

CITATION: Target Canada Co. (Re), 2015 ONSC 1028

COURT FILE NO.: CV-15-10832-00CL

DATE: 2015-02-18

SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE - ONTARIO

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

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

BEFORE: Regional Senior Justice Morawetz

COUNSEL: *Jeremy Dacks, John MacDonald and Shawn Irving*, for the Target Canada Co.,
Target Canada Health Co., Target Canada Mobile GP Co., Target Canada
Pharmacy (BC) Corp., Target Canada Pharmacy (Ontario) Corp., Target Canada
Pharmacy Corp., Target Canada Pharmacy (SK) Corp., and Target Canada
Property LLC (the "Applicants")

Jay Swartz, for the Target Corporation

William Sasso, Sharon Strosberg and Jacqueline Horvat, Proposed Representative
Counsel for the Pharmacy Franchisee Association of Canada

Susan Philpott, Employee Representative Counsel for employees of the
Applicants

Alan Mark, Melaney Wagner, Graham Smith and Franci Kussner, for the
Monitor, Alvarez & Marsal Inc.

J. Dietrich, for Merchant Retail Solutions ULC, Gordon Brothers Canada ULC
and G.A. Retail Canada ULC

Andrew Hodhod, for Bell Canada

Harvey Chaiton, for the Directors and Officers

HEARD: February 11, 2015

RELEASED: February 18, 2015

ENDORSEMENT

[1] The Pharmacy Franchisee Association of Canada ("PFAC") brought this motion for the following relief:

- a. appointing PFAC as the representative of the Pharmacists and Franchisees (collectively, the "Pharmacists") under the Pharmacy Franchise Agreements ("Franchise Agreements");
- b. appointing Sutts, Strosberg LLP as the Pharmacists' Representative Counsel (the "Representative Counsel");
- c. appointing BDO Canada ("BDO") as the Pharmacists' financial advisor;
- d. directing that the Pharmacists' reasonable legal and other professional expenses be paid from the estate of the Target Canada Entities with appropriate administrative charges to secure payment;
- e. directing that the "Disclaimer of Franchise Agreements" dated January 26, 2015 by the Franchisor, Target Pharmacy Franchising LP ("Target Pharmacy") be set aside;
- f. declaring that the Franchise Agreements and/or related agreements may not be disclaimed without court order; and
- g. directing that Target Pharmacy cannot deny the Pharmacists access to premises, discontinue supplies or otherwise interfere with a Pharmacist's operations without that Pharmacist's consent or a court order.

[2] On January 26, 2015, Target Pharmacy delivered Disclaimers of Franchise Agreements and related agreements to each of the Pharmacists operating the pharmacies at 93 locations across Canada (outside Quebec), seeking to shut down these pharmacies in the Target Canada store locations within 30 days.

[3] The Pharmacists ask the court to deny Target Pharmacy's Disclaimer of the Franchise Agreements because (i) the Disclaimers will not enhance the prospects of a viable arrangement being made; and (ii) the Pharmacists will suffer significant financial hardship as a consequence of the disclaimer, with insolvency and/or bankruptcy awaiting many of them.

[4] Under the proposed wind-down, Target Pharmacy is not responsible for pharmacy shut-down costs. Instead, the Pharmacists are responsible for (i) the payment of salaries, severance pay and other obligations to their own employees, suppliers and contractors; (ii) the relocation costs of their pharmacies; and (iii) the continuation of services to their patients in accordance with professional standards.

[5] The Pharmacists recognize that they face numerous challenges as a result of Target store closures. In relocating, or winding-down pharmacy operations, the Pharmacists are required to comply with applicable legislation, regulations and standards governing the conduct of pharmacists in Canada, including such matters as: notice of pharmacy closure; notice of intention to open a new pharmacy; the safe-guarding of personal health records; providing notice to patients respecting their personal health information; and safeguarding and disposing of narcotics and controlled substances.

[6] The Pharmacists seem to accept that when a Target store closes, the pharmacy within that store will also close. They state that they require “breathing space” that may be afforded to them by an order that the Franchise Agreements are not to be disclaimed at this time. They ask the court to direct Target Pharmacy and its Affiliates not to deny them access to their licenced space or otherwise interfere with the Pharmacist’s operations without the consent of or on terms directed by the court. Practically speaking, the Pharmacists want to postpone the effect of the disclaimer in the hope of obtaining a continuation of support payments from Target Canada for an unspecified time.

[7] There is no doubt that the closure or pending closure of Target Canada is causing and will cause significant dislocation for a number of parties. For the most part, Target Employees will lose their jobs. Representative Counsel have been appointed to assist employees in a process that includes an Employee Trust.

[8] The closure of Target Canada also impacts suppliers to Target, especially sole suppliers. The insolvency of Target Canada and its filing under the *Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act* (CCAA) has no doubt resulted in Target defaulting on a number of contractual relationships. These suppliers will have claims against Target Canada that will be filed in due course.

[9] The closure of Target Canada also affects the Pharmacists. The insolvency of Target and its filing under the CCAA has resulted in Target defaulting on its contractual relationships with the Pharmacists. Target wishes to disclaim the Franchise Agreements. The Monitor approved the proposed disclaimer and, as noted, disclaimer notices were sent on January 26, 2015.

[10] The Pharmacists are challenging the disclaimer and seek an order under s. 32(2) of the CCAA that the Franchise Agreements not be disclaimed. Section 32(4) of the CCAA references a section 32(2) order and provides:

Factors to be considered – In deciding whether to make the order, the court is to consider, among other things,

- (a) whether the monitor approved the proposed disclaimer or resiliation;
- (b) whether the disclaimer or resiliation would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made in respect of the company; and
- (c) whether the disclaimer or resiliation would likely cause significant financial hardship to a party to the agreement.

[11] The reality that the Target stores will be closing provides, in my view, the starting point to analyze the issue being brought forward by the Pharmacists.

[12] Following the closing of a particular Target Store, it is unrealistic for the Pharmacist to carry on the operation of the pharmacy. As noted by counsel to the Applicants, as soon as operations cease at a particular location, the store will “go dark” and there will no longer be employee or security support that would permit the Franchisees to continue to operate. Further, counsel to the Applicants submits it would not be either commercially reasonable or practical for the Franchisees to continue to operate in a closed store, nor would it be reasonable or in the interests of stakeholders to require these locations to remain open in order to serve the interests of the Franchisees.

[13] It is in this context that the issue of the disclaimer has to be considered.

[14] Counsel to the Pharmacists seem to appreciate the reality of the situation, as reflected in the following references in their factum.

49. It is cold comfort for the Pharmacists to be advised that their losses in relation to the disclaimer of the Franchise Agreement are provable claims in the CCAA proceedings. The Pharmacists must pay their employees now. It is problematic that a provable claim may result in the possible recovery of some part of those payments, at a future uncertain date, if the funds are available in the Target Pharmacy Estate.
50. Evidence that simply provides that a debtor company will be more profitable with the disclaimer contracts is insufficient. Setting aside the disclaimers in this case will provide the Pharmacists with flexibility and time to make informed decisions and carry out their own relocation and/or wind-down in a manner that causes the least amount of damages to themselves and those who depend on them. ...
53. Respectfully, such disclaimer should not be permitted until the court receives an independent report of the circumstances of each of the Pharmacists and directs the orderly wind-down and/or relocation of such operations on terms that are fair and reasonable. ...
55. In no respect is the 30-day termination of the Franchise Agreements fair, reasonable and equitable to the Pharmacists, their employees and the public they serve. For many Pharmacists, it minimizes their capacity to relocate, [and] will leave them without funds to pay their employees, or the capacity to meet their ongoing obligations to their patients.

[15] It seems to me, having considered these submissions, that the Pharmacists recognize that it is inevitable that the pharmacies will be shut down.

[16] With respect to the factors to be considered as set out in s. 32(4), the disclaimer notices were approved by the Monitor. The Pharmacists complain that no reasons were provided in the notice approved by the Monitor. However, there is no requirement in s. 32(1) for the Monitor to provide reasons for its approval. This is reflected in Form 4 – Notice by Debtor Company to Disclaim or Resiliate an Agreement.

[17] However, the absence of reasons does not lead necessarily to the conclusion that the Monitor did not consider certain factors prior to providing its approval.

[18] The Monitor has made reference to the issues affecting the pharmacies in its Reports.

[19] The pharmacies were specifically the subject of comment in the Monitor's First Report at sections 8.2 – 8.5, and in the Second Report at section 6. Section 6.1 (h) of the Second Report specifically comments on the disclaimer notices. A summary of the reasons is provided at section 6.2.

[20] The information contained in the Monitor's reports establishes that there was communication as between Target Canada, the Monitor and the Franchisees such that it was clear that the stores were being closed. Specific reference to the communication is set out in the Monitor's Report at section 6.1(f), which in turn references the second Wong affidavit, filed by the Applicants.

[21] I am satisfied that the Monitor considered a number of relevant factors prior to approving the disclaimer notices.

[22] With respect to the second factor to be considered, namely whether the disclaimer would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made in respect of the company, the Applicants have indicated they may be filing a plan of arrangement. I note that a plan may be required to ensure an orderly distribution of assets to the creditors.

[23] The Applicants seek to achieve an orderly wind-down and maximization of realizations to the benefit of all unsecured creditors. It seems to me that if the disclaimers are set aside it would delay this process because it would extend the time period for Target Canada to make payments to one group of creditors (the Pharmacists) to the detriment of the creditors generally. Further, in the absence of an effective disclaimer, the Target Entities will continue to incur significant ongoing administrative costs which would be detrimental to the estate and all stakeholders.

[24] The interests of all creditors must be taken into account. In this case, store closures and liquidation are inevitable. The Applicants should focus on an asset realization and a maximization of return to creditors on a timely basis. Setting aside the disclaimer might provide limited assistance to the Pharmacists, but it would come at the expense of other creditors. This is not a desirable outcome. I expressed similar views in *Timminco Ltd., Re*, 2012 ONSC 4471 at paragraph 62 as follows:

[62] I have also taken into account that the effect of acceding to the argument put forth by counsel to Mr. Timmins would result in an improvement to his position relative to, and at the expense of, the unsecured creditors and other stakeholders of the Timminco Entities. If the Agreement is disclaimed, however, the monthly amounts that would otherwise be paid to Mr. Timmins would be available for distribution to all of Timminco's unsecured creditors, including Mr. Timmins. This equitable result is dictated by the guiding principles of the CCAA.

[25] I am satisfied that the disclaimer will be beneficial to the creditors generally because it will enable the Applicants to move forward with their liquidation plan without a further delay to accommodate the Pharmacists.

[26] The third factor is whether the disclaimer would likely cause significant financial hardship to a party to the agreement. This factor is addressed by Counsel to the Monitor at paragraph 27 of its factum.

27. On its own terms the CCAA effectively imposes a high threshold, beyond economic or financial loss, for the consideration under section 32(4): there must be evidence of financial *hardship*, it must be *significant* financial hardship, and it must be *likely* to be caused by the disclaimer. Financial loss or damage, without more, is not sufficient, in the Monitor's submission. It appears that Section 32 itself recognizes the distinction, providing expressly in ss. 32(7) that where a party suffers "a loss" in relation to the disclaimer the consequence is that such party "is considered to have a provable claim." (emphasis in original)

[27] In these circumstances, the pharmacies will inevitably close in the very near future whether or not the Franchise Agreements are disclaimed. I accept the submission of counsel to the Monitor to the effect that no Franchisee has adduced evidence that disallowing the Disclaimer and continuing to operate in otherwise dark, vacated premises would improve its financial circumstances.

[28] The situation facing the Pharmacists is not pleasant. However, in my view, setting aside the disclaimer will not improve their situation. Extending the time before the disclaimers take effect has the consequence of requiring Target Canada to allocate additional assets to the Pharmacists in priority to other unsecured creditors. This is not a desirable outcome.

[29] The Target Canada Entities, in consultation and with the support of the Monitor, have offered a degree of accommodation to the Pharmacists. The details are set out at paragraphs 64-66 of the affidavit of Mark Wong sworn February 16, 2015:

64. As outlined above, in consultation with and with the support of the Monitor, on February 9, 2015 the Target Canada Entities' legal advisors delivered an accommodation to PFAC's counsel intended to address the primary concern expressed by PFAC, namely that franchisees require additional time to transfer patient files and drug inventory and to relocate their respective pharmacy

businesses. Under the terms of the accommodation, TCC will permit the pharmacists to continue to operate at their respective existing TCC locations until the earlier of March 30, 2015 and three days following written notice by TCC to the pharmacist of the anticipated store closure at such pharmacist's location. The accommodation provides that the Notices of Disclaimer will continue in effect and the franchise agreements will be disclaimed on February 25, 2015, but the pharmacists will be entitled to remain on the premises for an additional period of time.

64. Under the terms of the accommodation, pharmacists will be able to continue operating in TCC stores for longer than the 30-day period contemplated. Depending on the date the Agent decides to vacate certain TCC stores, many pharmacists may be able to continue operating for 60 days or more following delivery of the Notices of Disclaimer and approximately 75 days following the date of the Initial Order. As I described above, at any time after the third anniversary of the opening date of the pharmacy, TCC Pharmacy would have the right to terminate the franchise agreement for any reason on 60 days' notice.

66. The March 30, 2015 date indicated in the accommodation made by Target Canada Entities is intended to be a reasonable compromise whereby pharmacist franchisees will get additional time to transfer patient files and inventory and relocate their businesses, while at the same time permitting the Target Canada Entities to undertake the orderly wind down of TCC pharmacy operations and the TCC retail stores as a whole. As I described above, in order to accommodate the continued operations of the pharmacies during the wind down process, TCC Pharmacy and TCC have not yet delivered notices of disclaimer to a number of third-party providers such as McKesson, Kroll and others, which TCC Pharmacy has maintained at considerable cost. The March 30, 2015 outside date for the operation of all TCC pharmacies will allow TCC Pharmacy to time the delivery of disclaimer notices to these third-party providers so as to avoid incurring additional unnecessary costs. The certainty provided by the firm outside date is also to the benefit of the pharmacies themselves, each of whom will be required to win down their operations and make alternate arrangements in the very short term as a result of the imminent closures of TCC retail stores.

[30] In the circumstances of this case, this accommodation represents, in my view, a constructive, practical and equitable approach to address a difficult issue.

[31] Having considered the factors set out in section 32(4) of the CCAA, the motion of PFAC for a direction that the disclaimer of the Franchise Agreements be set aside is dismissed, together with ancillary relief related to the disclaimers. It is not necessary to address the standing issue raised by the Monitor.

[32] I turn now to the request of PFAC that it be appointed representative of the Franchisees and that Sutts, Strosberg LLP be appointed as the Pharmacists' Representative Counsel, and BDO as the Pharmacists' financial advisor.

[33] In view of my decision relating to the disclaimers, the scope of legal and financial services required by the Pharmacists may be limited. However, there are many transitional issues that remain to be addressed. First and foremost is dealing with the patient records and ensuring uninterrupted delivery of prescription drugs to all such patients. There is also interaction required between Target Pharmacy, the Franchisees, and the regulators, concerning the relocation or shut down of pharmacies and the return of certain products to suppliers. This is not a simple case where the Franchisee receiving the disclaimer notice can simply walk away from the scene. From a professional and regulatory standpoint, they still have to participate in the process.

[34] In addressing these transition issues and recognizing that similar circumstances exist for the Franchisees, there would appear to be some benefit in having a limited form of representation for the Franchisees. This would assist in ensuring that a consistent approach is followed not only in the wind-down or relocation aspect of the process, but also in the claims process. In my view, the estate could benefit if this process was coordinated.

[35] The Monitor and the Applicants would have a single point of contact which would likely result in a reduction in administrative time and costs during the liquidation and the claims process. I am satisfied that PFAC has the support of the majority of franchisees. PFAC is appointed as the Representative of the Pharmacists. Sutts, Strosberg LLP is appointed Representative Counsel and BDO is appointed as the Pharmacists financial advisor.

[36] The funding of this representational role is to be limited. The Applicants are to make available up to \$100,000, inclusive of disbursements and HST, to PFAC to be used for legal and financial advisory services to be provided by Sutts, Strosberg, as Representative Counsel and BDO as financial advisor in these proceedings. PFAC can provide copies of invoices to the Monitor, who can arrange for payment of same. Any surplus funds at the conclusion of the representation are to be returned to the Applicants. The contribution to PFAC can be used only to cover legal and financial advisory services provided to date in these proceedings as well as to assist on the going forward matters, subject to the following parameters.

[37] Such assistance is to be limited to:

- a. corresponding with the regulators concerning the wind-down process and the relocation process;
- b. return of inventory; and
- c. participating in the claims process.

[38] If the individual franchisees decide not to participate in PFAC, they should not expect any further accommodation in a financial sense.

[39] In arriving at this accommodation, I have taken into account that this limited funding will provide benefits to the Applicants under CCAA protection insofar as the legal and financial advisory services provided by Representative Counsel and BDO should reduce the overall administrative cost to the estate and will avoid a multiplicity of legal retainers. The representation and funding will also benefit the franchisees so that they can effectively shut-down or relocate their business and prepare any resulting claim in the CCAA proceedings.

[40] Given the limited nature of the Applicants' financial contribution, an administrative charge is not, in my view, required.

[41] In the result, PFAC's motion for representation status is granted, with limitations set out above. The motion in respect of the disclaimers is dismissed.



R.S.J. Geoffrey Morawetz

Date: February 18, 2015