

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

Estate/Court File No. 31-2363758

Estate/Court File No. 31-2363759

**IN THE MATTER OF THE NOTICE OF INTENTION TO MAKE A PROPOSAL OF JONES CANADA, INC., A CORPORATION WITH A HEAD OFFICE IN THE CITY OF TORONTO IN THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, AND NINE WEST CANADA LP, A PARTNERSHIP WITH A HEAD OFFICE IN THE CITY OF TORONTO IN THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO**

**Applicants**

**BOOK OF AUTHORITIES  
(Extension of Proposal Period)**

July 30, 2018

**STIKEMAN ELLIOTT LLP**  
Barristers & Solicitors  
5300 Commerce Court West  
199 Bay Street  
Toronto, Canada M5L 1B9

**Elizabeth Pillon** LSUC#: 35638M  
Tel: (416) 869-5623

**Maria Konyukhova** LSUC#: 52880V  
Tel: (416)869-5230

**Sanja Sopic** LSUC#: 66487P  
Tel: (416) 869-6825

**Lawyers for the Applicants**

# INDEX

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

Estate/Court File No. 31-2363758

Estate/Court File No. 31-2363759

**IN THE MATTER OF THE NOTICE OF INTENTION TO MAKE A PROPOSAL OF  
JONES CANADA, INC., A CORPORATION WITH A HEAD OFFICE IN THE CITY OF  
TORONTO IN THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, AND NINE WEST CANADA LP, A  
PARTNERSHIP WITH A HEAD OFFICE IN THE CITY OF TORONTO IN THE  
PROVINCE OF ONTARIO**

**Applicants**

**INDEX**

<b>TAB</b>	<b>CASE</b>
1.	<i>Colossus Minerals Inc. (Re)</i> , 2014 ONSC 514
2.	<i>In the Matter of the Notice of Intention to Make a Proposal of Karrys Bros. Limited, Karrys Software Limited and Karbro Transport Inc.</i> , Court File No. 32-1942339/1942340/194234, Order and Endorsement of Justice Penny, dated December 24, 2014

**TAB 1**

2014 ONSC 514  
Ontario Superior Court of Justice

Colossus Minerals Inc., Re

2014 CarswellOnt 1517, 2014 ONSC 514, 14 C.B.R. (6th) 261, 237 A.C.W.S. (3d) 584

**In the Matter of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency  
Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, As Amended**

In the Matter of the Notice of Intention of Colossus Minerals Inc., of the City of Toronto in the Province of Ontario

H.J. Wilton-Siegel J.

Heard: January 16, 2014

Judgment: February 7, 2014

Docket: CV-14-10401-00CL

Counsel: S. Brotman, D. Chochla for Applicant, Colossus Minerals Inc.

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

H. Chaiton for Proposal Trustee

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

Subject: Insolvency

**Related Abridgment Classifications**

Bankruptcy and insolvency

XX Miscellaneous

**Headnote**

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Miscellaneous

Applicant filed notice of intention to make proposal under s. 50.4(1) of Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act (Can.) (BIA) on January 13, 2014 — Main asset of applicant was 75 percent interest in gold and platinum project in Brazil, which was held by subsidiary — Project was nearly complete — However, there was serious water control issue that urgently required additional de-watering facilities to preserve applicant's interest in project — As none of applicant's mining interests, including project, were producing, it had no revenue and had been accumulating losses — Applicant sought orders granting various relief under BIA — Application granted — Court granted approval of debtor-in-possession loan (DIP Loan) and DIP charge dated January 13, 2014 with S Inc. and certain holders of applicant's outstanding gold-linked notes in amount up to \$4 million, subject to first-ranking charge on applicant's property, being DIP charge — Court also approved first-priority administration charge in maximum amount of \$300,000 to secure fees and disbursements of proposal trustee and counsel — Proposed services were essential both to successful proceeding under BIA as well as for conduct of sale and investor solicitation process — Court approved indemnity and priority charge to indemnify applicant's directors and officers for obligations and liabilities they may incur in such capacities from and after filing of notice of intention to make proposal — Remaining directors and officers would not continue without indemnification — Court also approved sale and investor solicitation process and engagement letter with D Ltd. for purpose of identifying financing and/or merger and acquisition opportunities available to applicant — Time to file proposal under BIA was extended.

**Table of Authorities**

**Statutes considered:**

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

Generally — referred to

s. 50.4(1) [en. 1992, c. 27, s. 19] — considered

s. 50.4(8) [en. 1992, c. 27, s. 19] — considered

s. 50.4(9) [en. 1992, c. 27, s. 19] — referred to

s. 50.6(1) [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 36] — considered

s. 50.6(5) [en. 2007, c. 36, s. 18] — considered

s. 64.1 [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 42] — considered

s. 64.2 [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 42] — considered

s. 65.13 [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 44] — referred to

s. 65.13(1) [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 44] — considered

s. 65.13(4) [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 44] — considered

*Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36

Generally — referred to

APPLICATION by debtor for various orders under *Bankruptcy and insolvency*.

***H.J. Wilton-Siegel J.:***

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

**Background**

2 The applicant filed a notice of intention to make a proposal under s. 50.4(1) of the BIA on January 13, 2014. Duff & Phelps Canada Restructuring Inc. (the "Proposal Trustee") has been named the Proposal Trustee in these proceedings. The Proposal Trustee has filed its first report dated January 14, 2014 addressing this application, among other things. The main asset of Colossus is a 75% interest in a gold and platinum project in Brazil (the "Project"), which is held by a subsidiary. The Project is nearly complete. However, there is a serious water control issue that urgently requires additional de-watering facilities to preserve the applicant's interest in the Project. As none of the applicant's mining interests, including the Project, are producing, it has no revenue and has been accumulating losses. To date, the applicant has been unable to obtain the financing necessary to fund its cash flow requirements through to the commencement of production and it has exhausted its liquidity.

**DIP Loan and DIP Charge**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Administration Charge**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **The SISP**

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

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

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

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

26 Lastly, the Proposal Trustee supports the proposed SISP.

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Extension of the Stay**

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

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

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

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

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

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

43 Lastly, the Proposal Trustee supports the requested relief.

*Application granted.*

TAB 2

CITATION: Karrys Bros. Ltd. (Re), 2014 ONSC7465  
COURT FILE NO.: 32-1942339/1942340/1942341  
DATE: 20141224

**SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE - ONTARIO**

IN THE MATTER OF AN INTENTION TO MAKE A PROPOSAL OF KARRYS BROS.,  
LIMITED, KARRYS SOFTWARE LIMITED AND KARBRO TRANSPORT INC.,

**COUNSEL:** *E. Pillon and K. Esaw* for the Applicants

*L. Rogers* for PWC

*S. Graft* for BMO

*C. Armstrong* for Core-Mark

**HEARD:** December 23, 2014

**ENDORSEMENT**

**Overview**

[1] On December 23, 2014 I granted orders approving a sale of substantially all of the applicants' assets together with various related administrative orders, with reasons to follow. These are those reasons.

[2] This motion seeks approval of a sale of the applicants' assets out of the ordinary course, authorization to distribute funds to the senior secured lender, a sealing order of certain confidential information and various administrative orders, including:

- (i) extending the time for filing a proposal;
- (ii) approving a key employee retention agreement;
- (iii) approving an administrative charge;
- (iv) approving the consolidation of the applicants' proposal proceedings; and
- (v) approving the report of the proposal trustee.

**Background**

[3] Karrys is a wholesale distributor of tobacco, confectionery, snacks, beverages, automotive supplies and other products to retail, gas and convenience stores across Canada. As of November 1, 2014, Karrys' assets were exceeded by its liabilities by over \$1 million. Karrys experienced net losses of over \$3 million in each of the last two years.

- Page 2 -

[4] As a result of its financial difficulties, Karrys committed defaults under its loan agreement with the Bank of Montréal in 2013. BMO is Karrys' senior secured lender. BMO agreed to a number of forbearance agreements to enable the sales process which is at the heart of this motion.

[5] Karrys commenced a sales process in December 2013. It retained a financial advisor, Capitalink. Karrys had initial, exclusive negotiations with Core-Mark, itself a wholesale distributor of similar goods, in May through July 2014. Those negotiations did not result in an agreement.

[6] Karrys retained Price Waterhouse Coopers to assist Karrys and Capitalink in undertaking a more expansive sale process. In the fall of 2014, Karrys developed a process in which Core-Mark agreed to make a stalking horse bid for substantially all of Karrys' assets.

[7] Over 53 potential strategic and financial buyers were also invited to bid on the assets. Thirteen of these potential buyers entered into confidentiality agreements and received a confidential information memorandum and access to Karrys' data room. PWC and Capitalink responded to all reasonable requests for information.

[8] By the bidding deadline of noon on December 10, 2014, however, no other bids were received. Core-Mark was, accordingly, declared the successful bidder.

[9] Karrys now asks for the court's approval of the asset purchase agreement with Core-Mark and for a vesting order, together with approval of distribution, from the proceeds, of the amount owed to BMO and other related relief.

#### The Sale and Vesting Order

[10] Jurisdiction to make orders approving the sale derives from s. 65.13 of the BIA. Factors for the court to consider when asked to approve a sale out of the ordinary course are also listed in s. 65.13.

[11] It is not necessary for the debtor to present its proposal under the BIA before an order approving a sale, *Re Komtech*, 2011 ONSC 3230.

[12] In this case, the sale was the result of a broad and comprehensive marketing process. Two financial advisors were engaged. When initial negotiations with Core-Mark did not produce an amount the applicants originally thought acceptable, another process was initiated with the assistance of PWC. Efforts to lever the Core-Mark offer were, however, although widely promoted, ultimately unsuccessful. The "market" has, in that sense, spoken.

[13] The proposal trustee, PWC, has reviewed the sale process and is supportive of the process and the result. The proposal trustee has, as well, conducted a detailed analysis of the Core-Mark bid measured against a "liquidation in bankruptcy" scenario. Even under a "best case" liquidation scenario, the unsecured creditors would be expected to recover significantly less than under the Core-Mark sale transaction. Under the proposed sale, there is the possibility of surplus for distribution to unsecured creditors. There would be no such possibility under a liquidation scenario. BMO, the senior secured lender, is also supportive of the process and the result.

- Page 3 -

[14] Because the purchase price represents, through an extensive sales process, the highest price realizable and an amount which is greater than what could be realized under a liquidation, the consideration to be received for the assets is reasonable and fair. Further, the sale will enable Karrys to make the payments contemplated under s. 65.13(8) of the BIA.

[15] The fact that the sales process was not pre-approved by the court is not a bar to the court's approval in this case. Is clear on the evidence that the Core-Mark transaction is the best available option in the circumstances. No one has come forward to argue otherwise. The test is the same whether approval is sought before or after the process – the principles in *Soundair* govern. The *Soundair* test has been met. A judgment call had to be made whether to further extend the process in hopes of perhaps finding a better bid. Further delay would just as likely have resulted in a greater erosion of value. An immediate sale was, on the evidence, the only way to maximize recovery.

[16] In addition, the process actually followed is indistinguishable from what the court might reasonably have approved had prior authorization been sought. There is no evidence, or likelihood, that Karrys or its creditors would be in a better position if some further, or other, sales process had been followed.

[17] The sale is approved and the vesting order shall issue.

#### The Key Supplier Issue

[18] On the very day Karrys filed its notice of intention to make a proposal, Karrys' principal tobacco supplier delivered a substantial quantity of tobacco. A dispute arose over payment. The supplier took the position it was under no legal obligation to continue to supply and that it would not supply unless payment was received. Karrys' supply agreement had expired and the parties were operating on the basis of an informal supply arrangement.

[19] Ensuring ongoing tobacco supply from this supplier was critical to Karrys in terms of the ongoing operations of the business pending the closing of the sale to Core-Mark, the satisfaction of conditions precedent to the closing with Core-Mark, including the loss of potential customers should their tobacco requirements not be satisfied, and the resulting risk that the Core-Mark transaction would be lost as a result.

[20] Karrys and its legal advisers considered there was significant litigation risk relating to the ability to enforce a stay of proceedings against the supplier in any event and, accordingly, entered into negotiations with the tobacco supplier.

[21] These negotiations resulted in a substantial payment to the supplier which, arguably, involved post-filing payment for a pre-filing obligation. Given the importance of this supplier to ongoing operations and to the success of the Core-Mark sale, however, Karrys, along with its advisors, had little option but to reach a settlement.

[22] Unlike the CCAA, the concept of "critical suppliers" is not found in the proposal provisions of the BIA. Nevertheless, in my view, similar considerations can and should be taken into account in appropriate circumstances. In this case, Karrys and its advisors reasonably believed that the ongoing viability of the business and the Core-Mark sale (which, as found

- Page 4 -

above, represents the highest realizable price for Karrys' assets available in the circumstances) required the ongoing availability of this critical source of supply. There is also a significant net benefit to Karrys arising from sales of the product supplied. The supply contract negotiated, in the context of both the importance of the supply and significant litigation risk, was, I find, reasonable in the circumstances.

### **BMO Distribution**

[23] BMO delivered notices of intention to enforce its security. The unchallenged evidence before the court is that BMO holds a valid, perfected security interest over each of the applicants' assets. BMO is entitled to a distribution of proceeds from the sale in satisfaction of its claim.

### **Sealing Order**

[24] I am satisfied that the confidential appendices should be sealed until the deal is closed. There is an important public interest in maximizing returns in proceedings of this kind. It is important, therefore, that until the deal is concluded, commercially sensitive information about the deal not be publicly disclosed. Failure to grant the order would impair the integrity of any subsequent process. In addition, in the context of the key employee retention agreement, there is sensitive personal information which ought not to be disclosed.

[25] The *Sierra Club* test has been met on the facts of this case, *Elleway Acquisitions Ltd.*, 2013 ONSC 7009. The salutary effects of granting the sealing order outweigh the limited deleterious effect of restricting access to these limited pieces of evidence.

### **Extension**

[26] Section 50.4(9) of the BIA grants the jurisdiction to grant the extension. The initial proposal period expires on January 12, 2015. The Core-Mark transaction will not close until February 2015.

[27] The applicants are acting in good faith. There is some prospect of surplus funds for distribution to unsecured creditors, given time to close the Core-Mark sale and assess the remaining priorities and claims. The cash flow statements indicate that Karrys has sufficient cash to fund operations through to the end of February 2015. There is no evidence any creditor will be prejudiced by the extension.

[28] Accordingly, the time for filing a proposal is extended to February 23, 2015.

### **Key Employee**

[29] It is often recognized in restructuring proceedings that retention of key employees is vital. Securing payment is, in turn, a vital incentive for the employee to remain.

[30] In this case, there is one employee whose assistance has been, and will remain, key to ongoing operations to the date of sale. The retention bonus in issue is relatively modest. It is supported by the proposal trustee and BMO. Without securing the retention payment, there is a

- Page 5 -

significant risk the employee would leave. In addition, given the abbreviated timeframe for closing the Core-Mark sale, it would be almost impossible to find a timely replacement.

[31] For these reasons, the retention agreement and charge, as requested, is approved.

**Administrative Charge**


[32] Section 64.2 of the BIA provides for a super-priority to secure the fees for needed professional services during the restructuring. Secured creditors have received notice of this request. The proposal trustee supports the granting of the charge. The amount sought is, in my view, appropriate. The administrative charge requested is approved.

**Consolidation**

[33] It is clear that the operations of the three applicants are closely intertwined such that it would be difficult to disentangle their affairs. In order to secure the just, most expeditious and least expensive resolution, it is necessary to consolidate these closely related bankruptcy proceedings. This will avoid duplication and reduce cost. The requested order is therefore granted.

**Proposal Trustee Report**

[34] Given my approval of the elements above, it follows that the first report and activities of the proposal trustee should also be approved.

  
Penny J.

Date: December 24, 2014

**IN THE MATTER OF THE NOTICE OF INTENTION TO MAKE A PROPOSAL OF JONES CANADA, INC., A CORPORATION WITH A HEAD OFFICE IN THE CITY OF TORONTO IN THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, AND NINE WEST CANADA LP, A PARTNERSHIP WITH A HEAD OFFICE IN THE CITY OF TORONTO IN THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO**

Estate/Court File No. 31-2363758  
Estate/Court File No. 31-2363759

**ONTARIO**  
**SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE**  
**(COMMERCIAL LIST)**  
Proceeding commenced at Toronto

**BOOK OF AUTHORITIES**  
**(EXTENSION OF PROPOSAL PERIOD)**

**STIKEMAN ELLIOTT LLP**  
Barristers & Solicitors  
5300 Commerce Court West  
199 Bay Street  
Toronto, Canada M5L 1B9

**Elizabeth Pillon** LSUC#: 35638M  
Tel: (416) 869-5236

**Maria Konyukhova** LSUC #: 52880V  
Tel: (416) 869-5230

**Sanja Sopic** LSUC#: 66487P  
Tel: (416) 869-6825

**Lawyers for the Applicants**