic forms of communication) to the following: (a) all creditors, including the Creditor's Committee, and other interested parties in accordance with the practice of the jurisdiction where the papers are filed or the proceedings are to occur; and (b) to the extent not otherwise entitled to receive notice under clause (a) above, the U.S. Trustee, the Office of the United States Trustee, and such other parties as may be designated by either of the Courts from time to time.

H. Joint Recognition of Stays of Proceedings Under the U.S. Bankruptcy Code and the CCAA

18 In recognition of the importance of the stay of proceedings and actions against the Matlack Companies and their assets under section 18.6 of the CCAA and the CCAA Order (the "Canadian Stay") on the successful completion of the Insolvency Proceedings for the benefit of the Matlack Companies and their respective estates and stakeholders, to the extent necessary and appropriate, the U.S. Bankruptcy Court shall extend and enforce the Canadian Stay in the United States (to the same extent such stay of proceedings and actions is applicable in Canada) to prevent adverse actions against the assets, rights and holdings of the Matlack Companies. In implementing the terms of this paragraph, the U.S. Bankruptcy Court may consult with the Canadian Court regarding (a) the interpretation and application of the Canadian Stay and any orders of the Canadian Court modifying or granting relief from the Canadian Stay, and (b) the enforcement in the United States of the Canadian Stay.

19 In recognition of the importance of the stay of proceedings and actions against the Matlack Companies and their assets under section 362 of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code (the "U.S. Stay") to the successful completion of the Insolvency Proceedings for the benefit of the Matlack Companies and their respective estates and stakeholders, to the extent necessary and appropriate, the Canadian Court shall extend and enforce the U.S. Stay in Canada (to the same extent such stay of proceedings and action is applicable in the United States) to prevent adverse actions against the assets, rights and holdings, of the Matlack Companies in Canada. In implementing the terms of this paragraph, the Canadian Court may consult with the U.S. Court regarding (a) the interpretation and application of the U.S. Stay and any order of the U.S. Court modifying or granting relief from the U.S. Stay, and (b) the enforcement in Canada of the U.S. Stay.

20 Nothing contained herein shall affect or limit the Matlack Companies' or other parties' rights to assert the applicability or non-applicability of the U.S. Stay or the Canadian Stay to any particular proceeding, property, asset, activity or other matter, wherever pending or located.

I. Effectiveness and Modification of Protocol

21 This Protocol shall become effective only upon its approval by both the U.S. Court and the Canadian Court.

22 This Protocol may not be supplemented, modified, terminated or replaced in any manner except by the U.S. Court and the Canadian Court. Notice of any legal proceeding to supplement, modify, terminate or replace this Protocol shall be given in accordance with paragraph 17 above.

J. Procedure for Resolving Disputes Under the Protocol

23 Disputes relating to the terms, intent or application of this Protocol may be addressed by interested parties to either the U.S. Court, the Canadian Court or both Courts upon notice, in accordance with paragraph 17 above. Where an issue is addressed to only one Court, in rendering a determination in any such dispute, such Court: (a) shall consult with the other Court; and (b) may, in its sole and exclusive discretion, either (i) render a binding decision after such consultation, (ii) defer to the determination of the other Court by transferring the matter, in whole or in part, to the other Court or (iii) seek a joint hearing of both Courts. Notwithstanding the foregoing, each Court in making a determination shall have regard to the independence, comity or inherent jurisdiction of the other Court established under existing law.

K. Preservation of Rights

24 Neither the terms of this Protocol nor any actions taken under the terms of this Protocol shall prejudice or affect the powers, rights, claims and defences of the Matlack Companies and their estates, the Creditor's Committee, the U.S. Trustee or any of the creditors of the Matlack Companies under applicable law, including the U.S. Bankruptcy Code and the CCAA.

L. Guidelines

25 The Protocol shall adopt by reference the Guidelines Applicable to Court-to-Court Communications in Cross-Border Cases (the "Guidelines") developed by The American Law Institute for the Transnational Insolvency Project, a copy of which are attached hereto as Schedule "1". In the case of any conflict between the terms of this Protocol and the terms of the Guidelines, the terms of this Protocol shall govern.

Application granted.

Footnotes

[1] A copy of this material may be obtained from the Executive Office, The American Law Institute, 4025 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, PA, USA 19104-3099.

Tab 6

2009 CarswellOnt 4232
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Lear Canada, Re

2009 CarswellOnt 4232, 179 A.C.W.S. (3d) 45, 55 C.B.R. (5th) 57

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF LEAR CANADA, LEAR CANADA INVESTMENTS LTD., LEAR CORPORATION CANADA LTD. AND THE OTHER APPLICANTS LISTED ON SCHEDULE "A"

APPLICATION UNDER SECTION 18.6 OF THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED

Pepall J.

Judgment: July 14, 2009
Docket: CV-09-00008269-00CL

Counsel: K. McElcheran, R. Stabile for Applicants
E. Lamek for Proposed Information Officer
A. Cobb for J.P. Morgan Chase Bank, N. A.

Subject: Insolvency

Related Abridgment Classifications
For all relevant Canadian Abridgment Classifications refer to highest level of case via History.

Headnote

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Bankruptcy and insolvency jurisdiction — Jurisdiction of courts — Jurisdiction of Bankruptcy Court — Territorial jurisdiction — Foreign bankruptcies

Insolvent debtor American company had Canadian subsidiary — Debtor was unable to meet obligations and began restructuring process in United States — Subsidiary and company brought application for recognition of foreign order — Application granted — Stay of proceedings in Canada granted — Subsidiary was entitled to apply for order as interested person under s. 18.6(4) of Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act and as debtor within s. 18.6(1) — While Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act does not define person, Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act extends definition to partnership — Real and substantial connection existed to American proceedings — Canadian operations were inextricably linked with business in foreign jurisdiction — Restructuring process required to occur internationally — Multiplicity of proceedings should be avoided.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by *Pepall J.*:

Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd., Re (2000), 5 B.L.R. (3d) 75, 18 C.B.R. (4th) 157, 2000 CarswellOnt 704 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered

Holt Cargo Systems Inc. v. ABC Containerline N.V. (Trustees of) (2001), 2001 SCC 90, 2001 CarswellNat 2816, 2001 CarswellNat 2817, [2001] 3 S.C.R. 907, 30 C.B.R. (4th) 6, 280 N.R. 1, 207 D.L.R. (4th) 577 (S.C.C.) — referred to

Magna Entertainment Corp., Re (2009), 2009 CarswellOnt 1267, 51 C.B.R. (5th) 82 (Ont. S.C.J.) — referred to

Matlack Inc., Re (2001), [2001] O.T.C. 382, 26 C.B.R. (4th) 45, 2001 CarswellOnt 1830 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — considered

United Air Lines Inc., Re (2003), 43 C.B.R. (4th) 284, 2003 CarswellOnt 2786 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Statutes considered:

Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C.
Generally — referred to

Chapter 11 — referred to

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

s. 2 "debtor company" — referred to

s. 18.6 [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — considered

s. 18.6(1) "foreign proceeding" [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — considered

s. 18.6(2) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — considered

s. 18.6(3) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — referred to

s. 18.6(4) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 125] — considered

APPLICATION by subsidiary of debtor and debtor for recognition of foreign order in bankruptcy proceedings.

***Pepall J.*:**

Relief Requested

1 Lear Canada, Lear Canada Investments Inc., Lear Corporation Canada Ltd. (the "Canadian Applicants") and other Applicants listed on Schedule "A" to the notice of motion request:

> 1. an order pursuant to section 18.6 of the CCAA recognizing and declaring that the Chapter 11 proceedings in the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York constitute "foreign proceedings";
>
> 2. a stay of proceedings against any of the Applicants or their property; and
>
> 3. an order appointing RSM Richter Inc. as information officer to report to this Court on the status of the U.S proceedings.

Backround Facts

2 Lear Corporation is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Delaware with headquarters in Southfield, Michigan. Its shares are listed on the New York Stock Exchange. It conducts its operations through approximately 210 facilities in 36 countries and is the ultimate parent company of about 125 directly and indirectly wholly-owned subsidiaries (collectively, "Lear"). Lear Canada Investments Ltd. and Lear Corporation Canada are both wholly-owned indirect subsidiaries of Lear Corporation. They are incorporated pursuant to the laws of Alberta. Lear Canada is a partnership owned 99.9% by Lear Corporation Canada Ltd. and 0.1% by Lear Canada Investments Ltd. and is the only operating entity of Lear in Canada.

3 Lear is a leading global supplier of automotive seating systems, electrical distribution systems, and electronic products. It has established itself as a Tier 1 global supplier of these parts to every major original equipment manufacturer ("OEM"). Lear has world wide manufacturing and production facilities, four of which are in Canada, namely Ajax, Kitchener, St. Thomas, and Whitby, Ontario. A fifth facility in Windsor, Ontario was closed in May of this year. Lear employs approximately 7,200 employees world wide of which 1,720 are employed by the Canadian operations. 1,600 are paid on an hourly basis and 120 are paid salary. 1,600 are members of the CAW and are covered by 5 separate collective bargaining agreements. Lear maintains a qualified defined contribution component of the Canadian salaried pension plan and 8 Canadian qualified defined benefit plans.

4 Lear conducts its North American business on a fully integrated basis. All management functions are based at the corporate headquarters in Southfield, Michigan and all customer relationships are maintained on a North American basis. The U.S. headquarters' operational support for the Canadian locations includes, but is not limited to, primary customer interface and support, product design and engineering, manufacturing and engineering, prototyping, launch support, programme management, purchasing and supplier qualification, testing and validation, and quality assurance. In addition, other support is provided for human resources, finance, information technology and other administrative functions.

5 Lear's Canadian operations are also linked to its U.S. operations through the companies' supply chain. Lear's facilities in Whitby, Ajax, and St. Thomas supply complete seat systems on a just-in-time basis to automotive assembly operations of the U.S. based OEMs, General Motors and Ford in Ontario. Lear's Kitchener facility manufactures seat metal components which are supplied primarily to several Lear assembly locations in the U.S., Canada and Mexico.

6 Lear Corporation, Lear Canada and others entered into a credit agreement with a syndicate of institutions led by J.P. Morgan Chase Bank, N.A. acting as general administrative agent and the Bank of Nova Scotia acting as the Canadian administrative agent. It provides for aggregate commitments of $2.289US billion. Although Lear Canada is a borrower under this senior secured credit facility, it is only liable for borrowings made in Canada and no funds have been advanced in this country.

7 Additionally, Lear Corporation has outstanding approximately $1.29US billion of senior unsecured notes. The Canadian Applicants are not issuers or guarantors of any of them.

8 Over the past several years, Lear has worked on restructuring its business. As part of this initiative, it closed or initiated the closure of 28 manufacturing facilities and 10 administrative/engineering facilities by the end of 2008. This included the Windsor facility for which statutory severance amounts owing to all employees have been paid.

9 Despite its efforts, Lear was faced with turmoil in the automotive industry. Decreased consumer confidence, limited credit availability and decreased demand for new vehicles all led to decreased production. As a result of these conditions, Lear defaulted under its senior secured credit facility in late 2008. In early 2009, Lear engaged in discussions with senior secured facility lenders and unsecured noteholders. It reached an agreement with the majority of them wherein they agreed to support a Chapter 11 plan.

10 On July 7, 2009, Lear filed voluntary petitions for relief under Chapter 11 of the US Bankruptcy Code and sought "first day" orders in those proceedings in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York. The Applicants now seek recognition of those proceedings and the orders. Lear expects to emerge from the Chapter 11 proceedings and any associated proceedings in other jurisdictions as a substantially de-leveraged enterprise with competitive going forward operations, and to do so in a timely basis.

Applicable Law

11 Section 18.6 of the CCAA was introduced in 1997 to address the rising number of international insolvencies. Courts have recognized that in the context of cross-border insolvencies, comity is to be encouraged. Efforts are made to complement, coordinate, and where appropriate, accommodate insolvency proceedings commenced in foreign jurisdictions.

12 Section 18.6(1) provides that "foreign proceeding" means a judicial or administrative proceeding commenced outside Canada in respect of a debtor under a law relating to bankruptcy or insolvency and dealing with the collective interests of creditors generally. It is well recognized that proceedings under Chapter 11 of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code fall within that definition and that, while not identical, the substance and procedures of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code are similar to those found in the Canadian bankruptcy regime: *United Air Lines Inc., Re*[1]

13 *Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd., Re*[2] provided an early interpretation of section 18.6, and while not without some controversy[3], the practice in Canadian insolvency proceedings has evolved accordingly. In that case, Farley J. distinguished between section 18.6(2) of the Act, which deals with concurrent filings by a debtor company under the CCAA in Canada and corresponding bankruptcy or insolvency legislation in a foreign jurisdiction, and section 18.6(4) which may deal with ancillary proceedings such as this one. As with section 2 of the Act, section 18.6(2) is in respect of a debtor company

whereas section 18.6 (4) permits any interested person to apply for recognition. As such, he held that the applicant before him was not required to meet the Act's definition of "debtor company" which required the company to be insolvent.[4] In addition, he noted that section 18.6(3) provides that an order of the Court under section 18.6 may be made on such terms and conditions as the Court considers appropriate in the circumstances.

14 Applying those legal principles, the Applicants are entitled to apply for an order pursuant to section 18.6 of the CCAA. They are debtors within the definition of section 18.6(1) and interested persons falling within section 18.6(4). In this regard, while the CCAA does not define the term "person", the BIA definition extends to include a partnership. In the absence of a definition in the CCAA, by analogy it is reasonable to interpret the term "person" as including a partnership.

15 I must then consider whether the order requested should be granted. In exercising discretion under section 18.6, it has been repeatedly held that in the context of an insolvency, the Court should consider whether a real and substantial connection exists between a matter and the foreign jurisdiction: *Matlack Inc., Re*[5] and *Magna Entertainment Corp., Re*[6] Where the operations of debtors are most closely connected to a foreign jurisdiction and the Canadian operations are inextricably linked with the business located in that foreign jurisdiction, it is appropriate for the Court in the foreign jurisdiction to exercise principal control over the insolvency process in accordance with the principles of comity and to avoid a multiplicity of proceedings: *Matlack, Re*[7]. As noted in that case, it is in the interests of creditors and stakeholders that a reorganization proceed in a coordinated fashion. This provides for stability and certainty. "The objective of such coordination is to ensure that creditors are treated as equitably and fairly as possible, wherever they are located."[8]

16 I am satisfied that an order recognizing the U.S. proceeding as a foreign proceeding within the meaning of section 18.6(1) should be granted and that a real and substantial connection has been established. The Applicants including Lear Canada are part of an integrated multi-national corporate enterprise with operations in 36 countries, one of which is Canada. Lear conducts its North American business on a fully integrated basis. As mentioned, all management functions are based at the U.S. corporate headquarters and all customer relationships are maintained on a North American basis. As such, the managerial and operational support for the Canadian locations is situate in the United States. In addition, Lear's Canadian operations are linked to the U.S. operations through the Lear's supply chain. As evidence of same, a note to Lear Canada's December 31, 2008 unaudited financial statement states that Lear Corporation provides Lear Canada with "significant operating support, including the negotiation of substantially all of its sales contracts. Such support is significant to the success of the Partnership's future operations and its ability to realize the carrying value of its assets."

17 I am also of the view that it is both necessary and desirable that the restructuring of this international enterprise be coordinated and that a multiplicity of proceedings in two different jurisdictions should be avoided. Granting relief will enable the Applicants to continue to operate in the ordinary course and preserve value and customer relationships. Coordination will also provide stability. The U.S. Court will be the primary court overseeing the restructuring proceedings of Lear. I also note that in its report filed with the Court, the proposed Information Officer, RSM Richter Inc., expressed its support for the relief requested by the Applicants.

18 That said, increasingly with the downturn in the global economy, this Court is entertaining requests for concurrent or ancillary orders relating to multi-group enterprises typically with a significant cross-border element. Frequently, relative to the whole enterprise, the Canadian component is small. From the viewpoint of efficiency and speed, both of which are important features of a restructuring, an applicant may be of the view that the Canadian operations do not merit a CCAA filing other than a section 18.6 request. In addressing whether to grant relief pursuant to section 18.6, the Court should, amongst other things, consider the interests of stakeholders in this country and the impact, if any, that may result from the relief requested. This would include benefits and prejudice such as any juridical advantage that may be compromised.[9] These issues should be addressed by an applicant in its materials. Assuming there are benefits, the existence of prejudice does not necessarily mean that the order will be refused but it is important that these facts at least be considered, and if appropriate,

certain protections should be incorporated into the order granted.

19 By way of example, in this case, the Court raised certain issues with the Applicants and they readily and appropriately in my view, filed additional affidavit evidence and included other provisions in the proposed order. The Court was concerned with the treatment that might be afforded Canadian unsecured creditors and particularly employees and trade creditors. Lear Canada had total current assets of approximately $60US million as at May 31, 2009 which included approximately $20US million in cash. Its total assets amounted to approximately $115US million. Total current liabilities as at the same time period amounted to about $75US million. In addition, pension and other post-retirement benefit obligations were stated to amount to about $170US million. There were also intercompany accounts of approximately $190US million in favour of Lear Canada for total liabilities of about $55US million. Counsel for the Applicants advised that significant pre-petition payments had been made to suppliers and that the intention is for Lear Canada to continue to carry on business.

20 In the additional evidence filed, the Applicants indicated that they had not yet sought approval of DIP financing arrangements but that under the proposed arrangement, the Canadian Applicants would not be borrowers or guarantors. In addition, the term sheet agreed to between the Applicants and the senior credit facility lenders provided that the Canadian Applicants had agreed to pay all general unsecured claims in full as they become due. Additionally, the Applicants had obtained an order in the U.S. proceedings authorizing them to pay and honour certain pre-petition claims for wages, salaries, bonuses and other compensation and it is the intention of the Applicants to continue to pay all wages and compensation due and to be due to Canadian employees. The Applicants are up to date on all current and special payments associated with the Canadian pension plans and will continue to make these payments going forward. Provisions reflecting this evidence were incorporated into the Court order.

21 The Canadian Applicants were not to make any advances or transfers of funds except to pay for goods and services in the ordinary course of business and in accordance with existing practices and similarly were not to grant security over or encumber or release their property. They also were to pay current service and special payments with respect to the Canadian pensions. The order further provided that in the event of inconsistencies between it and the terms of the Chapter 11 orders, the provisions of my order were to govern.

22 The order includes a stay of proceedings against the Applicants and their property, a recognition of various orders and an administration charge and a directors' charge. The order also includes the usual come back provision in which any person affected may move to rescind or vary the order on at least 7 days' notice.

23 Where one jurisdiction has an ancillary role, the Court in the ancillary jurisdiction should be provided with information on an on going basis and be kept apprised of developments in respect of the debtors' reorganization efforts in the foreign jurisdiction. In addition, stakeholders in the ancillary jurisdiction should be afforded appropriate access to the proceedings in the principal jurisdiction.[10] In this case, RSM Richter Inc. as Information Officer intends to be a watchdog and monitor developments in the U.S. proceedings and keep this Court informed. This Court supports its request to be added to the service list in the Chapter 11 proceeding and any request for standing before the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York that the Information Officer may make. In this regard, this Court seeks the aid and assistance of that Court.

Application granted.

Footnotes

1 (2003), 43 C.B.R. (4th) 284 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), at 285.

2 (2000), 18 C.B.R. (4th) 157 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]).

3 See for example, Professor J.S. Ziegel's article "Corporate Groups and Canada-U.S. Cross-Border Insolvencies: Contrasting Judicial Visions", (2001) 35 C.B.L.J. 459.

4 It should be noted that a voluntary filing under Chapter 11 does not require an applicant to be insolvent and a partnership is eligible to apply for relief as well.

5 (2001), 26 C.B.R. (4th) 45 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]).

6 (2009), 51 C.B.R. (5th) 82 (Ont. S.C.J.).

7 Supra, note 5 at para. 8.

8 Ibid, at para. 3.

9 See *Holt Cargo Systems Inc. v. ABC Containerline N.V. (Trustees of)*, [2001] 3 S.C.R. 907 (S.C.C.).

10 See *Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd., Re*, supra, note 2 at para. 21.

Tab 7

1998 ABQB 636
Alberta Court of Queen's Bench

Roberts v. Picture Butte Municipal Hospital

1998 CarswellAlta 646, 1998 ABQB 636, [1998] A.J. No. 817, [1999] 4 W.W.R. 443, 227 A.R. 308, 23 C.P.C. (4th) 300, 64 Alta. L.R. (3d) 218, 81 A.C.W.S. (3d) 47

Wanda Mae Roberts, a.k.a. Wanda Mae Lichuk, and Alan Roberts, Plaintiffs and Picture Butte Municipal Hospital, St. Michael's General Hospital, Dr. Tom Melling, McGhan Medical Corporation and Dow Corning Corporation, Defendants

Forsyth J.

Judgment: July 10, 1998
Docket: Calgary 8901-12679

Counsel: *G.J. Bigg*, for Plaintiffs.
K.M. Eidsvik, for Defendant, McGhan Medical Corporation.
F. Foran, Q.C., for Defendant, Dow Corning Corporation.
J. Shriar, for Defendants, Picture Butte Municipal Hospital and St. Michael's General Hospital.
P. Leveque, for Defendant, Dr. Tom Melling.

Subject: Insolvency; Civil Practice and Procedure

Related Abridgment Classifications
For all relevant Canadian Abridgment Classifications refer to highest level of case via History.

Headnote

Practice --- Disposition without trial — Stay or dismissal of action — Grounds — Another proceeding pending — General

Plaintiffs brought action against manufacturer arising out of failure of its silicone gel implants — Class action had been commenced by other litigants in United States arising out of failure of implants — Manufacturer sought and received protection under United States Bankruptcy Code — Under s. 362 of Code all actions or proceedings against manufacturer to recover claims that arose before claims bar date were automatically stayed — Manufacturer applied for permanent stay of plaintiffs' action against it on grounds that Alberta court should recognize jurisdiction of United States Bankruptcy Court — Application granted — Plaintiffs had attorned to jurisdiction of U.S. Bankruptcy Court by

filing proof of claim — Even if there had been no attornment, U.S. Bankruptcy Court was best forum for case in interest of promoting international comity — Clear wording of Code, similar philosophies and procedures in Canada and U.S., number of claims outstanding and fact that Plan of Reorganization filed with U.S. Bankruptcy Court had been accepted in Ontario and Quebec, favoured recognition of U.S. proceedings — United States Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C. 1982, s. 362.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by *Forsyth J.*:

Amchem Products Inc. v. British Columbia (Workers' Compensation Board), [1993] 3 W.W.R. 441, 14 C.P.C. (3d) 1, [1993] 1 S.C.R. 897, 150 N.R. 321, 23 B.C.A.C. 1, 39 W.A.C. 1, 102 D.L.R. (4th) 96, 77 B.C.L.R. (2d) 62 (S.C.C.) — applied

Antwerp Bulkcarriers N.V., Re (1996), 48 C.B.R (3d) 109, 43 C.B.R. (3d) 284 (C.S. Que.) — referred to

Microbiz Corp. v. Classic Software Systems Inc. (1996), 45 C.B.R. (3d) 40 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — applied

Morguard Investments Ltd. v. De Savoye (1990), 46 C.P.C. (2d) 1, 15 R.P.R. (2d) 1, 76 D.L.R. (4th) 256, 122 N.R. 81, [1991] 2 W.W.R. 217, 52 B.C.L.R. (2d) 160, [1990] 3 S.C.R. 1077 (S.C.C.) — applied

Neese, Re (1981), 12 B.R. 968 (U.S. Bankr. W.D. Va.) — applied

Olympia & York Developments Ltd. v. Royal Trust Co. (1993), 20 C.B.R. (3d) 165 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — referred to

Pitts v. Hill & Hill Truck Line Inc. (1987), 53 Alta. L.R. (2d) 219, 66 C.B.R. (N.S.) 273, 84 A.R. 333 (Alta. Master) — applied

Taylor v. Dow Corning Australia Pty. Ltd. (December 19, 1997), Doc. 8438/95 (Australia Vic. Sup. Ct.) — applied

Tradewell Inc. v. American Sensors & Electronics Inc., 1997 WL 423075 (U.S. S.D. N.Y.) — considered

Statutes considered:

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3
Generally — referred to

s. 2(1) "property" — considered

s. 69(1)(a) [rep. & sub. 1992, c. 27, s. 36(1)] — considered

Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C. 1982 (U.S.)
Generally — considered

s. 362 — considered

s. 362(a)(1) — considered

s. 362(a)(3) — considered

s. 541 — considered

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

APPLICATION by manufacturer for permanent stay of plaintiffs' action for damages arising from faulty product.

Forsyth J.:

Application

1 This is an application by the Defendant Dow Corning Corporation ("DCC") for a permanent stay of proceedings against it. DCC is now the only remaining Defendant in this action, as the actions against the other four Defendants were dismissed on the basis of having been commenced outside of the applicable limitation periods. DCC applies for a permanent stay of these proceedings on the grounds that this Court should recognize the jurisdiction of the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, Northern Division. The Plaintiffs, Wanda and Alan Roberts, argue that a stay is inappropriate.

Background

2 The female Plaintiff underwent surgery in 1981 for bilateral fibrocystic disease and mammary dysplasia in both breasts. Also in 1981, she received silicone gel breast implants manufactured by McGhan Medical Corporation ("McGhan"), a former Defendant. After problems with those implants, they were replaced in June 1983 with silicone gel implants manufactured by DCC. Soon after, one implant was found to have ruptured, necessitating surgery to clean up as much silicone as possible from her system.

3 Since that time, the female Plaintiff alleges widespread pain and problems, which she blames on the silicone gel released into her body. For this application, it is not necessary nor appropriate for me to comment on her symptoms or their cause.

4 The Plaintiffs started this action on August 31, 1989. There was also class action litigation in the U.S which coordinated all claims arising out of the failure of both McGhan and DCC implants. That class action collapsed when DCC sought bankruptcy protection on May 15, 1995 under Chapter 11 of the *United States Bankruptcy Code* (the "*U.S. Bankruptcy Code*"). Section 362 of the *U.S. Bankruptcy Code* imposes an automatic stay on all actions or proceedings against DCC to recover claims that arose before the claims bar date.

5 The U.S. Bankruptcy Court set February 14, 1997 as the foreign claims bar date (the deadline for filing claims in the bankruptcy proceedings). The Plaintiffs filed proofs of claim in that U.S. proceeding on January 17, 1997. More than 700,000 proofs of claim were filed from many countries, including more than 30,000 by Canadian residents.

Legislation

6 DCC is asking that this Court recognize the proceedings in the U.S. Bankruptcy Court. The *U.S. Bankruptcy Code* provides for an automatic stay once bankruptcy proceedings are commenced in the U.S.:

> 362 (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, a petition filed under section 301, 302, or 303 of this title ... operates as a stay, applicable to all entities, of -
>
> > (1) the commencement or continuation, including the issuance or employment of process, of a judicial, administrative, or other action or proceeding against the debtor that was or could have been commenced before the commencement of the case under this title, or to recover a claim against the debtor that arose before the commencement of the case under this title;
> >
> > . . . . .
> >
> > (3) any act to obtain possession of property of the estate or of property from the estate or to exercise control over property of the estate;

Section 541 provides that "property of the estate" is comprised of various types of property "wherever located and by whomever held".

7 Therefore, the stay purports to be extra-territorial, applying, for example, in Alberta. It is then up to this Court to decide whether the principles of comity favour upholding the stay in this jurisdiction. As the Plaintiffs emphasize, comity is a discretionary matter. I am not bound by the stay imposed by the *U.S. Bankruptcy Act*.

8 I note that the Canadian legislation has a similar provision (*Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act ("BIA")*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3):

> 69(1) Subject to subsections (2) and (3) and sections 69.4 and 69.5 on the filing of a notice of intention under section 50.4 by an insolvent person,
>
> > (a) no creditor has any remedy against the insolvent person or the insolvent person's property, or shall commence or continue any action, execution or other proceedings, for the recovery of a claim provable in bankruptcy,

Under s. 2(1) "property" of the *BIA*:

> "property" includes money, goods, things in action, land and every description of property, whether real or personal, legal or equitable, and whether situated in Canada or elsewhere, ...

9 The Plaintiffs accept that the *U.S. Bankruptcy Code* governs DCC's estate, and that the Plaintiffs are creditors under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Bankruptcy Court.

Plan or Reorganization

10 DCC filed a Plan of Reorganization (the "Plan") with the Bankruptcy Court on August 25, 1997. The Bankruptcy Court rejected this Plan, and an amended plan was presented on February 17, 1998. The Bankruptcy Court approved that Plan, which now has to be voted upon by the various classes of creditors. DCC's proposed Plan would allow it to pay most creditors and continue operating. To manage product liability claims, DCC would establish and fund two trusts with up to $2.4 billion U.S. DCC would separately pay approximately $1 billion to commercial creditors over seven years.

11 Breast implant claimants would have four settlement paths, based on their history, symptoms and past and proposed treatment. Any claims not settled by agreement under the Plan process would go to common issue trials. Any claims remaining after common issue trials would undergo individual claims review and mediation. The last resort would be individual litigation. These individual trials would be held in the U.S., dismissed in favour of litigation in the claimant's home jurisdiction, or held in the U.S. using the law of the claimant's home jurisdiction. The Plan is designed to solve as many claims as possible in an orderly and expeditious manner.

12 The U.S. procedure provides that once the Bankruptcy Court approves a Plan, it is sent to the creditors for a vote. The creditors vote by class. All of the Canadian breast implant claimants are in the foreign claimants' class of creditors. If more than two-thirds of those voting in a class approve, the Plan is considered approved by the class. After the vote, the Bankruptcy Court holds a confirmation hearing. It may confirm the Plan if it meets the *U.S. Bankruptcy Code* requirements. In DCC's words, the Bankruptcy Court must conclude:

> (i) that the Plan was proposed in good faith;
>
> (ii) that each class of creditors that does not vote to accept the Plan will receive at least as great a recovery as such creditors would have received had the debtor been liquidated under the liquidation procedures provided in Chapter 7 of the *Bankruptcy Code*; and
>
> (iii) that the Plan does not discriminate unfairly against any class of creditors that does not vote to accept the Plan.

Therefore, the Bankruptcy Court may approve a Plan even if all classes of creditors do not vote to accept it, as long as that Court finds the Plan does not discriminate unfairly against the rejecting class.

13 The originally proposed Plan did not make it to the creditor review stage. The Bankruptcy Court apparently had a number of concerns, one of which was the treatment of the foreign claimants. The Plaintiffs raise that concern in this Court also. The proposed settlement payments for foreign claimants would range from 35 to 60 per cent of those offered to U.S. claimants, on the theory that product liability litigation yields lower damage awards in non-U.S. jurisdictions. The proposed settlement for Canadian claimants is 60 per cent of the payments offered to U.S. claimants. According to DCC's affidavit (by Craig J. Litherland, dated December 12, 1997), some of the differing factors among U.S. and foreign jurisdictions are:

> a. the absence of contingency fee arrangements;

b. the responsibility of judges rather than juries to asses [sic] liability and damages;

c. the award of costs to prevailing litigants;

d. limitations on theories of liability and recovery;

e. limited pretrial procedures;

f. the absence of the 'deep pocket expectation' prevalent in the United States resulting in lower damage awards;

g. lower damage awards for pain and suffering;

h. less or no punitive damages; and

i. nationalized health care insurance and other benefits that are either directly deducted from an award or operate to reduce the likelihood of a large damage award.

Of course, not all of these factors would apply in any one non-U.S. jurisdiction.

14 The Plaintiffs claim the foreign discount is discriminatory and inequitable. Not all of the factors are applicable in Alberta. Moreover, some simply try to shift the burden from DCC to other entities (such as the Canadian medicare system). In addition, the Plaintiffs claim that taking 40 per cent away from foreign claimants leaves that much more for U.S. claimants. DCC argues that the procedure is fair, not necessarily equal. It also emphasizes that the foreign discount only applies to settlements. Any claims that proceed to individual trials would not be discounted.

15 The amended Plan will be put to the creditors. It may be that the Plan will be confirmed, even if the foreign claimants' class rejects it.

Analysis

General Principles

16 Where an appropriate forum must be chosen, the Courts may grant a stay of proceedings. In the words of the Supreme Court of Canada: "This enables the court of the forum selected by the Plaintiffs (the domestic forum) to stay the action at the request of the Defendant if persuaded that the case should be tried elsewhere." (*Amchem Products Inc. v. British Columbia (Workers' Compensation Board)*, [1993] 1 S.C.R. 897 (S.C.C.), at 912). This decision is completely discretionary. I am not bound to defer to the U.S. bankruptcy proceedings.

17 *Amchem* also discusses the vital principle of comity (at 913-14, citing *Morguard Investments Ltd. v. De Savoye*, [1990] 3 S.C.R. 1077 (S.C.C.), at 1096):

> 'Comity' in the legal sense, is neither a matter of absolute obligation, on the one hand, nor of mere courtesy and good will, upon the other. But it is the recognition which one nation allows within its territory to the legislative, executive or judicial acts of another nation, having due regard both to international duty and convenience, and to the rights of its own citizens or of other persons who are under the protection of its laws. ...

18 After cautioning against abusing the power to enjoin foreign litigation, the S.C.C. in *Amchem* outlined the test for restraining foreign proceedings. Although a case on anti-suit injunctions, the first part of the test also relates to stays. The Court must determine if there is a forum other than the domestic forum which is "clearly more appropriate" (at 931). If not, the domestic forum should refuse to stay the domestic proceedings. At 931-32, the S.C.C. continued:

> In this step of the analysis, the domestic court as a matter of comity must take cognizance of the fact that the foreign court has assumed jurisdiction. If, applying the principles relating to *forum non conveniens* outlined above, the foreign court could reasonably have concluded that there was no alternative forum that was clearly more appropriate, the domestic court should respect that decision and the application should be dismissed. When there is a genuine disagreement between the courts of our country and another, the courts of this country should not arrogate to themselves the decision for both jurisdictions. In most cases it will appear from the decision of the foreign court whether it acted on principles similar to those that obtain here, but, if not, then the domestic court must consider whether the result is consistent with those principles.

19 As La Forest J. stated in *Morguard Investments Ltd. v. De Savoye* (1990), 76 D.L.R. (4th) 256 (S.C.C.) at 268, modern states "cannot live in splendid isolation". They must follow comity, which is "the deference and respect due by other states to the actions of a state legitimately taken within its own territory."

20 Comity and cooperation are increasingly important in the bankruptcy context. As internationalization increases, more parties have assets and carry on activities in several jurisdictions. Without some coordination, there would be multiple proceedings, inconsistent judgments and general uncertainty. See, for example, comments in *Olympia & York Developments Ltd. v. Royal Trust Co.* (1993), 20 C.B.R. (3d) 165 (Ont. Gen. Div.); *Antwerp Bulkcarriers N.V., Re* (1996), 43 C.B.R. (3d) 284 (C.S. Que.); and J.D. Honsberger, "*Canadian Recognition of Foreign Judicially Supervised Arrangements*" (1989), 76 D.B.R. (N.S.) 86.

21 I also note that U.S. Courts have shown themselves willing to grant comity in similar circumstances. For example, a Bankruptcy Court granted comity in *Tradewell Inc. v. American Sensors & Electronics Inc.*, 1997 WL 423075 (U.S. S.D. N.Y. 1997). In that case, all proceedings against the Defendant Canadian corporation were stayed under the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*. The Defendant successfully applied to the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for a stay in the U.S. based on comity. That Court stated that U.S. public policy should recognize the foreign proceedings, thus facilitating the "orderly and systematic distribution" of the debtor's assets. This was especially true for Canada, which has similar procedures and procedural safeguards.

Discussion

22 The *U.S. Bankruptcy Code* provision imposing a stay once bankruptcy proceedings have begun is comparable to Canada's *BIA* provision. They also both have the same underlying philosophy - to ensure a fair distribution of assets among all creditors, not just those who happen to have begun proceedings prior to the initiation of bankruptcy. In a situation such as DCC's, there is another motive - if all matters can be stayed, there is a better chance that the DCC will be able to restructure successfully.

23 The number of claims is significant. The U.S. Bankruptcy Court has decided that it is impractical and unfair to have thousands of individual claims going through the adversarial court system. Instead, it agrees with DCC's proposal to settle as many as possible, hold common issue trials as appropriate, then have as many individual trials as still necessary. This appears logical and in the interests of all creditors as a group.

24 An additional consideration is that the Plaintiffs have filed proofs of claim in the U.S. bankruptcy proceedings. The Plaintiffs have, therefore, attorned to the jurisdiction of the U.S. Bankruptcy Court. As stated in *Neese, Re*, 12 B.R. 968 (U.S. Bankr. W.D. Va. 1981) at 971:

> ... [the] defendants voluntarily availed themselves of the jurisdiction of this Court when they filed, by counsel, proofs of claim in the underlying title 11 bankruptcy case. ... Having filed their proofs of claim in the underlying bankruptcy case, the defendants cannot now deny this Court's personal jurisdiction over them in a proceeding directly related to that case.

The same principles apply in Canada - see, for example, *Microbiz Corp. v. Classic Software Systems Inc.* (1996), 45 C.B.R. (3d) 40 (Ont. Gen. Div.); and *Pitts v. Hill & Hill Truck Line Inc.* (1987), 66 C.B.R. (N.S.) 273 (Alta. Master).

25 The Plaintiffs argue that foreign claimants are not treated fairly by the proposed Plan because their settlement package would be at a discount from that given to U.S. claimants. However, there are several safeguards to prevent unfairness. First, the Plaintiffs, along with the rest of the class, have the opportunity to vote against the Plan. If, as a class, they vote against it, the U.S. Bankruptcy Court can only confirm the Plan if it feels the Plan does not "discriminate unfairly" against classes which rejected it. I understand this to mean that treatment can be fair across classes without being equal, as long as there is equality within the class itself. Second, the Plaintiffs are not obliged to settle under the Plan. They may proceed to trial. Third, this Plan actually protects creditors. If there were no stay and no Plan, only the first to trial and judgment would receive any compensation at all, and trials could potentially drag on for many years. Under the Plan, each creditor will receive something and will receive it much sooner.

26 I do not comment on the factors used to assess the discount rate for foreign claimants, except to say that they were not all intended to relate to each foreign jurisdiction. If these factors are accepted by the U.S. Bankruptcy Court in the exercise of its jurisdiction, a jurisdiction to which it is appropriate for me to grant comity and to which the Plaintiffs have attorned, then it is not for me to decide if I would have accepted the factors.

27 The Plaintiffs also argue that the recent Australian case *Taylor v. Dow Corning Australia Pty. Ltd.* (December 19, 1997), Doc. 8438/95 (Australia Vic. Sup. Ct.) should persuade me to dismiss this stay application. There, the Australian Court denied Dow Corning Australia's ("DCA's") application for a stay of proceedings in an action by an Australian plaintiff against DCA. While not binding on me in any event, the reasons in *Taylor* are clearly distinguishable.

28 DCA is a solvent subsidiary of DCC. DCC was initially a defendant, but that plaintiff discontinued against DCC. The Court ruled that any judgment against DCA would not disadvantage creditors of DCC. Further, the plaintiff was entitled to be treated as a creditor of DCA, not DCC.

29 In addition, that plaintiff did not file a proof of claim in the U.S. bankruptcy proceedings. This is extremely significant. In the present case, the Plaintiffs deliberately attorned to the U.S. jurisdiction by filing proofs of claim. In *Taylor*, the plaintiff deliberately did not. There is obiter in *Taylor*, as the Court held attornment was not relevant where a solvent subsidiary, not

the insolvent parent, asks for the stay.

30 Finally, the Plaintiffs argue that I should not grant a stay when the U.S. Bankruptcy Court has not been asked to grant an injunction against non-U.S. proceedings such as this. For example, the Australian Court in *Taylor* queried why DCC had not requested such an injunction and concluded one would have been denied in any event. In the present case, however, an injunction is not necessary. The *U.S. Bankruptcy Code* itself provides for a stay of all proceedings against DCC. This is not comparable to *Taylor*, where the defendant was DCA, not DCC itself.

Order

31 In the circumstances of this case, the U.S. Bankruptcy Court has apparently decided that fairness among creditors is achieved without having complete equality across all classes of creditors. The Plaintiffs attorned to that jurisdiction. However, even had there been no attornment, I find that common sense dictates that these matters would be best dealt with by one Court, and in the interest of promoting international comity it seems the forum for this case is in the U.S.Bankruptcy Court. Thus, in either case, whether there has been an attornment or not, I conclude it is appropriate for me to exercise my discretion and apply the principles of comity and grant the Defendant's stay application. I reach this conclusion based on all the circumstances, including the clear wording of the *U.S. Bankruptcy Code* provision, the similar philosophies and procedures in Canada and the U.S., the Plaintiffs' attornment to the jurisdiction of the U.S. Bankruptcy Court, and the incredible number of claims outstanding. Lastly, while not determinative, I found it significant that there has been acceptance of the Plan in Ontario and Quebec. This not only suggests that the Plan proposes a reasonable offer, but it also suggests that the parties affected in these provinces have accepted the principle that international comity should be recognized in these proceedings.

Application granted.

End of Document

Tab 8

CITATION: Re Xinergy Ltd., 2015 ONSC 2692
COURT FILE NO.: CV-15-10936-00CL
DATE: 20150424

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
COMMERCIAL LIST

IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT, R.S.C. 1985, c. C 36, AS AMENDED AND IN THE MATTER OF CERTAIN PROCEEDINGS TAKEN IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT WITH RESPECT TO **XINERGY LTD.** APPLICATION OF XINERGY LTD. UNDER SECTION 46 OF THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT, R.S.C. 1985, c. C 36, AS AMENDED	)	*Jane Dietrich and Natalie Levine*, for the Applicant *Aubrey E. Kauffman*, for Whitebox Advisors LLC, Highbridge Capital Management LLC and other DIP Lenders *Sean Sweig*, for Deloitte Restructuring Inc., the proposed Information Officer *James H. Grout*, for Jon Nix, a shareholder of the Applicant **HEARD:** April 23, 2015

NEWBOULD J.

[1] On April 6, 2015, Xinergy Ltd. ("Xinergy"), an Ontario corporation, commenced a voluntary reorganization proceeding in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Western District of Virginia (the "U.S. Court") under chapter 11 of the United States Bankruptcy Code. On the same date, 25 of Xinergy's U.S. subsidiaries also filed voluntary petitions under chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code with the U.S. Court.

[2] On April 6 and 7, 2015 the chapter 11 Debtors filed 17 First Day Motions with the U.S. Court and on April 7 and 8, 2015, the U.S. Court entered the orders requested.

[3] Xinergy has now brought an application before this Court pursuant to Part IV of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, RSC 1985, c C-36, as amended for an order recognizing the U.S. proceedings as foreign main proceedings and for orders recognizing some of the first day orders made by the U.S. Court. At the conclusion of the hearing I granted the orders requested for short reasons to follow. These are my reasons.

Business of the applicant

[4] Xinergy is a publicly traded company on the TSX under the ticker symbol XRG. As at September 30, 2014, the date of Xinergy's most recent public filing, there were approximately 58.3 million voting common shares issued and outstanding, and 7.5 million common non-voting shares issued and outstanding, totalling approximately 65.8 million common shares.

[5] The Chapter 11 Debtors are a U.S.-based producer of metallurgical and thermal coal with mineral reserves, mining operations and coal properties located in the Central Appalachian regions of West Virginia and Virginia. The Chapter 11 Debtors' principal operations include two active mining complexes known as South Fork and Raven Crest located in Greenbrier and Boone Counties, West Virginia. The Chapter 11 Debtors also lease or own the mineral rights to properties located in Fayette, Nicholas and Greenbrier Counties, West Virginia and Wise County, Virginia. Collectively, the Chapter 11 Debtors lease or own mineral rights to approximately 72,000 acres with proven and probable coal reserves of approximately 77 million tons and additional estimated reserves of 40 million tons.

[6] The Chapter 11 Debtors currently produce and ship coal from the South Fork mid-volatile metallurgical mine and the Raven Crest thermal operations. The Chapter 11 Debtors' primary customers for metallurgical coal—used in a chemical process that yields coke for the manufacture of steel—are steel producers, commodities brokers and industrial customers throughout North America, Europe and South America. Electric utilities and industrial companies in the southeastern United States and Europe are the principal customers for the Chapter 11 Debtors' thermal coal.

[7] Recently, U.S. demand for thermal coal has fallen sharply in large part due to (i) increasingly attractive alternative sources of energy, such as natural gas, and (ii) burdensome environmental and governmental regulations impacting end users. Simultaneously, the increasingly stringent regulatory environment in which coal companies operate has driven up the cost of mining and processing coal. Continued weakness in the market for metallurgical and thermal coal, combined with an extremely cold and snowy winter that impacted the mining and shipment of coal, has continued to erode Xinergy's cash position. Prior to approval by the U.S. Court of the post-petition DIP financing, Xinergy lacked the liquidity needed to maintain operations in the near term and to sustain its current capital structure. The confluence of these factors and Xinergy's substantial debt burden has taken Xinergy to the point of unsustainability absent the relief provided by the Chapter 11 proceeding.

[8] Xinergy has issued US$200 million in 9.25% Senior Secured Notes (the "Second Lien Notes"), of which approximately US$195 million (principal amount) is outstanding. As of the April 6, 2015, Xinergy was also obligated under two term loans totalling US$20 million in principal amount (the "First Lien Loans").

Requests for relief

[9] Xinergy seeks recognition of four of the orders granted by the U.S. Court. The U.S. Court orders are:

(a) Order Authorizing Xinergy Ltd. to Act as a Foreign Representative (the "Foreign Representative Order");

(b) Interim Order (I) Authorizing Debtors (a) to Obtain Post-petition Financing and (b) to Utilize Cash Collateral; (II) Granting Adequate Protection to Prepetition Secured Parties; and (III) Scheduling Final Hearing (the " Interim DIP Order");

(c) Interim Trading Order Establishing Notification Procedures and Approving Restrictions on Certain Transfers of Equity Interests in the Debtors' Estates (the "Interim Trading Order"); and

(d) Interim Order (I) Authorizing Debtors to Maintain Existing Bank Accounts and Business Forms and Continue to Use Existing Cash Management System; (II) Granting Administrative Expense Status for Intercompany Claims; and (III) Waiving the Requirements of Section 345(b) of the Bankruptcy Code (the "Interim Cash Management Order")

Recognition of foreign main proceeding

[10] Subsection 46(1) of the CCAA provides that a foreign representative may apply to the Court for recognition of a foreign proceeding in respect of which he or she is a foreign representative.

[11] A "foreign representative" for the purpose of subsection 46(1) of the CCAA is defined by subsection 45(1) of the CCAA, which provides:

> "Foreign Representative" means a person or body, including one appointed on an interim basis, who is authorized, in a foreign proceeding respect of a debtor company, to
>
> (a) monitor the debtor company's business and financial affairs or the purpose of reorganization; or
>
> (b) act as a representative in respect of the foreign proceeding.

[12] In the Chapter 11 proceedings, the Chapter 11 Debtors sought the appointment of Xinergy as the foreign representative of the Chapter 11 Debtors, within the meaning of subsection 45(1) of the CCAA. The Foreign Representative Order was granted by the U.S. Court on April 7, 2015.

[13] Subsection 47(1) of the CCAA provides that the Court shall grant an order recognizing the foreign proceeding if (i) the proceeding is a foreign proceeding; and (ii) the applicant is a foreign representative in respect of that proceeding. There is no question but that the Chapter 11 proceedings are foreign proceedings and should be recognized under the CCAA.

[14] Subsection 47(2) of the CCAA requires that the Court specify whether the foreign proceeding is a "foreign main proceeding" or a "foreign non-main proceeding." I am satisfied that the Chapter 11 proceedings are foreign main proceedings.

[15] Subsection 45(2) of the CCAA provides that in the absence of proof to the contrary, a debtor company's registered office is deemed to be the centre of its main interests, or COMI. The registered office of Xinergy is in Toronto at its counsel's office. In considering whether the registered office presumption has been rebutted a court should consider the following factors in determining COMI (i) the location is readily ascertainable by creditors (ii) the location is one in which the debtor's principal assets and operations are found and (iii) the location is where the management of the debtor takes place. See *Lightsquared LLP, Re* (2012), 92 C.B.R. (5th) 321; *MtGox Co. (Re)* (2014), 20 C.B.R. (6th) 307.

[16] Although Xinergy's registered office is in Ontario, it has no operations in Canada. Additionally, Xinergy has no employees in Canada and no offices in Canada other than its registered office. The Chapter 11 Debtors operate on an integrated basis, with corporate and other major decision-making occurring from the consolidated offices in Knoxville, Tennessee. In particular:

(a) Corporate and other major decision-making occurs from the consolidated offices in Knoxville, Tennessee, although administrative employees frequently work remotely or from the Chapter 11 Debtors' mines in the United States;

(b) All of the senior executives of the Chapter 11 Debtors, including Xinergy, are residents of the United States;

(c) In order to fulfil the Canadian residency requirements of Ontario corporations, Xinergy has two Canadian directors;

(d) The majority of the management of the Chapter 11 Debtors, including Xinergy, is shared;

(e) Employee administration, human resource functions, marketing and communications decisions are made, and related actions taken, on behalf of all of the Chapter 11 Debtors, including Xinergy, in the United States;

(f) The Chapter 11 Debtors, including Xinergy, share a cash management system that is largely funded by the U.S. Subsidiaries, overseen by employees of the United States-based Chapter 11 Debtors and located primarily in the United States;

(g) Other functions shared between the Chapter 11 Debtors, including Xinergy, are managed from the United States including: pricing decisions, business development decisions, accounts payable, accounts receivable and treasury functions;

(h) While Xinergy maintains a bank account with The Toronto Dominion Bank in Ontario, the Chapter 11 Debtors use this account to make Canadian denominated deposits and to pay for Canadian services. When additional funds are required, a transfer is made from the U.S. operating account at Xinergy Corp. Xinergy is dependent on the U.S. subsidiaries for substantially all of its funding requirements; and

(i) Other functions shared between the Chapter 11 Debtors, including Xinergy, are managed from the United States including: pricing decisions, business development decisions, accounts payable, accounts receivable and treasury functions.

[17] As the Chapter 11 proceedings are foreign main proceedings, an order is to go under subsection 48(1) of the CCAA staying all proceedings against Xinergy.

Interim DIP Order

[18] The Interim DIP Facility Order, inter alia:

(a) authorizes Xinergy Corp. to obtain post-petition financing pursuant to the DIP Facility up to an aggregate principal amount of $40 million;

(b) authorizes Xinergy and the other Chapter 11 Debtors to unconditionally guarantee all obligations arising under the DIP Facility;

(c) authorizes the Chapter 11 Debtors to use proceeds of the DIP Facility to pay in full the First Lien Loans (the holders of the First Lien Notes are the DIP lenders) ; and

(d) grants first priority super priority claims in connection with the DIP Facility.

[19] The authorization by the U.S. Court to use the proceeds of the DIP Facility to pay out the First Lien Loans, called a "rollup" provision, is not something that can be ordered in a CCAA proceeding as subsection 11.2(1) of the CCAA provides that DIP security may not secure an obligation that existed prior to an Initial Order. However, the issue is whether our Court should recognize the U.S. Court order authorizing that DIP facility under the principles of comity recognized in section 44 of Part IV of the CCAA.

[20] Such a provision has been recognized in *Hartford Computer Hardware Inc., Re* (2012), 94 C.B.R. (5th) 20 by Morawetz J. (as he then was) under section 49 of the CCAA which permits an order to be made if the Court is satisfied that it is necessary to protect the debtor's property or is in the interests of its creditors.

[21] It was obviously seen by the U.S. Court to be in the interests of Xinergy and the other Chapter 11 Debtors to make DIP order that it did. One question to consider is whether there would be any material adverse interest to any Canadian interests in recognizing the "rollup" features of the DIP facility. If there were such material adverse interest, it would put in play a consideration of that adverse interest vis-à-vis the principles of comity that speak to the recognition of an order made in a foreign main proceeding.

[22] In this case, there are four unsecured creditors of Xinergy in Canada being (i) a director owed approximately $1,674, (ii) TMX Equity Transfer Services owed approximately $4,000, (iii) TMX owed $16,492, and (iv) the solicitors for Xinergy (who consent to the rollup DIP facility). The bank account in Canada had approximately $48,415 in it on April 6, 2015. The Canadian unsecured creditors, however, had no economic interest in that bank account as it was secured to the holders of the First Lien Notes. The DIP facility has not changed that. Deloitte, the proposed Information Officer, is of the view that there will be no material prejudice to the Canadian creditors if the Interim Dip Facility order is recognized in these proceedings, and I accept that view.

[23] I am satisfied that the Interim DIP Facility Order should be recognized.

Other orders

[24] The interim trading order made by the U.S. Court ordered on an interim basis certain restrictions on the trading of Xinergy stock. In light of the rules under the Internal Revenue Code in the United States, transfers of the stock may, through no fault of the Chapter 11 Debtors, deprive the Chapter 11 Debtors of important tax benefits. The Interim Trading order was made to protect against this potential harm to debtors in chapter 11 proceedings. It is appropriate to recognize it in this CCAA proceeding.

[25] The relief granted by the U.S. Court in the Interim Cash Management Order will permit Xinergy and the other Chapter 11 Debtors to continue to operate in ordinary course, thereby preserving value for creditors. It is appropriate to recognize it in this CCAA proceeding.

[26] Xinergy has requested an order appointing Deloitte as Information Officer and granting a super-priority charge up to a maximum of $100,000 for its fees and those of its counsel. It is appropriate to make such an order. The DIP lenders consent to the charge. The appointment of Deloitte will help facilitate these proceedings and the dissemination of information concerning the Chapter 11 proceeding. The Information Officer will: (i) act as a resource to the foreign

representative in the performance of its duties; (ii) act as an officer to the Court, reporting to the Court on the proceedings, as required by the Court; and (iii) provide stakeholders of Xinergy with material information on the Chapter 11 proceeding. See *Lear Canada, Re* (2009), 55 C.B.R. (5th) 57 at para. 23 per Pepall J. (as she then was).

[27] For these reasons, I signed the orders as requested at the conclusion of the hearing.

Newbould J.

Released: April 24, 2015

CITATION: Re Xinergy Ltd., 2015 ONSC 2692
COURT FILE NO.: CV-15-10936-00CL
DATE: 20150424

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
COMMERCIAL LIST

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF CERTAIN PROCEEDINGS TAKEN IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT WITH RESPECT TO **XINERGY LTD.**

APPLICATION OF XINERGY LTD. UNDER SECTION 46 OF THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT, R.S.C. 1985, c. C 36, AS AMENDED

REASONS FOR JUDGMENT

Newbould J.

Released: April 24, 2015

Tab 9

2009 CarswellOnt 1998
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Indalex Ltd., Re

2009 CarswellOnt 1998, 176 A.C.W.S. (3d) 930, 52 C.B.R. (5th) 61

In the Matter of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C., c. C-36, as amended

And In the Matter of a Plan of Compromise or Arrangement of Indalex Limited, Indalex Holdings (B.C.) Ltd., 6326765 Canadian Inc. and Novar Inc. (Applicants)

Morawetz J.

Heard: April 8, 2009
Judgment: April 8, 2009
Docket: CV-09-8122-00CL

Counsel: Linc Rogers, Katherine McEachern for Applicants
Wael Rostom for JPMorgan Chase Bank (N.A.) as Pre-petition Agent, DIP Agent for Proposed DIP Lenders
Ashley Taylor for FTI Consulting Canada ULC, Monitor

Subject: Insolvency

Related Abridgment Classifications
For all relevant Canadian Abridgment Classifications refer to highest level of case via History.

Headnote

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Proposal — Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Arrangements — Approval by court — Miscellaneous issues

I Ltd. was involved in Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act proceedings — I Ltd. brought motion for approval of Debtor-In-Possession ("DIP") financing, pursuant to credit agreement with its US parent and its affiliates, and for post-filing guarantee — Motion granted — DIP financing was required — Structure of DIP credit agreement was reasonable — Modifications proposed were appropriate.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by *Morawetz J.*:

A & M Cookie Co. Canada, Re (2008), 49 C.B.R. (5th) 188, 2008 CarswellOnt 7136 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — followed

InterTAN Canada Ltd., Re (2008), 49 C.B.R. (5th) 248, 2008 CarswellOnt 8040 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — followed

Intertan Canada Ltd., Re (2009), 49 C.B.R. (5th) 232, 2009 CarswellOnt 324 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Pliant Corp. of Canada Ltd., Re (March 24, 2009), Doc. 09-CL-8007 (Ont. S.C.J.) — followed

Smurfit-Stone Container Inc., Re (2009), 50 C.B.R. (5th) 71, 2009 CarswellOnt 391 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — followed

Statutes considered:

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

MOTION by company involved in Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act proceedings for approval of debtor-in-possession financing and for post-filing guarantee.

***Morawetz J.* (Orally):**

1 On April 8, 2009, the record was endorsed as follows: "Order granted in the form presented, as amended. Brief reasons will follow." These are those reasons.

2 The Applicants brought this motion for:

> (i) the approval of debtor-in-possession financing ("DIP Financing") pursuant to a Credit Agreement (the "DIP Credit Agreement") among the Applicants, their U.S. parent and its affiliates (collectively, ("Indalex U.S.") and together with the Applicants, (collectively, the "Indalex Group")) and JPMorgan Chase Bank (N.A.) ("JPMorgan"), in its capacity as Administrative Agent for the Lenders (collectively, the "DIP Lenders") and
>
> (ii) the approval of a secured guarantee granted by the Applicants in favour of the DIP Lenders, guaranteeing the obligations of Indalex U.S. under the DIP Credit Agreement (the "Post-Filing Guarantee").

3 Counsel to the Applicants submits that the purpose of these CCAA proceedings is to preserve value for a broad cross-section of stakeholders of the Applicants including their employees, customers, business partners, suppliers and secured and other creditors and that in order to accomplish this goal, the Applicants need stable and reliable access to DIP Financing. Counsel further submits that one of the pre-conditions to obtaining such financing is that the Applicants provide a guarantee (the "Post-Filing Guarantee") of the obligations of Indalex U.S. Indalex U.S. is currently subject to Chapter 11 proceedings.

4 Counsel to the Applicants further submits that the authorization of DIP Financing and the Post-Filing Guarantee is reasonable, appropriate and justified in the circumstances and that DIP Financing is necessary to preserve the opportunity to seek a viable growing concern solution and that sufficient safeguards are in place to protect the pre-filing collateral position of the Applicants' unsecured creditors and any potential prejudice in connection with the granting of the Post-Filing Guarantee is substantially outweighed by the potential benefit to stakeholders, derived from the DIP Financing.

5 The relevant facts, in support of the requested relief, are set out at paragraph 4 of the factum submitted by counsel to the Applicants.

6 The record has established, in my view, that DIP financing is required. However, prior to approving the DIP Financing pursuant to the DIP Credit Agreement, it is necessary to consider a number of factors which include the benefit the Applicants will receive from the DIP Facility and the collateral that is charged to secure the DIP Facility. See *Intertan Canada Ltd., Re* (2009), 49 C.B.R. (5th) 232 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]). In this case, the proposed collateral being provided to the DIP Lenders includes a secured guarantee of the Applicants in favour of the DIP Lenders, guaranteeing the obligations of Indalex U.S. under the DIP Credit Agreement.

7 The situation in which proposed DIP financing has been conditional on a guarantee by the Canadian debtor of the U.S. debtors' obligations has recently been considered by this court in *A & M Cookie Co. Canada, Re* (2008), 49 C.B.R. (5th) 188 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), *InterTAN Canada Ltd., Re* (2008), 49 C.B.R. (5th) 248 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), *Smurfit-Stone Container Inc., Re*, (January 27, 2009, CV-09-7966-00CL), [2009 CarswellOnt 391 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List])] and *Pliant Corp. of Canada Ltd., Re* (March 24, 2009), Doc. 09-CL-8007 (Ont. S.C.J.).

8 These cases have established that the following factors are relevant in determining the appropriateness of authorizing a guarantee in connection with a DIP facility:

> (a) the need for additional financing by the Canadian debtor to support a going concern restructuring;
>
> (b) the benefit of the breathing space afforded by CCAA protection;
>
> (c) the availability (or lack thereof) of any financing alternatives, including the availability of alternative terms to those proposed by the DIP lender;
>
> (d) the practicality of establishing a stand-alone solution for the Canadian debtors;
>
> (e) the contingent nature of the liability of the proposed guarantee and the likelihood that it will be called on;
>
> (f) any potential prejudice to the creditors of the entity if the request is approved, including whether unsecured creditors are put in any worse position by the provision of a cross-guarantee of a foreign affiliate than as existed prior to the filing, apart from the impact of the super-priority status of new advances to the debtor under the DIP financing;
>
> (g) the benefits that may accrue to the stakeholders if the request is approved and the prejudice to those stakeholders if the request is denied; and

(h) a balancing of the benefits accruing to stakeholders generally against any potential prejudice to creditors.

9 In this case, I am satisfied that the Applicants have established the following:

(a) the Applicants are in need of the additional financing in order to support operations during the period of a going concern restructuring;

(b) there is a benefit to the breathing space that would be afforded by the DIP Financing that will permit the Applicants to identify a going concern solution;

(c) there is no other alternative available to the Applicants for a going concern solution;

(d) a stand-alone solution is impractical given the integrated nature of the business of Indalex Canada and Indalex U.S.;

(e) given the collateral base of Indalex U.S., the Monitor is satisfied that it is unlikely that the Post-Filing Guarantee with respect to the U.S. Additional Advances will ever be called and the Monitor is also satisfied that the benefits to stakeholders far outweighs the risk associated with this aspect of the Post-Filing Guarantee;

(f) the benefit to stakeholders and creditors of the DIP Financing outweighs any potential prejudice to unsecured creditors that may arise as a result of the granting of super-priority secured financing against the assets of the Applicants;

(g) the Pre-Filing Security has been reviewed by counsel to the Monitor and it appears that the unsecured creditors of the Canadian debtors will be in no worse position as a result of the Post-Filing Guarantee than they were otherwise, prior to the CCAA filing, as a result of the limitation of the Canadian guarantee set forth in the draft Amended and Restated Initial Order (see [10] and [11] below); and

(h) the balancing of the prejudice weighs in favour of the approval of the DIP Financing.

10 The Monitor also filed a report in respect of the motion. The Monitor indicated that it was concerned that any DIP structure securing the Canadian Pre-Filing Guarantee via court-ordered charge could potentially prejudice Canadian stakeholders by pre-determining the issue of the validity and enforceability of the Canadian Pre-Filing Guarantee. As a result of the concerns raised by the Monitor, the Applicants and the Senior Secured Creditors addressed the situation, the details of which are set out at paragraph 25 of the Monitor's First Report.

11 As stated at paragraph 26 of the Monitor's Report, the intent of the structure is for the Senior Secured Lenders to obtain the benefit of Court-ordered charges securing the DIP Financing and the cross-guarantees of the U.S. Additional Advances and the Canadian Additional Advances while maintaining the *status quo* vis-à-vis the Canadian Pre-Filing Guarantee.

12 The Monitor's Report also summarizes the DIP Credit Agreement. The DIP Credit Agreement provides a maximum facility of up to $84.6 million and the Applicants may draw up to $24.36 million, and the U.S. Debtors are able to borrow the balance, in each case subject to margin availability under borrowing-based calculations for the Applicants and the U.S. Debtors.

13 Counsel to the Monitor has reviewed the security of the Senior Secured Lenders, other than the Canadian Pre-Filing Guarantee and has provided an opinion to the Monitor which states that, subject to the assumptions and qualifications contained therein, the Senior Secured Lenders' security is valid and enforceable and ranks in priority to other claims with respect to accounts and inventory.

14 The Monitor has also referenced that maintaining business operations is in the interests of all stakeholders as it will afford the Applicants the opportunity to develop a viable restructuring plan designed to maximize recoveries for all stakeholders and furthermore, maintaining operations continues the employment of approximately 750 people as well as providing ongoing business for suppliers and customers. The Monitor has also reported that if the Applicants' request for approval of the DIP Agreement was to be denied, the Applicants would be unable to continue operations, both likely resulting in the forced liquidation of the assets to the detriment of creditors, employees, suppliers and customers.

15 The Monitor also considered the potential prejudice to creditors and reports that the likelihood of a call on the Applicants' guarantee of the U.S. Additional Advances is unlikely and that the approval of the DIP Agreement and the proposed structuring of the DIP Charge provide appropriate protection for the DIP Lenders and appropriately balances the benefits to stakeholders that will accrue from such approval with the need to protect the interests of the Canadian creditors against any potential prejudice.

16 The Monitor concludes its Report by noting that it is of the view that approval of the DIP Agreement is in the best interests of the Applicants and their stakeholders and recommends approval of the DIP Agreement and the granting of the DIP Charge.

17 I am satisfied that the Applicants have established that the granting of DIP Financing is necessary and that the structure of the DIP Credit Agreement is reasonable in the circumstances. DIP Financing pursuant to DIP Credit Agreement is accordingly approved.

18 The proposed Amended and Restated Order also provides for certain restructuring powers and an agreed upon priority as between the Directors' Charge, the Administrative Charge and the DIP Lenders' Charge. In my view, these modifications are appropriate and are approved.

19 An order shall issue in the form presented, as amended, which order I have signed.

Motion granted.

End of Document

IN THE MATTER OF THE *COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED, IN THE MATTER OF CERTAIN PROCEEDINGS TAKEN IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT WITH RESPECT TO THE DEBTORS, AND APPLICATION OF HORSEHEAD HOLDING CORP. UNDER SECTION 46 OF THE *COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT*

Court File No. CV-16-11271-00CL

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
COMMERCIAL LIST

Proceedings commenced at Toronto

BRIEF OF AUTHORITIES OF THE APPLICANT

(Application returnable February 5, 2016)

AIRD & BERLIS LLP
Barristers and Solicitors
Brookfield Place
Suite 1800, Box 754
181 Bay Street
Toronto, ON M5J 2T9

Sam Babe (LSUC # 49498B)
Tel: 416.865.7718
Fax: 416.863.1515
Email: sbabe@airdberlis.com

Lawyers for the Applicant