

THE KING'S BENCH
WINNIPEG CENTRE

IN THE MATTER OF THE *COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT*, RSC 1985, c
C-36, as amended

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF MANITOBA
CLINIC MEDICAL CORPORATION AND THE MANITOBA CLINIC HOLDING CO. LTD.

BRIEF OF LAW OF THE MONITOR
ALVAREZ & MARSAL CANADA INC.
DATED OCTOBER 27, 2023
DATE OF HEARING : TUESDAY, OCTOBER, 2023 AT 9:00A.M.
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHARTIER

MONITOR
ALVAREZ & MARSAL CANADA INC.
Bow Valley Square IV
Suite 1110, 250 – 6th Avenue SW
Calgary, Alberta T2P 3H7
Orest Konowalchuk/Cassie Riglin
Telephone : (403) 538-4736/ (403) 538-7519
Email : okonowalchuk@alvarezandmarsal.com/criglin@alvarezandmarsal.com

MONITOR'S COUNSEL
McDougall Gauley LLP
Barristers and Solicitors
Ian Sutherland, K.C./Craig Firth
500-616 Main Street
Saskatoon, SK S7H 0J6
Telephone : (306) 665-5417
Fax : (306) 652-1323
Email : isutherland@mcdougallgauley.com/cfrith@mcdougallgauley.com

**THE KING'S BENCH
WINNIPEG CENTRE**

IN THE MATTER OF THE *COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT*, RSC 1985, c
C-36, as amended

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF MANITOBA
CLINIC MEDICAL CORPORATION AND THE MANITOBA CLINIC HOLDING CO. LTD.

**BRIEF OF LAW OF THE MONITOR
ALVAREZ & MARSAL CANADA INC.
DATED OCTOBER 27, 2023**

INDEX

	PAGE
I. Documents and Authorities to be Relied On	3
II. Introduction	4
III. Facts	5
IV. Issues	6
V. Discussion	6
VI. Conclusion	13

I. DOCUMENTS AND AUTHORITIES RELIED ON

Documents to be relied on:

1. the pleadings and materials filed herein;
2. the Amended and Restated Initial Order signed December 2, 2022 (the “**ARIO**”);
3. the Affidavit of Keith McConnell sworn November 28, 2022;
4. the Pre-Filing Report of Alvarez & Marsal Canada Inc. dated November 29, 2022;
5. the First Report of the Monitor dated January 20, 2023;
6. the Second Report of the Monitor dated April 18, 2023;
7. the Third Report of the Monitor dated July 31, 2023;
8. the Fourth Report of the Monitor dated September 22, 2023 (the “**Fourth Report**”);
9. the Fifth Report of the Monitor dated October 27, 2023 (the “**Fifth Report**”);
10. the Confidential Supplement to the Fifth Report dated October 27, 2023 (the “**Confidential Supplement**”);
11. the Affidavit of Service of Shelby Braun, to be filed;
12. the Notice of Motion dated October 27, 2023; and
13. such further and other documentation as counsel may advise and this Honourable Court may permit.

Cases, statutory provisions and authorities to be relied on:

TABS

- A. *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36 (the "**CCAA**"), s. 11 and 36;
- B. *Target Canada Co. (Re)*, 2015 ONSC 2066;
- C. *Royal Bank of Canada v Soundair Corp.*, 1991 CarswellOnt 205;
- D. *Sherman Estate v Donovan*, 2021 SCC 25;
- E. *Ontario Securities Commission v Bridging Finance Inc.*, 2021 ONSC 4347; and
- F. *Target Canada Co. (Re)*, 2015 ONSC 7574.

II. INTRODUCTION

1. The Monitor¹ brings this motion for, among other relief, Court approval of a Transaction involving the sale of Realco's Class B partnership units (the "**Purchased Assets**" or the "**Units**") to the Partnership's general partner, Dynacare.

2. The Partnership operates a number of laboratories in Manitoba and is one of the province's largest providers of community laboratory services. The Partnership's contract with the Government of Manitoba, the Community Laboratories Agreement, will expire on March 31, 2024. If the Partnership is not able to secure a new contract with the Government of Manitoba through the RFP process, the value of these Units will be significantly reduced.

Fifth Report at paras 27 and 41

3. Over the past several months the Monitor has been discussing and negotiating a prospective sale of the Purchased Assets with the Partnership. CIBC, the senior secured creditor, has been involved throughout this process. These efforts culminated in the parties entering into the Sale Agreement.

***Ibid* at paras 37 and 47 to 48**

¹ Unless otherwise defined, capitalized terms will have the meanings given to them in the Fifth Report, the Monitor's notice of motion, the Approval and Vesting Order, and the Sealing and Other Relief Order.

4. The Monitor is of the view that the Transaction described in the Sale Agreement should be approved for the following reasons:

- (a) the unique nature of the Units makes them difficult to market and sell to the public;
- (b) the Monitor believes, based on the information and documentation it has been provided, that the purchase price contemplated in the Transaction is commercially competitive;
- (c) the income generated from the Purchased Assets is not guaranteed to continue past March 31, 2024, which affects their potential value; and
- (d) selling the Units to the Purchaser will avoid potential litigation that may arise from either a dispute over the value of the Units or the ability of the Monitor to publicly market (and sell) the Units.

***Ibid* at para 51**

5. In addition to the relief sought in relation to the AVO, the Monitor is also seeking an order:

- (a) sealing the Confidential Supplement, which contains commercially sensitive information about the Transaction;
- (b) approving the Fifth Report and the Monitor's activities described therein; and
- (c) approving the fees and disbursements of the Monitor, its legal counsel, and counsel to the Companies.

6. The approval of the AVO and the sealing of the Confidential Supplement are appropriate because, in the Monitor's respectful submission, the factors established under section 36 of the *CCAA* and the legal test set out in *Sherman Estate v Donovan*, respectively, are satisfied based on the evidence before the Court.

III. FACTS

7. The relevant facts are set out in the Fifth Report, the Confidential Supplement, and the previous reports and affidavits filed in these proceedings.

8. For the sake of economy, the facts will not be summarized here, but instead referred to, where appropriate, in the discussion below.

IV. ISSUES

9. This Brief of Law addresses the following issues:

- (a) Should the Court approve the Transaction contemplated by the Sale Agreement?
- (b) Should the Confidential Supplement be sealed?
- (c) Should the Court approve the Fifth Report and the Monitor's activities?
- (d) Should the Court approve the fees and disbursements on the Monitor, its legal counsel, and the Companies' legal counsel?

V. DISCUSSION

A. The Transaction should be approved

10. The Court has the jurisdiction to approve the Transaction pursuant to section 11 of the *CCAA*, provided that the factors enumerated in section 36 are satisfied.

***CCAA*, sections 11 and 36 [TAB A]**

11. The Purchaser is not a "related person" (as that term is defined in section 36(5) of the *CCAA*) and, therefore, section 36(4) of the *CCAA* is not engaged. The relevant portions of section 36 of the *CCAA* are reproduced below:

Restriction on disposition of business assets

36 (1) A debtor company in respect of which an order has been made under this Act may not sell or otherwise dispose of assets outside the ordinary course of business unless authorized to do so by a court. Despite any requirement for shareholder approval, including one under federal or provincial law, the court may authorize the sale or disposition even if shareholder approval was not obtained.

Notice to creditors

(2) A company that applies to the court for an authorization is to give notice of the application to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the proposed sale or disposition.

Factors to be considered

(3) In deciding whether to grant the authorization, the court is to consider, among other things,

- (a) whether the process leading to the proposed sale or disposition was reasonable in the circumstances;
- (b) whether the monitor approved the process leading to the proposed sale or disposition;
- (c) whether the monitor filed with the court a report stating that in their opinion the sale or disposition would be more beneficial to the creditors than a sale or disposition under a bankruptcy;
- (d) the extent to which the creditors were consulted;
- (e) the effects of the proposed sale or disposition on the creditors and other interested parties; and
- (f) whether the consideration to be received for the assets is reasonable and fair, taking into account their market value.

...

Assets may be disposed of free and clear

(6) The court may authorize a sale or disposition free and clear of any security, charge or other restriction and, if it does, it shall also order that other assets of the company or the proceeds of the sale or disposition be subject to a security, charge or other restriction in favour of the creditor whose security, charge or other restriction is to be affected by the order.

Restriction — employers

(7) The court may grant the authorization only if the court is satisfied that the company can and will make the payments that would have been required under paragraphs 6(5)(a) and (6)(a) if the court had sanctioned the compromise or arrangement.

12. In *Target Canada Co. (Re)* [**Target**], Justice Morawetz (as he then was) observed that the factors outlined in section 36(3) of the *CCAA* (the “**Section 36(3) Factors**”) are not meant to be exhaustive and may not apply in every case. Similarly, he noted that the Section 36(3) Factors overlap with the factors set out in *Royal Bank v Soundair Corp.* [**Soundair**], which were frequently cited by the Courts in *CCAA* proceedings prior to the 2009 amendments to *CCAA*.

***Target Canada Co. (Re)*,
2015 ONSC 2066 at para 15 [TAB B]**

13. In *Soundair*, the Court was asked to approve a sale entered into by the Court-appointed receiver. In *Soundair*, the Ontario Court of Appeal established the following test that Courts should consider when deciding whether to approve a proposed sale in the context of a receivership:

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

Royal Bank of Canada v Soundair Corp.,
1991 CarswellOnt 205 at para 16 [TAB C]

14. Notably, the sale in *Soundair* was not derived from a Court-approved sales process. The Ontario Court of Appeal held that the terms of the private sale were reasonable in light of the unique nature of the assets that were being sold (i.e. commercial airplanes) because there were only a limited pool of prospective purchasers.

Ibid at para 18

15. In *Target*, Justice Morawetz (as he then was) approved the sale of certain assets of Target Canada Co. (the debtor company) to Target Corporation. The sale was not the derived from a Court-approved process, such as a sales and investment solicitation process or a structured bid process. Justice Morawetz (as he then was) found that the sale was reasonable and that the Section 36(3) Factors had been satisfied:

17 I am also satisfied that the process was reasonable in light of the unique assets involved. Whether or not a legal challenge by Target Brands would ultimately be successful, the litigation risks would, in my view, be expected to materially affect the value of the Purchased Assets to an unrelated third party. Further, the uniqueness of the Purchased Assets makes Target Corporation the only realistic purchaser. Only Hilco Global ('Hilco') submitted a bid with respect to some, but not all, of the assets included in the Initial Offer. None of the remaining bidders elected to submit an offer. Given that only one of the liquidation firms submitted a bid, the Applicants and the Monitor considered whether the proposed sale to Target Corporation was fair and reasonable. They came to the conclusion that the likely price to be obtained by an unrelated third party did not support the sale of the Purchased Assets to an unrelated third party.

18 As required by section 36 of the CCAA, the Monitor has been involved throughout the proposed transaction. The Monitor's Seventh Report comments at length on the transaction, and specifically whether it would be fair and reasonable to accept the offer from Target Corporation. The Monitor supports the conclusion that the purchase price offered by Target Corporation far exceeds the estimated liquidation values obtained. The Monitor is of the opinion that the APA benefits the creditors of the Applicants. The Monitor supports the motion for approval of the APA.

19 I am satisfied that the transaction is in the best interests of stakeholders. The transaction does provide some enhanced economic value to the estate. Further, the APA Agreement allows the Monitor, TCC and Target Corporation to agree upon the timetable for delivery of the Purchased Assets. This flexibility is of assistance to TCC and its Inventory Liquidation Process. In addition, there are no fees or commission payable on the transaction and the Agreement does provide certain guaranteed value to TCC.

20 The Applicants submit that all of the other statutory requirements for obtaining relief under section 36 have been satisfied. In particular, no parties have registered security interests against the Purchased Assets.

Target Canada Co. (Re),
2015 ONSC 2066 at paras 17 to 20 [TAB B]

16. The Monitor submits that the Transaction satisfies the applicable Section 36(3) Factors and should be approved for the following reasons:

- (a) it is reasonable for the Monitor, on behalf of the Companies, to enter into the Transaction with the Purchaser because:
 - (i) like the assets purchased in *Target* and *Soundair*, the Purchased Assets are unique - they are units in a Partnership. The unique nature of these assets make them difficult to market to the public;
 - (ii) the Monitor was unable to independently verify the percentage of Realco's diluted interest in the Partnership based on the information and documentation that was provided by both the Purchaser and Realco;
 - (iii) notwithstanding the aforementioned challenges, the proposed purchase price falls within the high-end range of values in the Monitor's assessment of value for what the Units may be worth;
 - (iv) the Monitor was able to secure a higher purchase price than what was originally offered by the Partnership under the LOI;
 - (v) in light of the looming expiration of the Community Laboratories Agreement, Realco's income stream from the Partnership is not guaranteed past March 31, 2024, which affects the potential value of the same; and
 - (vi) the Partnership would likely oppose a public sales process which may, in turn, have resulted in litigation;

Fifth Report at para 51

- (b) the Monitor, with its enhanced powers under the ARIO, was not only involved throughout the negotiations with the Purchaser, it was the driving force behind the Sale Agreement; and

***Ibid* at paras 37 to 41**

- (c) the Companies' senior secured creditor, CIBC, will likely be the only creditor who will be materially affected by this Transaction. CIBC was consulted throughout the negotiations and is supportive of the Transaction.

***Ibid* at para 48**

17. In addition to satisfying the Section 36(3) Factors, the Transaction also satisfies section 36(7) of the CCAA, which requires that the Companies have sufficient funds to make the payments to its employees that are required pursuant to section 6(5)(a) of the CCAA. In light of the foregoing reasons, the Monitor respectfully requests this Court approve the Transaction and grant the AVO.

***Ibid* at subpara 51(f)**

B. The Confidential Supplement should be sealed

18. The legal test that the Court must apply in determining whether to grant a sealing order was revisited by the Supreme Court of Canada in *Sherman Estate v Donovan* [***Sherman Estate***] where it held that in order to rebut the general open-Court presumption, an applicant must establish that:

- (a) court openness poses a serious risk to an important public interest;
- (b) the order sought by an applicant is necessary to prevent this serious risk to the identified interest because reasonable alternative measures will not prevent this risk; and
- (c) as a matter of proportionality, the benefits of the order outweigh its negative effects.

***Sherman Estate v Donovan*,
2021 SCC 25 at para 38 [TAB D]**

19. Chief Justice Morawetz of the Ontario Superior Court applied the *Sherman Estate* test in *Ontario Securities Commission v Bridging Finance Inc.* and held that a sealing order was warranted where an application was made to seal commercially sensitive information regarding a proposed sales process.

***Ontario Securities Commission v Bridging Finance Inc.,*
2021 ONSC 4347 at paras 25 to 26 [TAB E]**

20. In this case, the Monitor is requesting a sealing order with respect to commercially sensitive terms associated with the Transaction including: (i) the LOI (which is subject to a confidentiality provision and contains the economic terms of the Transaction); (ii) the results of the Monitor's Assessment; and (iii) the key economic terms of the Sale Agreement (collectively the "**Confidential Information**").

21. The Monitor submits that it has satisfied the test laid out in *Sherman Estate* and that is appropriate to grant the sealing order for the following reasons:

- (a) the Monitor has taken steps to minimize the intrusion on the open-Court principle by only redacting the commercial terms of the Sale Agreement and appending it to the Fifth Report (which is publicly available);
- (b) publicly disclosing the Confidential Information could prejudice the commercial interests of Realco if, for example, the Transaction does not close;
- (c) it is necessary to seal the Second Confidential Supplement because there is no alternative method by which the Confidential Information can be introduced into evidence before the Court without exposing the Confidential Information to the deleterious effects associated with public exposure;
- (d) any interested party may apply to Court to unseal the Confidential Supplement in the event it feels prejudiced by the sealing order; and
- (e) the Courts have accepted that there is a public interest in preserving the integrity of confidential information as it relates to a proposed sale.

***Ibid* at paras 25 to 26**

C. The Court should approve the Fifth Report and the Monitor's activities

22. The Monitor requests this Court's approval of its Fifth Report and the activities described in that report. This is a routine request in *CCAA* proceedings and, where there is no opposition, this relief is routinely granted.

***Re Target Canada Co.*, 2015 ONSC 7574 at paras 1-2
[TAB F]**

23. Approving the Monitor's Fifth Report and the activities described therein allows, among other things: (a) the Monitor to move forward with the next steps in these *CCAA* proceedings (namely, closing the Transaction); (b) the Monitor to have an opportunity to address any stakeholder's concerns and rectify any problems; and (c) this Court to satisfy itself that the Monitor's activities have been conducted in a prudent and diligent manner.

***Ibid* at para 23**

24. The Fifth Report of the Monitor details the Monitor's activities since filing the Fourth Report. In addition to attending to the daily obligations associated with monitoring the Applicants and dealing with the various stakeholders, the Monitor has assisted the Applicants in reviewing Partnership's books and records, negotiating the Transaction, and papering the Sale Agreement.

Fifth Report at para 19

25. As of the date of this brief, no one has objected to the approval order sought by the Monitor. Similarly, the Monitor is unaware of any allegations of wrongdoing or impropriety with respect to its activities to date. Accordingly, the Monitor requests that it be granted the relief sought.

D. The Court should approve the professional fees and expenses

26. The Monitor seeks an order approving the fees and expenses of the Monitor, its legal counsel, and the Companies' legal counsel pursuant to section 29 of the ARIO. The Monitor has

reviewed the invoices submitted to date and is of the view that the fees billed and expenses charged have been necessary to facilitate the Companies' ongoing operations and, ultimately, this Sale Agreement.

***Ibid* at paras 54 to 56**

VI. CONCLUSION

27. For the reasons stated in this Brief of Law, the Monitor respectfully requests that the requested relief be granted in the form of both the AVO and Sealing and Other Relief Order that have been filed.

ALL OF WHICH IS RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 27th day of October, 2023.

McDOUGALL GAULEY LLP

Per:



For: Ian Sutherland, K.C., counsel to the applicant,
Alvarez & Marsal Canada Inc.

TAB A



CANADA

CONSOLIDATION

CODIFICATION

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act

Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies

R.S.C., 1985, c. C-36

L.R.C. (1985), ch. C-36

Current to October 5, 2023

À jour au 5 octobre 2023

Last amended on April 27, 2023

Dernière modification le 27 avril 2023

OFFICIAL STATUS OF CONSOLIDATIONS

Subsections 31(1) and (2) of the *Legislation Revision and Consolidation Act*, in force on June 1, 2009, provide as follows:

Published consolidation is evidence

31 (1) Every copy of a consolidated statute or consolidated regulation published by the Minister under this Act in either print or electronic form is evidence of that statute or regulation and of its contents and every copy purporting to be published by the Minister is deemed to be so published, unless the contrary is shown.

Inconsistencies in Acts

(2) In the event of an inconsistency between a consolidated statute published by the Minister under this Act and the original statute or a subsequent amendment as certified by the Clerk of the Parliaments under the *Publication of Statutes Act*, the original statute or amendment prevails to the extent of the inconsistency.

LAYOUT

The notes that appeared in the left or right margins are now in boldface text directly above the provisions to which they relate. They form no part of the enactment, but are inserted for convenience of reference only.

NOTE

This consolidation is current to October 5, 2023. The last amendments came into force on April 27, 2023. Any amendments that were not in force as of October 5, 2023 are set out at the end of this document under the heading “Amendments Not in Force”.

CARACTÈRE OFFICIEL DES CODIFICATIONS

Les paragraphes 31(1) et (2) de la *Loi sur la révision et la codification des textes législatifs*, en vigueur le 1^{er} juin 2009, prévoient ce qui suit :

Codifications comme élément de preuve

31 (1) Tout exemplaire d'une loi codifiée ou d'un règlement codifié, publié par le ministre en vertu de la présente loi sur support papier ou sur support électronique, fait foi de cette loi ou de ce règlement et de son contenu. Tout exemplaire donné comme publié par le ministre est réputé avoir été ainsi publié, sauf preuve contraire.

Incompatibilité — lois

(2) Les dispositions de la loi d'origine avec ses modifications subséquentes par le greffier des Parlements en vertu de la *Loi sur la publication des lois* l'emportent sur les dispositions incompatibles de la loi codifiée publiée par le ministre en vertu de la présente loi.

MISE EN PAGE

Les notes apparaissant auparavant dans les marges de droite ou de gauche se retrouvent maintenant en caractères gras juste au-dessus de la disposition à laquelle elles se rattachent. Elles ne font pas partie du texte, n'y figurant qu'à titre de repère ou d'information.

NOTE

Cette codification est à jour au 5 octobre 2023. Les dernières modifications sont entrées en vigueur le 27 avril 2023. Toutes modifications qui n'étaient pas en vigueur au 5 octobre 2023 sont énoncées à la fin de ce document sous le titre « Modifications non en vigueur ».

TABLE OF PROVISIONS

An Act to facilitate compromises and arrangements between companies and their creditors

	Short Title
1	Short title
	Interpretation
2	Definitions
3	Application
	PART I
	Compromises and Arrangements
4	Compromise with unsecured creditors
5	Compromise with secured creditors
5.1	Claims against directors — compromise
6	Compromises to be sanctioned by court
7	Court may give directions
8	Scope of Act
	PART II
	Jurisdiction of Courts
9	Jurisdiction of court to receive applications
10	Form of applications
11	General power of court
11.001	Relief reasonably necessary
11.01	Rights of suppliers
11.02	Stays, etc. — initial application
11.03	Stays — directors
11.04	Persons obligated under letter of credit or guarantee
11.06	Member of the Canadian Payments Association
11.08	Restriction — certain powers, duties and functions
11.09	Stay — Her Majesty
11.1	Meaning of regulatory body
11.2	Interim financing
11.3	Assignment of agreements
11.4	Critical supplier

TABLE ANALYTIQUE

Loi facilitant les transactions et arrangements entre les compagnies et leurs créanciers

	Titre abrégé
1	Titre abrégé
	Définitions et application
2	Définitions
3	Application
	PARTIE I
	Transactions et arrangements
4	Transaction avec les créanciers chirographaires
5	Transaction avec les créanciers garantis
5.1	Transaction — réclamations contre les administrateurs
6	Homologation par le tribunal
7	Le tribunal peut donner des instructions
8	Champ d'application de la loi
	PARTIE II
	Juridiction des tribunaux
9	Le tribunal a juridiction pour recevoir des demandes
10	Forme des demandes
11	Pouvoir général du tribunal
11.001	Redressements normalement nécessaires
11.01	Droits des fournisseurs
11.02	Suspension : demande initiale
11.03	Suspension — administrateurs
11.04	Suspension — lettres de crédit ou garanties
11.06	Membre de l'Association canadienne des paiements
11.08	Restrictions : exercice de certaines attributions
11.09	Suspension des procédures : Sa Majesté
11.1	Définition de organisme administratif
11.2	Financement temporaire
11.3	Cessions
11.4	Fournisseurs essentiels

11.5	Removal of directors
11.51	Security or charge relating to director's indemnification
11.52	Court may order security or charge to cover certain costs
11.6	Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act matters
11.7	Court to appoint monitor
11.8	No personal liability in respect of matters before appointment
11.9	Disclosure of financial information
12	Fixing deadlines
13	Leave to appeal
14	Court of appeal
15	Appeals
16	Order of court of one province
17	Courts shall aid each other on request

PART III

General

Duty of Good Faith

18.6	Good faith
	Claims
19	Claims that may be dealt with by a compromise or arrangement

20	Determination of amount of claims
21	Law of set-off or compensation to apply

Classes of Creditors

22	Company may establish classes
22.1	Class — creditors having equity claims

Monitors

23	Duties and functions
24	Right of access
25	Obligation to act honestly and in good faith

Powers, Duties and Functions of Superintendent of Bankruptcy

26	Public records
27	Applications to court and right to intervene
28	Complaints
29	Investigations

11.5	Révocation des administrateurs
11.51	Biens grevés d'une charge ou sûreté en faveur d'administrateurs ou de dirigeants
11.52	Biens grevés d'une charge ou sûreté pour couvrir certains frais
11.6	Lien avec la Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité
11.7	Nomination du contrôleur
11.8	Immunité
11.9	Divulgence de renseignements financiers
12	Échéances
13	Permission d'en appeler
14	Cour d'appel
15	Appels
16	Ordonnance d'un tribunal d'une province
17	Les tribunaux doivent s'entraider sur demande

PARTIE III

Dispositions générales

Obligation d'agir de bonne foi

18.6	Bonne foi
	Réclamations
19	Réclamations considérées dans le cadre des transactions ou arrangements

20	Détermination du montant de la réclamation
21	Compensation

Catégories de créanciers

22	Établissement des catégories de créanciers
22.1	Catégorie de créanciers ayant des réclamations relatives à des capitaux propres

Contrôleurs

23	Attributions
24	Droit d'accès aux biens
25	Diligence

Attributions du surintendant des faillites

26	Registres publics
27	Demande au tribunal et intervention
28	Plaintes
29	Investigations et enquêtes

30	Powers in relation to licence
31	Delegation
	Agreements
32	Disclaimer or resiliation of agreements
33	Collective agreements
34	Certain rights limited
	Obligations and Prohibitions
35	Obligation to provide assistance
36	Restriction on disposition of business assets
	Preferences and Transfers at Undervalue
36.1	Application of sections 38 and 95 to 101 of the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act
	Her Majesty
37	Deemed trusts
38	Status of Crown claims
39	Statutory Crown securities
40	Act binding on Her Majesty
	Miscellaneous
41	Certain sections of Winding-up and Restructuring Act do not apply
42	Act to be applied conjointly with other Acts
43	Claims in foreign currency

PART IV

Cross-border Insolvencies

Purpose

44	Purpose
-----------	---------

Interpretation

45	Definitions
-----------	-------------

Recognition of Foreign Proceeding

46	Application for recognition of a foreign proceeding
47	Order recognizing foreign proceeding
48	Order relating to recognition of a foreign main proceeding
49	Other orders
50	Terms and conditions of orders
51	Commencement or continuation of proceedings

30	Décision relative à la licence
31	Pouvoir de délégation
	Contrats et conventions collectives
32	Résiliation de contrats
33	Conventions collectives
34	Limitation de certains droits
	Obligations et interdiction
35	Assistance
36	Restriction à la disposition d'actifs
	Traitements préférentiels et opérations sous-évaluées
36.1	Application des articles 38 et 95 à 101 de la Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité
	Sa Majesté
37	Fiducies présumées
38	Réclamations de la Couronne
39	Garanties créées par législation
40	Obligation de Sa Majesté
	Dispositions diverses
41	Inapplicabilité de certains articles de la Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations
42	Application concurrente d'autres lois
43	Créances en monnaies étrangères

PARTIE IV

Insolvabilité en contexte international

Objet

44	Objet
-----------	-------

Définitions

45	Définitions
-----------	-------------

Reconnaissance des instances étrangères

46	Demande de reconnaissance de l'instance étrangère
47	Ordonnance de reconnaissance
48	Effets de la reconnaissance d'une instance étrangère principale
49	Autre ordonnance
50	Conditions
51	Début et continuation de la procédure

	Obligations
52	Cooperation — court
53	Obligations of foreign representative
	Multiple Proceedings
54	Concurrent proceedings
55	Multiple foreign proceedings
	Miscellaneous Provisions
56	Authorization to act as representative of proceeding under this Act
57	Foreign representative status
58	Foreign proceeding appeal
59	Presumption of insolvency
60	Credit for recovery in other jurisdictions
61	Court not prevented from applying certain rules

PART V

Administration

62	Regulations
63	Review of Act

	Obligations
52	Collaboration — tribunal
53	Obligations du représentant étranger
	Instances multiples
54	Instances concomitantes
55	Plusieurs instances étrangères
	Dispositions diverses
56	Autorisation d'agir à titre de représentant dans toute procédure intentée sous le régime de la présente loi
57	Statut du représentant étranger
58	Instance étrangère : appel
59	Présomption d'insolvabilité
60	Sommes reçues à l'étranger
61	Application de règles étrangères

PARTIE V

Administration

62	Règlements
63	Rapport



R.S.C., 1985, c. C-36

L.R.C., 1985, ch. C-36

An Act to facilitate compromises and arrangements between companies and their creditors

Short Title

Short title

1 This Act may be cited as the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*.

R.S., c. C-25, s. 1.

Interpretation

Definitions

2 (1) In this Act,

aircraft objects [Repealed, 2012, c. 31, s. 419]

bargaining agent means any trade union that has entered into a collective agreement on behalf of the employees of a company; (*agent négociateur*)

bond includes a debenture, debenture stock or other evidences of indebtedness; (*obligation*)

cash-flow statement, in respect of a company, means the statement referred to in paragraph 10(2)(a) indicating the company's projected cash flow; (*état de l'évolution de l'encaisse*)

claim means any indebtedness, liability or obligation of any kind that would be a claim provable within the meaning of section 2 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*; (*réclamation*)

collective agreement, in relation to a debtor company, means a collective agreement within the meaning of the jurisdiction governing collective bargaining between the debtor company and a bargaining agent; (*convention collective*)

Loi facilitant les transactions et arrangements entre les compagnies et leurs créanciers

Titre abrégé

Titre abrégé

1 *Loi sur les arrangements avec les créanciers des compagnies.*

S.R., ch. C-25, art. 1.

Définitions et application

Définitions

2 (1) Les définitions qui suivent s'appliquent à la présente loi.

accord de transfert de titres pour obtention de crédit

Accord aux termes duquel une compagnie débitrice transfère la propriété d'un bien en vue de garantir le paiement d'une somme ou l'exécution d'une obligation relativement à un contrat financier admissible. (*title transfer credit support agreement*)

actionnaire S'agissant d'une compagnie ou d'une fiducie de revenu assujetties à la présente loi, est assimilée à l'actionnaire la personne ayant un intérêt dans cette compagnie ou détenant des parts de cette fiducie. (*shareholder*)

administrateur S'agissant d'une compagnie autre qu'une fiducie de revenu, toute personne exerçant les fonctions d'administrateur, indépendamment de son titre, et, s'agissant d'une fiducie de revenu, toute personne exerçant les fonctions de fiduciaire, indépendamment de son titre. (*director*)

agent négociateur Syndicat ayant conclu une convention collective pour le compte des employés d'une compagnie. (*bargaining agent*)

biens aéronautiques [Abrogée, 2012, ch. 31, art. 419]

company means any company, corporation or legal person incorporated by or under an Act of Parliament or of the legislature of a province, any incorporated company having assets or doing business in Canada, wherever incorporated, and any income trust, but does not include banks, authorized foreign banks within the meaning of section 2 of the *Bank Act*, telegraph companies, insurance companies and companies to which the *Trust and Loan Companies Act* applies; (*compagnie*)

court means

(a) in Nova Scotia, British Columbia and Prince Edward Island, the Supreme Court,

(a.1) in Ontario, the Superior Court of Justice,

(b) in Quebec, the Superior Court,

(c) in New Brunswick, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, the Court of Queen's Bench,

(c.1) in Newfoundland and Labrador, the Trial Division of the Supreme Court, and

(d) in Yukon and the Northwest Territories, the Supreme Court, and in Nunavut, the Nunavut Court of Justice; (*tribunal*)

debtor company means any company that

(a) is bankrupt or insolvent,

(b) has committed an act of bankruptcy within the meaning of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or is deemed insolvent within the meaning of the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*, whether or not proceedings in respect of the company have been taken under either of those Acts,

(c) has made an authorized assignment or against which a bankruptcy order has been made under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, or

(d) is in the course of being wound up under the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act* because the company is insolvent; (*compagnie débitrice*)

director means, in the case of a company other than an income trust, a person occupying the position of director by whatever name called and, in the case of an income trust, a person occupying the position of trustee by whatever name called; (*administrateur*)

eligible financial contract means an agreement of a prescribed kind; (*contrat financier admissible*)

compagnie Toute personne morale constituée par une loi fédérale ou provinciale ou sous son régime et toute personne morale qui possède un actif ou exerce des activités au Canada, quel que soit l'endroit où elle a été constituée, ainsi que toute fiducie de revenu. La présente définition exclut les banques, les banques étrangères autorisées, au sens de l'article 2 de la *Loi sur les banques*, les compagnies de télégraphe, les compagnies d'assurances et les sociétés auxquelles s'applique la *Loi sur les sociétés de fiducie et de prêt*. (*company*)

compagnie débitrice Toute compagnie qui, selon le cas :

a) est en faillite ou est insolvable;

b) a commis un acte de faillite au sens de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* ou est réputée insolvable au sens de la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations*, que des procédures relatives à cette compagnie aient été intentées ou non sous le régime de l'une ou l'autre de ces lois;

c) a fait une cession autorisée ou à l'encontre de laquelle une ordonnance de faillite a été rendue en vertu de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*;

d) est en voie de liquidation aux termes de la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations* parce que la compagnie est insolvable. (*debtor company*)

contrat financier admissible Contrat d'une catégorie réglementaire. (*eligible financial contract*)

contrôleur S'agissant d'une compagnie, la personne nommée en application de l'article 11.7 pour agir à titre de contrôleur des affaires financières et autres de celle-ci. (*monitor*)

convention collective S'entend au sens donné à ce terme par les règles de droit applicables aux négociations collectives entre la compagnie débitrice et l'agent négociateur. (*collective agreement*)

créancier chirographaire Tout créancier d'une compagnie qui n'est pas un créancier garanti, qu'il réside ou soit domicilié au Canada ou à l'étranger. Un fiduciaire pour les détenteurs d'obligations non garanties, lesquelles sont émises en vertu d'un acte de fiducie ou autre acte fonctionnant en faveur du fiduciaire, est réputé un créancier chirographaire pour toutes les fins de la présente loi sauf la votation à une assemblée des créanciers relativement à ces obligations. (*unsecured creditor*)

equity claim means a claim that is in respect of an equity interest, including a claim for, among others,

- (a) a dividend or similar payment,
- (b) a return of capital,
- (c) a redemption or retraction obligation,
- (d) a monetary loss resulting from the ownership, purchase or sale of an equity interest or from the rescission, or, in Quebec, the annulment, of a purchase or sale of an equity interest, or
- (e) contribution or indemnity in respect of a claim referred to in any of paragraphs (a) to (d); (*réclamation relative à des capitaux propres*)

equity interest means

- (a) in the case of a company other than an income trust, a share in the company — or a warrant or option or another right to acquire a share in the company — other than one that is derived from a convertible debt, and
- (b) in the case of an income trust, a unit in the income trust — or a warrant or option or another right to acquire a unit in the income trust — other than one that is derived from a convertible debt; (*intérêt relatif à des capitaux propres*)

financial collateral means any of the following that is subject to an interest, or in the Province of Quebec a right, that secures payment or performance of an obligation in respect of an eligible financial contract or that is subject to a title transfer credit support agreement:

- (a) cash or cash equivalents, including negotiable instruments and demand deposits,
- (b) securities, a securities account, a securities entitlement or a right to acquire securities, or
- (c) a futures agreement or a futures account; (*garantie financière*)

income trust means a trust that has assets in Canada if

- (a) its units are listed on a prescribed stock exchange on the day on which proceedings commence under this Act, or
- (b) the majority of its units are held by a trust whose units are listed on a prescribed stock exchange on the day on which proceedings commence under this Act; (*fiducie de revenu*)

créancier garanti Détenteur d'hypothèque, de gage, charge, nantissement ou privilège sur ou contre l'ensemble ou une partie des biens d'une compagnie débitrice, ou tout transport, cession ou transfert de la totalité ou d'une partie de ces biens, à titre de garantie d'une dette de la compagnie débitrice, ou un détenteur de quelque obligation d'une compagnie débitrice garantie par hypothèque, gage, charge, nantissement ou privilège sur ou contre l'ensemble ou une partie des biens de la compagnie débitrice, ou un transport, une cession ou un transfert de tout ou partie de ces biens, ou une fiducie à leur égard, que ce détenteur ou bénéficiaire réside ou soit domicilié au Canada ou à l'étranger. Un fiduciaire en vertu de tout acte de fiducie ou autre instrument garantissant ces obligations est réputé un créancier garanti pour toutes les fins de la présente loi sauf la votation à une assemblée de créanciers relativement à ces obligations. (*secured creditor*)

demande initiale La demande faite pour la première fois en application de la présente loi relativement à une compagnie. (*initial application*)

état de l'évolution de l'encaisse Relativement à une compagnie, l'état visé à l'alinéa 10(2)a) portant, projections à l'appui, sur l'évolution de l'encaisse de celle-ci. (*cash-flow statement*)

fiducie de revenu Fiducie qui possède un actif au Canada et dont les parts sont inscrites à une bourse de valeurs mobilières visée par règlement à la date à laquelle des procédures sont intentées sous le régime de la présente loi, ou sont détenues en majorité par une fiducie dont les parts sont inscrites à une telle bourse à cette date. (*income trust*)

garantie financière S'il est assujéti soit à un intérêt ou, dans la province de Québec, à un droit garantissant le paiement d'une somme ou l'exécution d'une obligation relativement à un contrat financier admissible, soit à un accord de transfert de titres pour obtention de crédit, l'un ou l'autre des éléments suivants :

- a) les sommes en espèces et les équivalents de trésorerie — notamment les effets négociables et dépôts à vue;
- b) les titres, comptes de titres, droits intermédiés et droits d'acquérir des titres;
- c) les contrats à terme ou comptes de contrats à terme. (*financial collateral*)

intérêt relatif à des capitaux propres

initial application means the first application made under this Act in respect of a company; (*demande initiale*)

monitor, in respect of a company, means the person appointed under section 11.7 to monitor the business and financial affairs of the company; (*contrôleur*)

net termination value means the net amount obtained after netting or setting off or compensating the mutual obligations between the parties to an eligible financial contract in accordance with its provisions; (*valeurs nettes dues à la date de résiliation*)

prescribed means prescribed by regulation; (*Version anglaise seulement*)

secured creditor means a holder of a mortgage, hypothec, pledge, charge, lien or privilege on or against, or any assignment, cession or transfer of, all or any property of a debtor company as security for indebtedness of the debtor company, or a holder of any bond of a debtor company secured by a mortgage, hypothec, pledge, charge, lien or privilege on or against, or any assignment, cession or transfer of, or a trust in respect of, all or any property of the debtor company, whether the holder or beneficiary is resident or domiciled within or outside Canada, and a trustee under any trust deed or other instrument securing any of those bonds shall be deemed to be a secured creditor for all purposes of this Act except for the purpose of voting at a creditors' meeting in respect of any of those bonds; (*créancier garanti*)

shareholder includes a member of a company — and, in the case of an income trust, a holder of a unit in an income trust — to which this Act applies; (*actionnaire*)

Superintendent of Bankruptcy means the Superintendent of Bankruptcy appointed under subsection 5(1) of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*; (*surintendant des faillites*)

Superintendent of Financial Institutions means the Superintendent of Financial Institutions appointed under subsection 5(1) of the *Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions Act*; (*surintendant des institutions financières*)

title transfer credit support agreement means an agreement under which a debtor company has provided title to property for the purpose of securing the payment or performance of an obligation of the debtor company in respect of an eligible financial contract; (*accord de transfert de titres pour obtention de crédit*)

unsecured creditor means any creditor of a company who is not a secured creditor, whether resident or

a) S'agissant d'une compagnie autre qu'une fiducie de revenu, action de celle-ci ou bon de souscription, option ou autre droit permettant d'acquérir une telle action et ne provenant pas de la conversion d'une dette convertible;

b) s'agissant d'une fiducie de revenu, part de celle-ci ou bon de souscription, option ou autre droit permettant d'acquérir une telle part et ne provenant pas de la conversion d'une dette convertible. (*equity interest*)

obligation Sont assimilés aux obligations les débiteures, stock-obligations et autres titres de créance. (*bond*)

réclamation S'entend de toute dette, de tout engagement ou de toute obligation de quelque nature que ce soit, qui constituerait une réclamation prouvable au sens de l'article 2 de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*. (*claim*)

réclamation relative à des capitaux propres Réclamation portant sur un intérêt relatif à des capitaux propres et visant notamment :

a) un dividende ou un paiement similaire;

b) un remboursement de capital;

c) tout droit de rachat d'actions au gré de l'actionnaire ou de remboursement anticipé d'actions au gré de l'émetteur;

d) des pertes pécuniaires associées à la propriété, à l'achat ou à la vente d'un intérêt relatif à des capitaux propres ou à l'annulation de cet achat ou de cette vente;

e) une contribution ou une indemnité relative à toute réclamation visée à l'un des alinéas a) à d). (*equity claim*)

surintendant des faillites Le surintendant des faillites nommé au titre du paragraphe 5(1) de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*. (*Superintendent of Bankruptcy*)

surintendant des institutions financières Le surintendant des institutions financières nommé en application du paragraphe 5(1) de la *Loi sur le Bureau du surintendant des institutions financières*. (*Superintendent of Financial Institutions*)

tribunal

domiciled within or outside Canada, and a trustee for the holders of any unsecured bonds issued under a trust deed or other instrument running in favour of the trustee shall be deemed to be an unsecured creditor for all purposes of this Act except for the purpose of voting at a creditors' meeting in respect of any of those bonds. (*créancier chirographaire*)

Meaning of *related* and *dealing at arm's length*

(2) For the purpose of this Act, section 4 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* applies for the purpose of determining whether a person is related to or dealing at arm's length with a debtor company.

R.S., 1985, c. C-36, s. 2; R.S., 1985, c. 27 (2nd Supp.), s. 10; 1990, c. 17, s. 4; 1992, c. 27, s. 90; 1993, c. 34, s. 52; 1996, c. 6, s. 167; 1997, c. 12, s. 120(E); 1998, c. 30, s. 14; 1999, c. 3, s. 22, c. 28, s. 154; 2001, c. 9, s. 575; 2002, c. 7, s. 133; 2004, c. 25, s. 193; 2005, c. 3, s. 15, c. 47, s. 124; 2007, c. 29, s. 104, c. 36, ss. 61, 105; 2012, c. 31, s. 419; 2015, c. 3, s. 37; 2018, c. 10, s. 89.

Application

3 (1) This Act applies in respect of a debtor company or affiliated debtor companies if the total of claims against the debtor company or affiliated debtor companies, determined in accordance with section 20, is more than \$5,000,000 or any other amount that is prescribed.

Affiliated companies

(2) For the purposes of this Act,

(a) companies are affiliated companies if one of them is the subsidiary of the other or both are subsidiaries of the same company or each of them is controlled by the same person; and

(b) two companies affiliated with the same company at the same time are deemed to be affiliated with each other.

a) Dans les provinces de la Nouvelle-Écosse, de la Colombie-Britannique et de l'Île-du-Prince-Édouard, la Cour suprême;

a.1) dans la province d'Ontario, la Cour supérieure de justice;

b) dans la province de Québec, la Cour supérieure;

c) dans les provinces du Nouveau-Brunswick, du Manitoba, de la Saskatchewan et d'Alberta, la Cour du Banc de la Reine;

c.1) dans la province de Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador, la Section de première instance de la Cour suprême;

d) au Yukon et dans les Territoires du Nord-Ouest, la Cour suprême et, au Nunavut, la Cour de justice du Nunavut. (*court*)

valeurs nettes dues à la date de résiliation La somme nette obtenue après compensation des obligations mutuelles des parties à un contrat financier admissible effectuée conformément à ce contrat. (*net termination value*)

Définition de *personnes liées*

(2) Pour l'application de la présente loi, l'article 4 de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* s'applique pour établir si une personne est liée à une compagnie débitrice ou agit sans lien de dépendance avec une telle compagnie.

L.R. (1985), ch. C-36, art. 2; L.R. (1985), ch. 27 (2^e suppl.), art. 10; 1990, ch. 17, art. 4; 1992, ch. 27, art. 90; 1993, ch. 34, art. 52; 1996, ch. 6, art. 167; 1997, ch. 12, art. 120(A); 1998, ch. 30, art. 14; 1999, ch. 3, art. 22, ch. 28, art. 154; 2001, ch. 9, art. 575; 2002, ch. 7, art. 133; 2004, ch. 25, art. 193; 2005, ch. 3, art. 15, ch. 47, art. 124; 2007, ch. 29, art. 104, ch. 36, art. 61 et 105; 2012, ch. 31, art. 419; 2015, ch. 3, art. 37; 2018, ch. 10, art. 89.

Application

3 (1) La présente loi ne s'applique à une compagnie débitrice ou aux compagnies débitrices qui appartiennent au même groupe qu'elle que si le montant des réclamations contre elle ou les compagnies appartenant au même groupe, établi conformément à l'article 20, est supérieur à cinq millions de dollars ou à toute autre somme prévue par les règlements.

Application

(2) Pour l'application de la présente loi :

a) appartiennent au même groupe deux compagnies dont l'une est la filiale de l'autre ou qui sont sous le contrôle de la même personne;

b) sont réputées appartenir au même groupe deux compagnies dont chacune appartient au groupe d'une même compagnie.

Company controlled

(3) For the purposes of this Act, a company is controlled by a person or by two or more companies if

(a) securities of the company to which are attached more than fifty per cent of the votes that may be cast to elect directors of the company are held, other than by way of security only, by or for the benefit of that person or by or for the benefit of those companies; and

(b) the votes attached to those securities are sufficient, if exercised, to elect a majority of the directors of the company.

Subsidiary

(4) For the purposes of this Act, a company is a subsidiary of another company if

(a) it is controlled by

(i) that other company,

(ii) that other company and one or more companies each of which is controlled by that other company, or

(iii) two or more companies each of which is controlled by that other company; or

(b) it is a subsidiary of a company that is a subsidiary of that other company.

R.S., 1985, c. C-36, s. 3; 1997, c. 12, s. 121; 2005, c. 47, s. 125.

PART I

Compromises and Arrangements

Compromise with unsecured creditors

4 Where a compromise or an arrangement is proposed between a debtor company and its unsecured creditors or any class of them, the court may, on the application in a summary way of the company, of any such creditor or of the trustee in bankruptcy or liquidator of the company, order a meeting of the creditors or class of creditors, and, if the court so determines, of the shareholders of the company, to be summoned in such manner as the court directs.

R.S., c. C-25, s. 4.

Application

(3) Pour l'application de la présente loi, ont le contrôle d'une compagnie la personne ou les compagnies :

a) qui détiennent — ou en sont bénéficiaires —, autrement qu'à titre de garantie seulement, des valeurs mobilières conférant plus de cinquante pour cent du maximum possible des voix à l'élection des administrateurs de la compagnie;

b) dont lesdites valeurs mobilières confèrent un droit de vote dont l'exercice permet d'élire la majorité des administrateurs de la compagnie.

Application

(4) Pour l'application de la présente loi, une compagnie est la filiale d'une autre compagnie dans chacun des cas suivants :

a) elle est contrôlée :

(i) soit par l'autre compagnie,

(ii) soit par l'autre compagnie et une ou plusieurs compagnies elles-mêmes contrôlées par cette autre compagnie,

(iii) soit par des compagnies elles-mêmes contrôlées par l'autre compagnie;

b) elle est la filiale d'une filiale de l'autre compagnie.

L.R. (1985), ch. C-36, art. 3; 1997, ch. 12, art. 121; 2005, ch. 47, art. 125.

PARTIE I

Transactions et arrangements

Transaction avec les créanciers chirographaires

4 Lorsqu'une transaction ou un arrangement est proposé entre une compagnie débitrice et ses créanciers chirographaires ou toute catégorie de ces derniers, le tribunal peut, à la requête sommaire de la compagnie, d'un de ces créanciers ou du syndic en matière de faillite ou liquidateur de la compagnie, ordonner que soit convoquée, de la manière qu'il prescrit, une assemblée de ces créanciers ou catégorie de créanciers, et, si le tribunal en décide ainsi, des actionnaires de la compagnie.

S.R., ch. C-25, art. 4.

Compromise with secured creditors

5 Where a compromise or an arrangement is proposed between a debtor company and its secured creditors or any class of them, the court may, on the application in a summary way of the company or of any such creditor or of the trustee in bankruptcy or liquidator of the company, order a meeting of the creditors or class of creditors, and, if the court so determines, of the shareholders of the company, to be summoned in such manner as the court directs.

R.S., c. C-25, s. 5.

Claims against directors — compromise

5.1 (1) A compromise or arrangement made in respect of a debtor company may include in its terms provision for the compromise of claims against directors of the company that arose before the commencement of proceedings under this Act and that relate to the obligations of the company where the directors are by law liable in their capacity as directors for the payment of such obligations.

Exception

(2) A provision for the compromise of claims against directors may not include claims that

- (a)** relate to contractual rights of one or more creditors; or
- (b)** are based on allegations of misrepresentations made by directors to creditors or of wrongful or oppressive conduct by directors.

Powers of court

(3) The court may declare that a claim against directors shall not be compromised if it is satisfied that the compromise would not be fair and reasonable in the circumstances.

Resignation or removal of directors

(4) Where all of the directors have resigned or have been removed by the shareholders without replacement, any person who manages or supervises the management of the business and affairs of the debtor company shall be deemed to be a director for the purposes of this section.

1997, c. 12, s. 122.

Compromises to be sanctioned by court

6 (1) If a majority in number representing two thirds in value of the creditors, or the class of creditors, as the case may be — other than, unless the court orders otherwise, a class of creditors having equity claims, — present and voting either in person or by proxy at the meeting or

Transaction avec les créanciers garantis

5 Lorsqu'une transaction ou un arrangement est proposé entre une compagnie débitrice et ses créanciers garantis ou toute catégorie de ces derniers, le tribunal peut, à la requête sommaire de la compagnie, d'un de ces créanciers ou du syndic en matière de faillite ou liquidateur de la compagnie, ordonner que soit convoquée, de la manière qu'il prescrit, une assemblée de ces créanciers ou catégorie de créanciers, et, si le tribunal en décide ainsi, des actionnaires de la compagnie.

S.R., ch. C-25, art. 5.

Transaction — réclamations contre les administrateurs

5.1 (1) La transaction ou l'arrangement visant une compagnie débitrice peut comporter, au profit de ses créanciers, des dispositions relativement à une transaction sur les réclamations contre ses administrateurs qui sont antérieures aux procédures intentées sous le régime de la présente loi et visent des obligations de celle-ci dont ils peuvent être, ès qualités, responsables en droit.

Restriction

(2) La transaction ne peut toutefois viser des réclamations portant sur des droits contractuels d'un ou de plusieurs créanciers ou fondées sur la fausse représentation ou la conduite injustifiée ou abusive des administrateurs.

Pouvoir du tribunal

(3) Le tribunal peut déclarer qu'une réclamation contre les administrateurs ne peut faire l'objet d'une transaction s'il est convaincu qu'elle ne serait ni juste ni équitable dans les circonstances.

Démission ou destitution des administrateurs

(4) Si tous les administrateurs démissionnent ou sont destitués par les actionnaires sans être remplacés, quiconque dirige ou supervise les activités commerciales et les affaires internes de la compagnie débitrice est réputé un administrateur pour l'application du présent article.

1997, ch. 12, art. 122.

Homologation par le tribunal

6 (1) Si une majorité en nombre représentant les deux tiers en valeur des créanciers ou d'une catégorie de créanciers, selon le cas, — mise à part, sauf ordonnance contraire du tribunal, toute catégorie de créanciers ayant des réclamations relatives à des capitaux propres —

meetings of creditors respectively held under sections 4 and 5, or either of those sections, agree to any compromise or arrangement either as proposed or as altered or modified at the meeting or meetings, the compromise or arrangement may be sanctioned by the court and, if so sanctioned, is binding

(a) on all the creditors or the class of creditors, as the case may be, and on any trustee for that class of creditors, whether secured or unsecured, as the case may be, and on the company; and

(b) in the case of a company that has made an authorized assignment or against which a bankruptcy order has been made under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or is in the course of being wound up under the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*, on the trustee in bankruptcy or liquidator and contributories of the company.

Court may order amendment

(2) If a court sanctions a compromise or arrangement, it may order that the debtor's constating instrument be amended in accordance with the compromise or arrangement to reflect any change that may lawfully be made under federal or provincial law.

Restriction — certain Crown claims

(3) Unless Her Majesty agrees otherwise, the court may sanction a compromise or arrangement only if the compromise or arrangement provides for the payment in full to Her Majesty in right of Canada or a province, within six months after court sanction of the compromise or arrangement, of all amounts that were outstanding at the time of the application for an order under section 11 or 11.02 and that are of a kind that could be subject to a demand under

(a) subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*;

(b) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, or a premium under Part VII.1 of that Act, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts; or

(c) any provision of provincial legislation that has a purpose similar to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any

présents et votant soit en personne, soit par fondé de pouvoir à l'assemblée ou aux assemblées de créanciers respectivement tenues au titre des articles 4 et 5, acceptent une transaction ou un arrangement, proposé ou modifié à cette ou ces assemblées, la transaction ou l'arrangement peut être homologué par le tribunal et, le cas échéant, lie :

a) tous les créanciers ou la catégorie de créanciers, selon le cas, et tout fiduciaire pour cette catégorie de créanciers, qu'ils soient garantis ou chirographaires, selon le cas, ainsi que la compagnie;

b) dans le cas d'une compagnie qui a fait une cession autorisée ou à l'encontre de laquelle une ordonnance de faillite a été rendue en vertu de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* ou qui est en voie de liquidation sous le régime de la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations*, le syndic en matière de faillite ou liquidateur et les contributeurs de la compagnie.

Modification des statuts constitutifs

(2) Le tribunal qui homologue une transaction ou un arrangement peut ordonner la modification des statuts constitutifs de la compagnie conformément à ce qui est prévu dans la transaction ou l'arrangement, selon le cas, pourvu que la modification soit légale au regard du droit fédéral ou provincial.

Certaines réclamations de la Couronne

(3) Le tribunal ne peut, sans le consentement de Sa Majesté, homologuer la transaction ou l'arrangement qui ne prévoit pas le paiement intégral à Sa Majesté du chef du Canada ou d'une province, dans les six mois suivant l'homologation, de toutes les sommes qui étaient dues lors de la demande d'ordonnance visée aux articles 11 ou 11.02 et qui pourraient, de par leur nature, faire l'objet d'une demande aux termes d'une des dispositions suivantes :

a) le paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*;

b) toute disposition du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi* qui renvoie au paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu* et qui prévoit la perception d'une cotisation, au sens du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, d'une cotisation ouvrière ou d'une cotisation patronale, au sens de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi*, ou d'une cotisation prévue par la partie VII.1 de cette loi ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités ou autres charges afférents;

c) toute disposition législative provinciale dont l'objet est semblable à celui du paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*, ou qui renvoie à ce paragraphe, et qui prévoit la perception d'une somme,

related interest, penalties or other amounts, and the sum

(i) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(ii) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a *province providing a comprehensive pension plan* as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a *provincial pension plan* as defined in that subsection.

Restriction — default of remittance to Crown

(4) If an order contains a provision authorized by section 11.09, no compromise or arrangement is to be sanctioned by the court if, at the time the court hears the application for sanction, Her Majesty in right of Canada or a province satisfies the court that the company is in default on any remittance of an amount referred to in subsection (3) that became due after the time of the application for an order under section 11.02.

Restriction — employees, etc.

(5) The court may sanction a compromise or an arrangement only if

(a) the compromise or arrangement provides for payment to the employees and former employees of the company, immediately after the court's sanction, of

(i) amounts at least equal to the amounts that they would have been qualified to receive under paragraph 136(1)(d) of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* if the company had become bankrupt on the day on which proceedings commenced under this Act, and

(ii) wages, salaries, commissions or compensation for services rendered after proceedings commence under this Act and before the court sanctions the compromise or arrangement, together with, in the case of travelling salespersons, disbursements properly incurred by them in and about the company's business during the same period; and

(b) the court is satisfied that the company can and will make the payments as required under paragraph (a).

ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités ou autres charges afférents, laquelle somme :

(i) soit a été retenue par une personne sur un paiement effectué à une autre personne, ou déduite d'un tel paiement, et se rapporte à un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à l'impôt sur le revenu auquel les particuliers sont assujettis en vertu de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*,

(ii) soit est de même nature qu'une cotisation prévue par le *Régime de pensions du Canada*, si la province est une province instituant un régime général de pensions au sens du paragraphe 3(1) de cette loi et si la loi provinciale a institué un régime provincial de pensions au sens de ce paragraphe.

Défaut d'effectuer un versement

(4) Lorsqu'une ordonnance comporte une disposition autorisée par l'article 11.09, le tribunal ne peut homologuer la transaction ou l'arrangement si, lors de l'audition de la demande d'homologation, Sa Majesté du chef du Canada ou d'une province le convainc du défaut de la compagnie d'effectuer un versement portant sur une somme visée au paragraphe (3) et qui est devenue exigible après le dépôt de la demande d'ordonnance visée à l'article 11.02.

Restriction — employés, etc.

(5) Le tribunal ne peut homologuer la transaction ou l'arrangement que si, à la fois :

a) la transaction ou l'arrangement prévoit le paiement aux employés actuels et anciens de la compagnie, dès son homologation, de sommes égales ou supérieures, d'une part, à celles qu'ils seraient en droit de recevoir en application de l'alinéa 136(1)d) de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* si la compagnie avait fait faillite à la date à laquelle des procédures ont été introduites sous le régime de la présente loi à son égard et, d'autre part, au montant des gages, salaires, commissions ou autre rémunération pour services fournis entre la date de l'introduction des procédures et celle de l'homologation, y compris les sommes que le voyageur de commerce a régulièrement déboursées dans le cadre de l'exploitation de la compagnie entre ces dates;

b) il est convaincu que la compagnie est en mesure d'effectuer et effectuera les paiements prévus à l'alinéa a).

Restriction — pension plan

(6) If the company participates in a prescribed pension plan for the benefit of its employees, the court may sanction a compromise or an arrangement in respect of the company only if

(a) the compromise or arrangement provides for payment of the following amounts that are unpaid to the fund established for the purpose of the pension plan:

(i) an amount equal to the sum of all amounts that were deducted from the employees' remuneration for payment to the fund,

(ii) if the prescribed pension plan is regulated by an Act of Parliament,

(A) an amount equal to the normal cost, within the meaning of subsection 2(1) of the *Pension Benefits Standards Regulations, 1985*, that was required to be paid by the employer to the fund, and

(A.1) an amount equal to the sum of all special payments, determined in accordance with section 9 of the *Pension Benefits Standards Regulations, 1985*, that were required to be paid by the employer to the fund referred to in sections 81.5 and 81.6 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* to liquidate an unfunded liability or a solvency deficiency,

(A.2) any amount required to liquidate any other unfunded liability or solvency deficiency of the fund as determined on the day on which proceedings commence under this Act,

(B) an amount equal to the sum of all amounts that were required to be paid by the employer to the fund under a defined contribution provision, within the meaning of subsection 2(1) of the *Pension Benefits Standards Act, 1985*,

(C) an amount equal to the sum of all amounts that were required to be paid by the employer to the administrator of a pooled registered pension plan, as defined in subsection 2(1) of the *Pooled Registered Pension Plans Act*, and

(iii) in the case of any other prescribed pension plan,

(A) an amount equal to the amount that would be the normal cost, within the meaning of subsection 2(1) of the *Pension Benefits Standards Regulations, 1985*, that the employer would be

Restriction — régime de pension

(6) Si la compagnie participe à un régime de pension réglementaire institué pour ses employés, le tribunal ne peut homologuer la transaction ou l'arrangement que si, à la fois :

a) la transaction ou l'arrangement prévoit que seront effectués des paiements correspondant au total des sommes ci-après qui n'ont pas été versées au fonds établi dans le cadre du régime de pension :

(i) les sommes qui ont été déduites de la rémunération des employés pour versement au fonds,

(ii) dans le cas d'un régime de pension réglementaire régi par une loi fédérale :

(A) les coûts normaux, au sens du paragraphe 2(1) du *Règlement de 1985 sur les normes de prestation de pension*, que l'employeur est tenu de verser au fonds,

(A.1) la somme égale au total des paiements spéciaux, établis conformément à l'article 9 du *Règlement de 1985 sur les normes de prestation de pension*, que l'employeur est tenu de verser au fonds visé aux articles 81.5 et 81.6 de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* pour la liquidation d'un passif non capitalisé ou d'un déficit de solvabilité,

(A.2) toute somme requise pour la liquidation de tout autre passif non capitalisé ou déficit de solvabilité du fonds établi à la date à laquelle des procédures sont intentées sous le régime de la présente loi,

(B) les sommes que l'employeur est tenu de verser au fonds au titre de toute disposition à cotisations déterminées au sens du paragraphe 2(1) de la *Loi de 1985 sur les normes de prestation de pension*,

(C) les sommes que l'employeur est tenu de verser à l'administrateur d'un régime de pension agréé collectif au sens du paragraphe 2(1) de la *Loi sur les régimes de pension agréés collectifs*,

(iii) dans le cas de tout autre régime de pension réglementaire :

(A) la somme égale aux coûts normaux, au sens du paragraphe 2(1) du *Règlement de 1985 sur les normes de prestation de pension*, que l'employeur serait tenu de verser au fonds si le régime était régi par une loi fédérale,

required to pay to the fund if the prescribed plan were regulated by an Act of Parliament, and

(A.1) an amount equal to the sum of all special payments, determined in accordance with section 9 of the *Pension Benefits Standards Regulations, 1985*, that would have been required to be paid by the employer to the fund referred to in sections 81.5 and 81.6 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* to liquidate an unfunded liability or a solvency deficiency if the prescribed plan were regulated by an Act of Parliament,

(A.2) any amount required to liquidate any other unfunded liability or solvency deficiency of the fund as determined on the day on which proceedings commence under this Act,

(B) an amount equal to the sum of all amounts that would have been required to be paid by the employer to the fund under a defined contribution provision, within the meaning of subsection 2(1) of the *Pension Benefits Standards Act, 1985*, if the prescribed plan were regulated by an Act of Parliament,

(C) an amount equal to the sum of all amounts that would have been required to be paid by the employer in respect of a prescribed plan, if it were regulated by the *Pooled Registered Pension Plans Act*; and

(b) the court is satisfied that the company can and will make the payments as required under paragraph (a).

Non-application of subsection (6)

(7) Despite subsection (6), the court may sanction a compromise or arrangement that does not allow for the payment of the amounts referred to in that subsection if it is satisfied that the relevant parties have entered into an agreement, approved by the relevant pension regulator, respecting the payment of those amounts.

Payment — equity claims

(8) No compromise or arrangement that provides for the payment of an equity claim is to be sanctioned by the court unless it provides that all claims that are not equity claims are to be paid in full before the equity claim is to be paid.

R.S., 1985, c. C-36, s. 6; 1992, c. 27, s. 90; 1996, c. 6, s. 167; 1997, c. 12, s. 123; 2004, c. 25, s. 194; 2005, c. 47, s. 126; 2007, c. 36, s. 106; 2009, c. 33, s. 27; 2012, c. 16, s. 82; 2023, c. 6, s. 5.

(A.1) la somme égale au total des paiements spéciaux, établis conformément à l'article 9 du *Règlement de 1985 sur les normes de prestation de pension*, que l'employeur serait tenu de verser au fonds visé aux articles 81.5 et 81.6 de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* pour la liquidation d'un passif non capitalisé ou d'un déficit de solvabilité si le régime était régi par une loi fédérale,

(A.2) toute somme requise pour la liquidation de tout autre passif non capitalisé ou déficit de solvabilité du fonds établi à la date à laquelle des procédures sont intentées sous le régime de la présente loi,

(B) les sommes que l'employeur serait tenu de verser au fonds au titre de toute disposition à cotisations déterminées au sens du paragraphe 2(1) de la *Loi de 1985 sur les normes de prestation de pension* si le régime était régi par une loi fédérale,

(C) les sommes que l'employeur serait tenu de verser à l'égard du régime s'il était régi par la *Loi sur les régimes de pension agréés collectifs*;

b) il est convaincu que la compagnie est en mesure d'effectuer et effectuera les paiements prévus à l'alinéa a).

Non-application du paragraphe (6)

(7) Par dérogation au paragraphe (6), le tribunal peut homologuer la transaction ou l'arrangement qui ne prévoit pas le versement des sommes mentionnées à ce paragraphe s'il est convaincu que les parties en cause ont conclu un accord sur les sommes à verser et que l'autorité administrative responsable du régime de pension a consenti à l'accord.

Païement d'une réclamation relative à des capitaux propres

(8) Le tribunal ne peut homologuer la transaction ou l'arrangement qui prévoit le paiement d'une réclamation relative à des capitaux propres que si, selon les termes de celle-ci, le paiement intégral de toutes les autres réclamations sera effectué avant le paiement de la réclamation relative à des capitaux propres.

L.R. (1985), ch. C-36, art. 6; 1992, ch. 27, art. 90; 1996, ch. 6, art. 167; 1997, ch. 12, art. 123; 2004, ch. 25, art. 194; 2005, ch. 47, art. 126; 2007, ch. 36, art. 106; 2009, ch. 33, art. 27; 2012, ch. 16, art. 82; 2023, ch. 6, art. 5.

Court may give directions

7 Where an alteration or a modification of any compromise or arrangement is proposed at any time after the court has directed a meeting or meetings to be summoned, the meeting or meetings may be adjourned on such term as to notice and otherwise as the court may direct, and those directions may be given after as well as before adjournment of any meeting or meetings, and the court may in its discretion direct that it is not necessary to adjourn any meeting or to convene any further meeting of any class of creditors or shareholders that in the opinion of the court is not adversely affected by the alteration or modification proposed, and any compromise or arrangement so altered or modified may be sanctioned by the court and have effect under section 6.

R.S., c. C-25, s. 7.

Scope of Act

8 This Act extends and does not limit the provisions of any instrument now or hereafter existing that governs the rights of creditors or any class of them and has full force and effect notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in that instrument.

R.S., c. C-25, s. 8.

PART II

Jurisdiction of Courts

Jurisdiction of court to receive applications

9 (1) Any application under this Act may be made to the court that has jurisdiction in the province within which the head office or chief place of business of the company in Canada is situated, or, if the company has no place of business in Canada, in any province within which any assets of the company are situated.

Single judge may exercise powers, subject to appeal

(2) The powers conferred by this Act on a court may, subject to appeal as provided for in this Act, be exercised by a single judge thereof, and those powers may be exercised in chambers during term or in vacation.

R.S., c. C-25, s. 9.

Le tribunal peut donner des instructions

7 Si une modification d'une transaction ou d'un arrangement est proposée après que le tribunal a ordonné qu'une ou plusieurs assemblées soient convoquées, cette ou ces assemblées peuvent être ajournées aux conditions que peut prescrire le tribunal quant à l'avis et autrement, et ces instructions peuvent être données tant après qu'avant l'ajournement de toute ou toutes assemblées, et le tribunal peut, à sa discrétion, prescrire qu'il ne sera pas nécessaire d'ajourner quelque assemblée ou de convoquer une nouvelle assemblée de toute catégorie de créanciers ou actionnaires qui, selon l'opinion du tribunal, n'est pas défavorablement atteinte par la modification proposée, et une transaction ou un arrangement ainsi modifié peut être homologué par le tribunal et être exécutoire en vertu de l'article 6.

S.R., ch. C-25, art. 7.

Champ d'application de la loi

8 La présente loi n'a pas pour effet de limiter mais d'étendre les stipulations de tout instrument actuellement ou désormais existant relativement aux droits de créanciers ou de toute catégorie de ces derniers, et elle est pleinement exécutoire et effective nonobstant toute stipulation contraire de cet instrument.

S.R., ch. C-25, art. 8.

PARTIE II

Juridiction des tribunaux

Le tribunal a juridiction pour recevoir des demandes

9 (1) Toute demande prévue par la présente loi peut être faite au tribunal ayant juridiction dans la province où est situé le siège social ou le principal bureau d'affaires de la compagnie au Canada, ou, si la compagnie n'a pas de bureau d'affaires au Canada, dans la province où est situé quelque actif de la compagnie.

Un seul juge peut exercer les pouvoirs, sous réserve d'appel

(2) Les pouvoirs conférés au tribunal par la présente loi peuvent être exercés par un seul de ses juges, sous réserve de l'appel prévu par la présente loi. Ces pouvoirs peuvent être exercés en chambre, soit durant une session du tribunal, soit pendant les vacances judiciaires.

S.R., ch. C-25, art. 9.

Form of applications

10 (1) Applications under this Act shall be made by petition or by way of originating summons or notice of motion in accordance with the practice of the court in which the application is made.

Documents that must accompany initial application

(2) An initial application must be accompanied by

- (a)** a statement indicating, on a weekly basis, the projected cash flow of the debtor company;
- (b)** a report containing the prescribed representations of the debtor company regarding the preparation of the cash-flow statement; and
- (c)** copies of all financial statements, audited or unaudited, prepared during the year before the application or, if no such statements were prepared in that year, a copy of the most recent such statement.

Publication ban

(3) The court may make an order prohibiting the release to the public of any cash-flow statement, or any part of a cash-flow statement, if it is satisfied that the release would unduly prejudice the debtor company and the making of the order would not unduly prejudice the company's creditors, but the court may, in the order, direct that the cash-flow statement or any part of it be made available to any person specified in the order on any terms or conditions that the court considers appropriate.

R.S., 1985, c. C-36, s. 10; 2005, c. 47, s. 127.

General power of court

11 Despite anything in the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*, if an application is made under this Act in respect of a debtor company, the court, on the application of any person interested in the matter, may, subject to the restrictions set out in this Act, on notice to any other person or without notice as it may see fit, make any order that it considers appropriate in the circumstances.

R.S., 1985, c. C-36, s. 11; 1992, c. 27, s. 90; 1996, c. 6, s. 167; 1997, c. 12, s. 124; 2005, c. 47, s. 128.

Relief reasonably necessary

11.001 An order made under section 11 at the same time as an order made under subsection 11.02(1) or during the period referred to in an order made under that subsection with respect to an initial application shall be

Forme des demandes

10 (1) Les demandes prévues par la présente loi peuvent être formulées par requête ou par voie d'assignation introductive d'instance ou d'avis de motion conformément à la pratique du tribunal auquel la demande est présentée.

Documents accompagnant la demande initiale

(2) La demande initiale doit être accompagnée :

- a)** d'un état portant, projections à l'appui, sur l'évolution hebdomadaire de l'encaisse de la compagnie débitrice;
- b)** d'un rapport contenant les observations réglementaires de la compagnie débitrice relativement à l'établissement de cet état;
- c)** d'une copie des états financiers, vérifiés ou non, établis au cours de l'année précédant la demande ou, à défaut, d'une copie des états financiers les plus récents.

Interdiction de mettre l'état à la disposition du public

(3) Le tribunal peut, par ordonnance, interdire la communication au public de tout ou partie de l'état de l'évolution de l'encaisse de la compagnie débitrice s'il est convaincu que sa communication causerait un préjudice indu à celle-ci et que sa non-communication ne causerait pas de préjudice indu à ses créanciers. Il peut toutefois préciser dans l'ordonnance que tout ou partie de cet état peut être communiqué, aux conditions qu'il estime indiquées, à la personne qu'il nomme.

L.R. (1985), ch. C-36, art. 10; 2005, ch. 47, art. 127.

Pouvoir général du tribunal

11 Malgré toute disposition de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* ou de la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations*, le tribunal peut, dans le cas de toute demande sous le régime de la présente loi à l'égard d'une compagnie débitrice, rendre, sur demande d'un intéressé, mais sous réserve des restrictions prévues par la présente loi et avec ou sans avis, toute ordonnance qu'il estime indiquée.

L.R. (1985), ch. C-36, art. 11; 1992, ch. 27, art. 90; 1996, ch. 6, art. 167; 1997, ch. 12, art. 124; 2005, ch. 47, art. 128.

Redressements normalement nécessaires

11.001 L'ordonnance rendue au titre de l'article 11 en même temps que l'ordonnance rendue au titre du paragraphe 11.02(1) ou pendant la période visée dans l'ordonnance rendue au titre de ce paragraphe relativement à la demande initiale n'est limitée qu'aux redressements normalement nécessaires à la continuation de l'exploitation

limited to relief that is reasonably necessary for the continued operations of the debtor company in the ordinary course of business during that period.

2019, c. 29, s. 136.

Rights of suppliers

11.01 No order made under section 11 or 11.02 has the effect of

- (a) prohibiting a person from requiring immediate payment for goods, services, use of leased or licensed property or other valuable consideration provided after the order is made; or
- (b) requiring the further advance of money or credit.

2005, c. 47, s. 128.

Stays, etc. — initial application

11.02 (1) A court may, on an initial application in respect of a debtor company, make an order on any terms that it may impose, effective for the period that the court considers necessary, which period may not be more than 10 days,

- (a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the 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 company; and
- (c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of any action, suit or proceeding against the company.

Stays, etc. — other than initial application

(2) A court may, on an application in respect of a debtor company other than an initial application, make an order, on any terms that it may impose,

- (a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, for any period that the court considers necessary, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under an Act referred to in paragraph (1)(a);
- (b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and

de la compagnie débitrice dans le cours ordinaire de ses affaires durant cette période.

2019, ch. 29, art. 136.

Droits des fournisseurs

11.01 L'ordonnance prévue aux articles 11 ou 11.02 ne peut avoir pour effet :

- a) d'empêcher une personne d'exiger que soient effectués sans délai les paiements relatifs à la fourniture de marchandises ou de services, à l'utilisation de biens loués ou faisant l'objet d'une licence ou à la fourniture de toute autre contrepartie de valeur qui ont lieu après l'ordonnance;
- b) d'exiger le versement de nouvelles avances de fonds ou de nouveaux crédits.

2005, ch. 47, art. 128.

Suspension : demande initiale

11.02 (1) Dans le cas d'une demande initiale visant une compagnie débitrice, le tribunal peut, par ordonnance, aux conditions qu'il peut imposer et pour la période maximale de dix jours qu'il estime nécessaire :

- a) suspendre, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, toute procédure qui est ou pourrait être intentée contre la compagnie sous le régime de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* ou de la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations*;
- b) surseoir, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, à la continuation de toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la compagnie;
- c) interdire, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, l'introduction de toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la compagnie.

Suspension : demandes autres qu'initiales

(2) Dans le cas d'une demande, autre qu'une demande initiale, visant une compagnie débitrice, le tribunal peut, par ordonnance, aux conditions qu'il peut imposer et pour la période qu'il estime nécessaire :

- a) suspendre, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, toute procédure qui est ou pourrait être intentée contre la compagnie sous le régime des lois mentionnées à l'alinéa (1)a);
- b) surseoir, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, à la continuation de toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la compagnie;

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

Burden of proof on application

(3) The court shall not make the order unless

(a) the applicant satisfies the court that circumstances exist that make the order appropriate; and

(b) in the case of an order under subsection (2), the applicant also satisfies the court that the applicant has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence.

Restriction

(4) Orders doing anything referred to in subsection (1) or (2) may only be made under this section.

2005, c. 47, s. 128, 2007, c. 36, s. 62(F); 2019, c. 29, s. 137.

Stays — directors

11.03 (1) An order made under section 11.02 may provide that no person may commence or continue any action against a director of the company on any claim against directors that arose before the commencement of proceedings under this Act and that relates to obligations of the company if directors are under any law liable in their capacity as directors for the payment of those obligations, until a compromise or an arrangement in respect of the company, if one is filed, is sanctioned by the court or is refused by the creditors or the court.

Exception

(2) Subsection (1) does not apply in respect of an action against a director on a guarantee given by the director relating to the company's obligations or an action seeking injunctive relief against a director in relation to the company.

Persons deemed to be directors

(3) If all of the directors have resigned or have been removed by the shareholders without replacement, any person who manages or supervises the management of the business and affairs of the company is deemed to be a director for the purposes of this section.

2005, c. 47, s. 128.

Persons obligated under letter of credit or guarantee

11.04 No order made under section 11.02 has effect on any action, suit or proceeding against a person, other than the company in respect of whom the order is made,

c) interdire, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, l'introduction de toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la compagnie.

Preuve

(3) Le tribunal ne rend l'ordonnance que si :

a) le demandeur le convainc que la mesure est opportune;

b) dans le cas de l'ordonnance visée au paragraphe (2), le demandeur le convainc en outre qu'il a agi et continue d'agir de bonne foi et avec la diligence voulue.

Restriction

(4) L'ordonnance qui prévoit l'une des mesures visées aux paragraphes (1) ou (2) ne peut être rendue qu'en vertu du présent article.

2005, ch. 47, art. 128, 2007, ch. 36, art. 62(F); 2019, ch. 29, art. 137.

Suspension — administrateurs

11.03 (1) L'ordonnance prévue à l'article 11.02 peut interdire l'introduction ou la continuation de toute action contre les administrateurs de la compagnie relativement aux réclamations qui sont antérieures aux procédures intentées sous le régime de la présente loi et visent des obligations de la compagnie dont ils peuvent être, ès qualités, responsables en droit, tant que la transaction ou l'arrangement, le cas échéant, n'a pas été homologué par le tribunal ou rejeté par celui-ci ou les créanciers.

Exclusion

(2) La suspension ne s'applique toutefois pas aux actions contre les administrateurs pour les garanties qu'ils ont données relativement aux obligations de la compagnie ni aux mesures de la nature d'une injonction les visant au sujet de celle-ci.

Présomption : administrateurs

(3) Si tous les administrateurs démissionnent ou sont destitués par les actionnaires sans être remplacés, quiconque dirige ou supervise les activités commerciales et les affaires internes de la compagnie est réputé un administrateur pour l'application du présent article.

2005, ch. 47, art. 128.

Suspension — lettres de crédit ou garanties

11.04 L'ordonnance prévue à l'article 11.02 est sans effet sur toute action, poursuite ou autre procédure contre la

who is obligated under a letter of credit or guarantee in relation to the company.

2005, c. 47, s. 128.

11.05 [Repealed, 2007, c. 29, s. 105]

Member of the Canadian Payments Association

11.06 No order may be made under this Act that has the effect of preventing a member of the Canadian Payments Association from ceasing to act as a clearing agent or group clearer for a company in accordance with the *Canadian Payments Act* or the by-laws or rules of that Association.

2005, c. 47, s. 128, 2007, c. 36, s. 64.

11.07 [Repealed, 2012, c. 31, s. 420]

Restriction — certain powers, duties and functions

11.08 No order may be made under section 11.02 that affects

(a) the exercise or performance by the Minister of Finance or the Superintendent of Financial Institutions of any power, duty or function assigned to them by the *Bank Act*, the *Cooperative Credit Associations Act*, the *Insurance Companies Act* or the *Trust and Loan Companies Act*;

(b) the exercise or performance by the Governor in Council, the Minister of Finance or the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation of any power, duty or function assigned to them by the *Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation Act*; or

(c) the exercise by the Attorney General of Canada of any power, assigned to him or her by the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*.

2005, c. 47, s. 128.

Stay — Her Majesty

11.09 (1) An order made under section 11.02 may provide that

(a) Her Majesty in right of Canada may not exercise rights under subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* or any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, or a premium under Part VII.1 of that Act, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, in respect of the company if the company is a tax debtor

personne — autre que la compagnie visée par l'ordonnance — qui a des obligations au titre de lettres de crédit ou de garanties se rapportant à la compagnie.

2005, ch. 47, art. 128.

11.05 [Abrogé, 2007, ch. 29, art. 105]

Membre de l'Association canadienne des paiements

11.06 Aucune ordonnance prévue par la présente loi ne peut avoir pour effet d'empêcher un membre de l'Association canadienne des paiements de cesser d'agir, pour une compagnie, à titre d'agent de compensation ou d'adhérent correspondant de groupe conformément à la *Loi canadienne sur les paiements* et aux règles et règlements administratifs de l'Association.

2005, ch. 47, art. 128; 2007, ch. 36, art. 64.

11.07 [Abrogé, 2012, ch. 31, art. 420]

Restrictions : exercice de certaines attributions

11.08 L'ordonnance prévue à l'article 11.02 ne peut avoir d'effet sur :

a) l'exercice par le ministre des Finances ou par le surintendant des institutions financières des attributions qui leur sont conférées par la *Loi sur les banques*, la *Loi sur les associations coopératives de crédit*, la *Loi sur les sociétés d'assurances* ou la *Loi sur les sociétés de fiducie et de prêt*;

b) l'exercice par le gouverneur en conseil, le ministre des Finances ou la Société d'assurance-dépôts du Canada des attributions qui leur sont conférées par la *Loi sur la Société d'assurance-dépôts du Canada*;

c) l'exercice par le procureur général du Canada des pouvoirs qui lui sont conférés par la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations*.

2005, ch. 47, art. 128.

Suspension des procédures : Sa Majesté

11.09 (1) L'ordonnance prévue à l'article 11.02 peut avoir pour effet de suspendre :

a) l'exercice par Sa Majesté du chef du Canada des droits que lui confère le paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu* ou toute disposition du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi* qui renvoie à ce paragraphe et qui prévoit la perception d'une cotisation, au sens du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, d'une cotisation ouvrière ou d'une cotisation patronale, au sens de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi*, ou d'une cotisation prévue par la partie VII.1 de cette loi ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents, à l'égard d'une compagnie

under that subsection or provision, for the period that the court considers appropriate but ending not later than

- (i) the expiry of the order,
- (ii) the refusal of a proposed compromise by the creditors or the court,
- (iii) six months following the court sanction of a compromise or an arrangement,
- (iv) the default by the company on any term of a compromise or an arrangement, or
- (v) the performance of a compromise or an arrangement in respect of the company; and

(b) Her Majesty in right of a province may not exercise rights under any provision of provincial legislation in respect of the company if the company is a debtor under that legislation and the provision has a purpose similar to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, and the sum

(i) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(ii) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a *province providing a comprehensive pension plan* as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a *provincial pension plan* as defined in that subsection,

for the period that the court considers appropriate but ending not later than the occurrence or time referred to in whichever of subparagraphs (a)(i) to (v) that may apply.

When order ceases to be in effect

(2) The portions of an order made under section 11.02 that affect the exercise of rights of Her Majesty referred to in paragraph (1)(a) or (b) cease to be in effect if

- (a) the company defaults on the payment of any amount that becomes due to Her Majesty after the order is made and could be subject to a demand under
 - (i) subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*,

qui est un débiteur fiscal visé à ce paragraphe ou à cette disposition, pour la période se terminant au plus tard :

- (i) à l'expiration de l'ordonnance,
- (ii) au moment du rejet, par le tribunal ou les créanciers, de la transaction proposée,
- (iii) six mois après que le tribunal a homologué la transaction ou l'arrangement,
- (iv) au moment de tout défaut d'exécution de la transaction ou de l'arrangement,
- (v) au moment de l'exécution intégrale de la transaction ou de l'arrangement;

b) l'exercice par Sa Majesté du chef d'une province, pour la période que le tribunal estime indiquée et se terminant au plus tard au moment visé à celui des sous-alinéas a)(i) à (v) qui, le cas échéant, est applicable, des droits que lui confère toute disposition législative de cette province à l'égard d'une compagnie qui est un débiteur visé par la loi provinciale, s'il s'agit d'une disposition dont l'objet est semblable à celui du paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*, ou qui renvoie à ce paragraphe, et qui prévoit la perception d'une somme, ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents, laquelle :

(i) soit a été retenue par une personne sur un paiement effectué à une autre personne, ou déduite d'un tel paiement, et se rapporte à un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à l'impôt sur le revenu auquel les particuliers sont assujettis en vertu de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*,

(ii) soit est de même nature qu'une cotisation prévue par le *Régime de pensions du Canada*, si la province est une province instituant un régime général de pensions au sens du paragraphe 3(1) de cette loi et si la loi provinciale institue un régime provincial de pensions au sens de ce paragraphe.

Cessation d'effet

(2) Les passages de l'ordonnance qui suspendent l'exercice des droits de Sa Majesté visés aux alinéas (1)a) ou b) cessent d'avoir effet dans les cas suivants :

- a) la compagnie manque à ses obligations de paiement à l'égard de toute somme qui devient due à Sa Majesté après le prononcé de l'ordonnance et qui pourrait faire l'objet d'une demande aux termes d'une des dispositions suivantes :

(ii) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, or a premium under Part VII.1 of that Act, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, or

(iii) any provision of provincial legislation that has a purpose similar to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, and the sum

(A) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(B) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a *province providing a comprehensive pension plan* as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a *provincial pension plan* as defined in that subsection; or

(b) any other creditor is or becomes entitled to realize a security on any property that could be claimed by Her Majesty in exercising rights under

(i) subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*,

(ii) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, or a premium under Part VII.1 of that Act, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, or

(iii) any provision of provincial legislation that has a purpose similar to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, and the sum

(A) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax

(i) le paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*,

(ii) toute disposition du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi* qui renvoie au paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu* et qui prévoit la perception d'une cotisation, au sens du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, d'une cotisation ouvrière ou d'une cotisation patronale, au sens de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi*, ou d'une cotisation prévue par la partie VII.1 de cette loi ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents,

(iii) toute disposition législative provinciale dont l'objet est semblable à celui du paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*, ou qui renvoie à ce paragraphe, et qui prévoit la perception d'une somme, ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents, laquelle :

(A) soit a été retenue par une personne sur un paiement effectué à une autre personne, ou déduite d'un tel paiement, et se rapporte à un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à l'impôt sur le revenu auquel les particuliers sont assujettis en vertu de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*,

(B) soit est de même nature qu'une cotisation prévue par le *Régime de pensions du Canada*, si la province est une province instituant un régime général de pensions au sens du paragraphe 3(1) de cette loi et si la loi provinciale institue un régime provincial de pensions au sens de ce paragraphe;

b) un autre créancier a ou acquiert le droit de réaliser sa garantie sur un bien qui pourrait être réclamé par Sa Majesté dans l'exercice des droits que lui confère l'une des dispositions suivantes :

(i) le paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*,

(ii) toute disposition du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi* qui renvoie au paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu* et qui prévoit la perception d'une cotisation, au sens du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, d'une cotisation ouvrière ou d'une cotisation patronale, au sens de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi*, ou d'une cotisation prévue par la partie VII.1 de cette loi ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents,

(iii) toute disposition législative provinciale dont l'objet est semblable à celui du paragraphe 224(1.2)

imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(B) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a *province providing a comprehensive pension plan* as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation establishes a *provincial pension plan* as defined in that subsection.

Operation of similar legislation

(3) An order made under section 11.02, other than the portions of that order that affect the exercise of rights of Her Majesty referred to in paragraph (1)(a) or (b), does not affect the operation of

(a) subsections 224(1.2) and (1.3) of the *Income Tax Act*,

(b) any provision of the *Canada Pension Plan* or of the *Employment Insurance Act* that refers to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* and provides for the collection of a contribution, as defined in the *Canada Pension Plan*, an employee's premium, or employer's premium, as defined in the *Employment Insurance Act*, or a premium under Part VII.1 of that Act, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, or

(c) any provision of provincial legislation that has a purpose similar to subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act*, or that refers to that subsection, to the extent that it provides for the collection of a sum, and of any related interest, penalties or other amounts, and the sum

(i) has been withheld or deducted by a person from a payment to another person and is in respect of a tax similar in nature to the income tax imposed on individuals under the *Income Tax Act*, or

(ii) is of the same nature as a contribution under the *Canada Pension Plan* if the province is a *province providing a comprehensive pension plan* as defined in subsection 3(1) of the *Canada Pension Plan* and the provincial legislation

de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*, ou qui renvoie à ce paragraphe, et qui prévoit la perception d'une somme, ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents, laquelle :

(A) soit a été retenue par une personne sur un paiement effectué à une autre personne, ou déduite d'un tel paiement, et se rapporte à un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à l'impôt sur le revenu auquel les particuliers sont assujettis en vertu de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*,

(B) soit est de même nature qu'une cotisation prévue par le *Régime de pensions du Canada*, si la province est une province instituant un régime général de pensions au sens du paragraphe 3(1) de cette loi et si la loi provinciale institue un régime provincial de pensions au sens de ce paragraphe.

Effet

(3) L'ordonnance prévue à l'article 11.02, à l'exception des passages de celle-ci qui suspendent l'exercice des droits de Sa Majesté visés aux alinéas (1)a) ou b), n'a pas pour effet de porter atteinte à l'application des dispositions suivantes :

a) les paragraphes 224(1.2) et (1.3) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*;

b) toute disposition du *Régime de pensions du Canada* ou de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi* qui renvoie au paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu* et qui prévoit la perception d'une cotisation, au sens du *Régime de pensions du Canada*, d'une cotisation ouvrière ou d'une cotisation patronale, au sens de la *Loi sur l'assurance-emploi*, ou d'une cotisation prévue par la partie VII.1 de cette loi ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents;

c) toute disposition législative provinciale dont l'objet est semblable à celui du paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*, ou qui renvoie à ce paragraphe, et qui prévoit la perception d'une somme, ainsi que des intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents, laquelle :

(i) soit a été retenue par une personne sur un paiement effectué à une autre personne, ou déduite d'un tel paiement, et se rapporte à un impôt semblable, de par sa nature, à l'impôt sur le revenu auquel les particuliers sont assujettis en vertu de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu*,

(ii) soit est de même nature qu'une cotisation prévue par le *Régime de pensions du Canada*, si la

establishes a *provincial pension plan* as defined in that subsection,

and for the purpose of paragraph (c), the provision of provincial legislation is, despite any Act of Canada or of a province or any other law, deemed to have the same effect and scope against any creditor, however secured, as subsection 224(1.2) of the *Income Tax Act* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(i), or as subsection 23(2) of the *Canada Pension Plan* in respect of a sum referred to in subparagraph (c)(ii), and in respect of any related interest, penalties or other amounts.

2005, c. 47, s. 128; 2009, c. 33, s. 28.

Meaning of *regulatory body*

11.1 (1) In this section, *regulatory body* means a person or body that has powers, duties or functions relating to the enforcement or administration of an Act of Parliament or of the legislature of a province and includes a person or body that is prescribed to be a regulatory body for the purpose of this Act.

Regulatory bodies — order under section 11.02

(2) Subject to subsection (3), no order made under section 11.02 affects a regulatory body's investigation in respect of the debtor company or an action, suit or proceeding that is taken in respect of the company by or before the regulatory body, other than the enforcement of a payment ordered by the regulatory body or the court.

Exception

(3) On application by the company and on notice to the regulatory body and to the persons who are likely to be affected by the order, the court may order that subsection (2) not apply in respect of one or more of the actions, suits or proceedings taken by or before the regulatory body if in the court's opinion

(a) a viable compromise or arrangement could not be made in respect of the company if that subsection were to apply; and

(b) it is not contrary to the public interest that the regulatory body be affected by the order made under section 11.02.

Declaration — enforcement of a payment

(4) If there is a dispute as to whether a regulatory body is seeking to enforce its rights as a creditor, the court may,

province est une province instituant un régime général de pensions au sens du paragraphe 3(1) de cette loi et si la loi provinciale institue un régime provincial de pensions au sens de ce paragraphe.

Pour l'application de l'alinéa c), la disposition législative provinciale en question est réputée avoir, à l'encontre de tout créancier et malgré tout texte législatif fédéral ou provincial et toute autre règle de droit, la même portée et le même effet que le paragraphe 224(1.2) de la *Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu* quant à la somme visée au sous-alinéa c)(i), ou que le paragraphe 23(2) du *Régime de pensions du Canada* quant à la somme visée au sous-alinéa c)(ii), et quant aux intérêts, pénalités et autres charges afférents, quelle que soit la garantie dont bénéficie le créancier.

2005, ch. 47, art. 128; 2009, ch. 33, art. 28.

Définition de *organisme administratif*

11.1 (1) Au présent article, *organisme administratif* s'entend de toute personne ou de tout organisme chargé de l'application d'une loi fédérale ou provinciale; y est assimilé toute personne ou tout organisme désigné à ce titre par règlement.

Organisme administratif — ordonnance rendue en vertu de l'article 11.02

(2) Sous réserve du paragraphe (3), l'ordonnance prévue à l'article 11.02 ne porte aucunement atteinte aux mesures — action, poursuite ou autre procédure — prises à l'égard de la compagnie débitrice par ou devant un organisme administratif, ni aux investigations auxquelles il procède à son sujet. Elles n'ont d'effet que sur l'exécution d'un paiement ordonné par lui ou le tribunal.

Exception

(3) Le tribunal peut par ordonnance, sur demande de la compagnie et sur préavis à l'organisme administratif et à toute personne qui sera vraisemblablement touchée par l'ordonnance, déclarer que le paragraphe (2) ne s'applique pas à l'une ou plusieurs des mesures prises par ou devant celui-ci, s'il est convaincu que, à la fois :

a) il ne pourrait être fait de transaction ou d'arrangement viable à l'égard de la compagnie si ce paragraphe s'appliquait;

b) l'ordonnance demandée au titre de l'article 11.02 n'est pas contraire à l'intérêt public.

Déclaration : organisme agissant à titre de créancier

(4) En cas de différend sur la question de savoir si l'organisme administratif cherche à faire valoir ses droits à

on application by the company and on notice to the regulatory body, make an order declaring both that the regulatory body is seeking to enforce its rights as a creditor and that the enforcement of those rights is stayed.

1997, c. 12, s. 124; 2001, c. 9, s. 576; 2005, c. 47, s. 128; 2007, c. 29, s. 106, c. 36, s. 65.

11.11 [Repealed, 2005, c. 47, s. 128]

Interim financing

11.2 (1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, a court may make an order declaring that all or part of the company's property is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in favour of a person specified in the order who agrees to lend to the company an amount approved by the court as being required by the company, having regard to its cash-flow statement. The security or charge may not secure an obligation that exists before the order is made.

Priority — secured creditors

(2) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

Priority — other orders

(3) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over any security or charge arising from a previous order made under subsection (1) only with the consent of the person in whose favour the previous order was made.

Factors to be considered

(4) In deciding whether to make an order, the court is to consider, among other things,

- (a)** the period during which the company is expected to be subject to proceedings under this Act;
- (b)** how the company's business and financial affairs are to be managed during the proceedings;
- (c)** whether the company's management has the confidence of its major creditors;
- (d)** whether the loan would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made in respect of the company;
- (e)** the nature and value of the company's property;

titre de créancier dans le cadre de la mesure prise, le tribunal peut déclarer, par ordonnance, sur demande de la compagnie et sur préavis à l'organisme, que celui-ci agit effectivement à ce titre et que la mesure est suspendue.

1997, ch. 12, art. 124; 2001, ch. 9, art. 576; 2005, ch. 47, art. 128; 2007, ch. 29, art. 106, ch. 36, art. 65.

11.11 [Abrogé, 2005, ch. 47, art. 128]

Financement temporaire

11.2 (1) Sur demande de la compagnie débitrice, le tribunal peut par ordonnance, sur préavis de la demande aux créanciers garantis qui seront vraisemblablement touchés par la charge ou sûreté, déclarer que tout ou partie des biens de la compagnie sont grevés d'une charge ou sûreté — d'un montant qu'il estime indiqué — en faveur de la personne nommée dans l'ordonnance qui accepte de prêter à la compagnie la somme qu'il approuve compte tenu de l'état de l'évolution de l'encaisse et des besoins de celle-ci. La charge ou sûreté ne peut garantir qu'une obligation postérieure au prononcé de l'ordonnance.

Priorité — créanciers garantis

(2) Le tribunal peut préciser, dans l'ordonnance, que la charge ou sûreté a priorité sur toute réclamation des créanciers garantis de la compagnie.

Priorité — autres ordonnances

(3) Il peut également y préciser que la charge ou sûreté n'a priorité sur toute autre charge ou sûreté grevant les biens de la compagnie au titre d'une ordonnance déjà rendue en vertu du paragraphe (1) que sur consentement de la personne en faveur de qui cette ordonnance a été rendue.

Facteurs à prendre en considération

(4) Pour décider s'il rend l'ordonnance, le tribunal prend en considération, entre autres, les facteurs suivants :

- a)** la durée prévue des procédures intentées à l'égard de la compagnie sous le régime de la présente loi;
- b)** la façon dont les affaires financières et autres de la compagnie seront gérées au cours de ces procédures;
- c)** la question de savoir si ses dirigeants ont la confiance de ses créanciers les plus importants;
- d)** la question de savoir si le prêt favorisera la conclusion d'une transaction ou d'un arrangement viable à l'égard de la compagnie;
- e)** la nature et la valeur des biens de la compagnie;

(f) whether any creditor would be materially prejudiced as a result of the security or charge; and

(g) the monitor's report referred to in paragraph 23(1)(b), if any.

Additional factor — initial application

(5) When an application is made under subsection (1) at the same time as an initial application referred to in subsection 11.02(1) or during the period referred to in an order made under that subsection, no order shall be made under subsection (1) unless the court is also satisfied that the terms of the loan are limited to what is reasonably necessary for the continued operations of the debtor company in the ordinary course of business during that period.

1997, c. 12, s. 124; 2005, c. 47, s. 128; 2007, c. 36, s. 65; 2019, c. 29, s. 138.

Assignment of agreements

11.3 (1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to every party to an agreement and the monitor, the court may make an order assigning the rights and obligations of the company under the agreement to any person who is specified by the court and agrees to the assignment.

Exceptions

(2) Subsection (1) does not apply in respect of rights and obligations that are not assignable by reason of their nature or that arise under

(a) an agreement entered into on or after the day on which proceedings commence under this Act;

(b) an eligible financial contract; or

(c) a collective agreement.

Factors to be considered

(3) In deciding whether to make the order, the court is to consider, among other things,

(a) whether the monitor approved the proposed assignment;

(b) whether the person to whom the rights and obligations are to be assigned would be able to perform the obligations; and

(c) whether it would be appropriate to assign the rights and obligations to that person.

f) la question de savoir si la charge ou sûreté causera un préjudice sérieux à l'un ou l'autre des créanciers de la compagnie;

g) le rapport du contrôleur visé à l'alinéa 23(1)b).

Facteur additionnel : demande initiale

(5) Lorsqu'une demande est faite au titre du paragraphe (1) en même temps que la demande initiale visée au paragraphe 11.02(1) ou durant la période visée dans l'ordonnance rendue au titre de ce paragraphe, le tribunal ne rend l'ordonnance visée au paragraphe (1) que s'il est également convaincu que les modalités du financement temporaire demandé sont limitées à ce qui est normalement nécessaire à la continuation de l'exploitation de la compagnie débitrice dans le cours ordinaire de ses affaires durant cette période.

1997, ch. 12, art. 124; 2005, ch. 47, art. 128; 2007, ch. 36, art. 65; 2019, ch. 29, art. 138.

Cessions

11.3 (1) Sur demande de la compagnie débitrice et sur préavis à toutes les parties au contrat et au contrôleur, le tribunal peut, par ordonnance, céder à toute personne qu'il précise et qui y a consenti les droits et obligations de la compagnie découlant du contrat.

Exceptions

(2) Le paragraphe (1) ne s'applique pas aux droits et obligations qui, de par leur nature, ne peuvent être cédés ou qui découlent soit d'un contrat conclu à la date à laquelle une procédure a été intentée sous le régime de la présente loi ou par la suite, soit d'un contrat financier admissible, soit d'une convention collective.

Facteurs à prendre en considération

(3) Pour décider s'il rend l'ordonnance, le tribunal prend en considération, entre autres, les facteurs suivants :

a) l'acquiescement du contrôleur au projet de cession, le cas échéant;

b) la capacité de la personne à qui les droits et obligations seraient cédés d'exécuter les obligations;

c) l'opportunité de lui céder les droits et obligations.

Restriction

(4) The court may not make the order unless it is satisfied that all monetary defaults in relation to the agreement — other than those arising by reason only of the company's insolvency, the commencement of proceedings under this Act or the company's failure to perform a non-monetary obligation — will be remedied on or before the day fixed by the court.

Copy of order

(5) The applicant is to send a copy of the order to every party to the agreement.

1997, c. 12, s. 124; 2005, c. 47, s. 128; 2007, c. 29, s. 107, c. 36, ss. 65, 112.

11.31 [Repealed, 2005, c. 47, s. 128]

Critical supplier

11.4 (1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring a person to be a critical supplier to the company if the court is satisfied that the person is a supplier of goods or services to the company and that the goods or services that are supplied are critical to the company's continued operation.

Obligation to supply

(2) If the court declares a person to be a critical supplier, the court may make an order requiring the person to supply any goods or services specified by the court to the company on any terms and conditions that are consistent with the supply relationship or that the court considers appropriate.

Security or charge in favour of critical supplier

(3) If the court makes an order under subsection (2), the court shall, in the order, declare that all or part of the property of the company is subject to a security or charge in favour of the person declared to be a critical supplier, in an amount equal to the value of the goods or services supplied under the terms of the order.

Priority

(4) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

1997, c. 12, s. 124; 2000, c. 30, s. 156; 2001, c. 34, s. 33(E); 2005, c. 47, s. 128; 2007, c. 36, s. 65.

Removal of directors

11.5 (1) The court may, on the application of any person interested in the matter, make an order removing from office any director of a debtor company in respect of which an order has been made under this Act if the court

Restriction

(4) Il ne peut rendre l'ordonnance que s'il est convaincu qu'il sera remédié, au plus tard à la date qu'il fixe, à tous les manquements d'ordre pécuniaire relatifs au contrat, autres que ceux découlant du seul fait que la compagnie est insolvable, est visée par une procédure intentée sous le régime de la présente loi ou ne s'est pas conformée à une obligation non pécuniaire.

Copie de l'ordonnance

(5) Le demandeur envoie une copie de l'ordonnance à toutes les parties au contrat.

1997, ch. 12, art. 124; 2005, ch. 47, art. 128; 2007, ch. 29, art. 107, ch. 36, art. 65 et 112.

11.31 [Abrogé, 2005, ch. 47, art. 128]

Fournisseurs essentiels

11.4 (1) Sur demande de la compagnie débitrice, le tribunal peut par ordonnance, sur préavis de la demande aux créanciers garantis qui seront vraisemblablement touchés par la charge ou sûreté, déclarer toute personne fournisseur essentiel de la compagnie s'il est convaincu que cette personne est un fournisseur de la compagnie et que les marchandises ou les services qu'elle lui fournit sont essentiels à la continuation de son exploitation.

Obligation de fourniture

(2) S'il fait une telle déclaration, le tribunal peut ordonner à la personne déclarée fournisseur essentiel de la compagnie de fournir à celle-ci les marchandises ou services qu'il précise, à des conditions compatibles avec les modalités qui régissaient antérieurement leur fourniture ou aux conditions qu'il estime indiquées.

Charge ou sûreté en faveur du fournisseur essentiel

(3) Le cas échéant, le tribunal déclare dans l'ordonnance que tout ou partie des biens de la compagnie sont grevés d'une charge ou sûreté, en faveur de la personne déclarée fournisseur essentiel, d'un montant correspondant à la valeur des marchandises ou services fournis en application de l'ordonnance.

Priorité

(4) Il peut préciser, dans l'ordonnance, que la charge ou sûreté a priorité sur toute réclamation des créanciers garantis de la compagnie.

1997, ch. 12, art. 124; 2000, ch. 30, art. 156; 2001, ch. 34, art. 33(A); 2005, ch. 47, art. 128; 2007, ch. 36, art. 65.

Révocation des administrateurs

11.5 (1) Sur demande d'un intéressé, le tribunal peut, par ordonnance, révoquer tout administrateur de la compagnie débitrice à l'égard de laquelle une ordonnance a été rendue sous le régime de la présente loi s'il est

is satisfied that the director is unreasonably impairing or is likely to unreasonably impair the possibility of a viable compromise or arrangement being made in respect of the company or is acting or is likely to act inappropriately as a director in the circumstances.

Filling vacancy

(2) The court may, by order, fill any vacancy created under subsection (1).

1997, c. 12, s. 124; 2005, c. 47, s. 128.

Security or charge relating to director's indemnification

11.51 (1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring that all or part of the property of the company is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in favour of any director or officer of the company to indemnify the director or officer against obligations and liabilities that they may incur as a director or officer of the company after the commencement of proceedings under this Act.

Priority

(2) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

Restriction — indemnification insurance

(3) The court may not make the order if in its opinion the company could obtain adequate indemnification insurance for the director or officer at a reasonable cost.

Negligence, misconduct or fault

(4) The court shall make an order declaring that the security or charge does not apply in respect of a specific obligation or liability incurred by a director or officer if in its opinion the obligation or liability was incurred as a result of the director's or officer's gross negligence or wilful misconduct or, in Quebec, the director's or officer's gross or intentional fault.

2005, c. 47, s. 128; 2007, c. 36, s. 66.

Court may order security or charge to cover certain costs

11.52 (1) On notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, the court may make an order declaring that all or part of the property of a debtor company is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in respect of the fees and expenses of

convaincu que ce dernier, sans raisons valables, compromet ou compromettra vraisemblablement la possibilité de conclure une transaction ou un arrangement viable ou agit ou agira vraisemblablement de façon inacceptable dans les circonstances.

Vacance

(2) Le tribunal peut, par ordonnance, combler toute vacance découlant de la révocation.

1997, ch. 12, art. 124; 2005, ch. 47, art. 128.

Biens grevés d'une charge ou sûreté en faveur d'administrateurs ou de dirigeants

11.51 (1) Sur demande de la compagnie débitrice, le tribunal peut par ordonnance, sur préavis de la demande aux créanciers garantis qui seront vraisemblablement touchés par la charge ou sûreté, déclarer que tout ou partie des biens de celle-ci sont grevés d'une charge ou sûreté, d'un montant qu'il estime indiqué, en faveur d'un ou de plusieurs administrateurs ou dirigeants pour l'exécution des obligations qu'ils peuvent contracter en cette qualité après l'introduction d'une procédure sous le régime de la présente loi.

Priorité

(2) Il peut préciser, dans l'ordonnance, que la charge ou sûreté a priorité sur toute réclamation des créanciers garantis de la compagnie.

Restriction — assurance

(3) Il ne peut toutefois rendre une telle ordonnance s'il estime que la compagnie peut souscrire, à un coût qu'il estime juste, une assurance permettant d'indemniser adéquatement les administrateurs ou dirigeants.

Négligence, inconduite ou faute

(4) Il déclare, dans l'ordonnance, que la charge ou sûreté ne vise pas les obligations que l'administrateur ou le dirigeant assume, selon lui, par suite de sa négligence grave ou de son inconduite délibérée ou, au Québec, par sa faute lourde ou intentionnelle.

2005, ch. 47, art. 128; 2007, ch. 36, art. 66.

Biens grevés d'une charge ou sûreté pour couvrir certains frais

11.52 (1) Le tribunal peut par ordonnance, sur préavis aux créanciers garantis qui seront vraisemblablement touchés par la charge ou sûreté, déclarer que tout ou partie des biens de la compagnie débitrice sont grevés d'une charge ou sûreté, d'un montant qu'il estime indiqué, pour couvrir :

- (a) the monitor, including the fees and expenses of any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the monitor in the performance of the monitor's duties;
- (b) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by the company for the purpose of proceedings under this Act; and
- (c) any financial, legal or other experts engaged by any other interested person if the court is satisfied that the security or charge is necessary for their effective participation in proceedings under this Act.

Priority

(2) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

2005, c. 47, s. 128; 2007, c. 36, s. 66.

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act matters

11.6 Notwithstanding the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*,

- (a) proceedings commenced under Part III of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* may be taken up and continued under this Act only if a proposal within the meaning of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* has not been filed under that Part; and
- (b) an application under this Act by a bankrupt may only be made with the consent of inspectors referred to in section 116 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* but no application may be made under this Act by a bankrupt whose bankruptcy has resulted from

(i) the operation of subsection 50.4(8) of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, or

(ii) the refusal or deemed refusal by the creditors or the court, or the annulment, of a proposal under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*.

1997, c. 12, s. 124.

Court to appoint monitor

11.7 (1) When an order is made on the initial application in respect of a debtor company, the court shall at the same time appoint a person to monitor the business and financial affairs of the company. The person so appointed must be a trustee, within the meaning of subsection 2(1) of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*.

a) les débours et honoraires du contrôleur, ainsi que ceux des experts — notamment en finance et en droit — dont il retient les services dans le cadre de ses fonctions;

b) ceux des experts dont la compagnie retient les services dans le cadre de procédures intentées sous le régime de la présente loi;

c) ceux des experts dont tout autre intéressé retient les services, si, à son avis, la charge ou sûreté était nécessaire pour assurer sa participation efficace aux procédures intentées sous le régime de la présente loi.

Priorité

(2) Il peut préciser, dans l'ordonnance, que la charge ou sûreté a priorité sur toute réclamation des créanciers garantis de la compagnie.

2005, ch. 47, art. 128; 2007, ch. 36, art. 66.

Lien avec la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*

11.6 Par dérogation à la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* :

a) les procédures intentées sous le régime de la partie III de cette loi ne peuvent être traitées et continuées sous le régime de la présente loi que si une proposition au sens de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* n'a pas été déposée au titre de cette même partie;

b) le failli ne peut faire une demande au titre de la présente loi qu'avec l'aval des inspecteurs visés à l'article 116 de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*, aucune demande ne pouvant toutefois être faite si la faillite découle, selon le cas :

(i) de l'application du paragraphe 50.4(8) de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*,

(ii) du rejet — effectif ou présumé — de sa proposition par les créanciers ou le tribunal ou de l'annulation de celle-ci au titre de cette loi.

1997, ch. 12, art. 124.

Nomination du contrôleur

11.7 (1) Le tribunal qui rend une ordonnance sur la demande initiale nomme une personne pour agir à titre de contrôleur des affaires financières ou autres de la compagnie débitrice visée par la demande. Seul un syndic au sens du paragraphe 2(1) de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* peut être nommé pour agir à titre de contrôleur.

Restrictions on who may be monitor

(2) Except with the permission of the court and on any conditions that the court may impose, no trustee may be appointed as monitor in relation to a company

(a) if the trustee is or, at any time during the two preceding years, was

(i) a director, an officer or an employee of the company,

(ii) related to the company or to any director or officer of the company, or

(iii) the auditor, accountant or legal counsel, or a partner or an employee of the auditor, accountant or legal counsel, of the company; or

(b) if the trustee is

(i) the trustee under a trust indenture issued by the company or any person related to the company, or the holder of a power of attorney under an act constituting a hypothec within the meaning of the *Civil Code of Quebec* that is granted by the company or any person related to the company, or

(ii) related to the trustee, or the holder of a power of attorney, referred to in subparagraph (i).

Court may replace monitor

(3) On application by a creditor of the company, the court may, if it considers it appropriate in the circumstances, replace the monitor by appointing another trustee, within the meaning of subsection 2(1) of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, to monitor the business and financial affairs of the company.

1997, c. 12, s. 124; 2005, c. 47, s. 129.

No personal liability in respect of matters before appointment

11.8 (1) Despite anything in federal or provincial law, if a monitor, in that position, carries on the business of a debtor company or continues the employment of a debtor company's employees, the monitor is not by reason of that fact personally liable in respect of a liability, including one as a successor employer,

(a) that is in respect of the employees or former employees of the company or a predecessor of the company or in respect of a pension plan for the benefit of those employees; and

(b) that exists before the monitor is appointed or that is calculated by reference to a period before the appointment.

Personnes qui ne peuvent agir à titre de contrôleur

(2) Sauf avec l'autorisation du tribunal et aux conditions qu'il peut fixer, ne peut être nommé pour agir à titre de contrôleur le syndic :

a) qui est ou, au cours des deux années précédentes, a été :

(i) administrateur, dirigeant ou employé de la compagnie,

(ii) lié à la compagnie ou à l'un de ses administrateurs ou dirigeants,

(iii) vérificateur, comptable ou conseiller juridique de la compagnie, ou employé ou associé de l'un ou l'autre;

b) qui est :

(i) le fondé de pouvoir aux termes d'un acte constitutif d'hypothèque — au sens du *Code civil du Québec* — émanant de la compagnie ou d'une personne liée à celle-ci ou le fiduciaire aux termes d'un acte de fiducie émanant de la compagnie ou d'une personne liée à celle-ci,

(ii) lié au fondé de pouvoir ou au fiduciaire visé au sous-alinéa (i).

Remplacement du contrôleur

(3) Sur demande d'un créancier de la compagnie, le tribunal peut, s'il l'estime indiqué dans les circonstances, remplacer le contrôleur en nommant un autre syndic, au sens du paragraphe 2(1) de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*, pour agir à ce titre à l'égard des affaires financières et autres de la compagnie.

1997, ch. 12, art. 124; 2005, ch. 47, art. 129.

Immunité

11.8 (1) Par dérogation au droit fédéral et provincial, le contrôleur qui, en cette qualité, continue l'exploitation de l'entreprise de la compagnie débitrice ou lui succède comme employeur est dégagé de toute responsabilité personnelle découlant de quelque obligation de la compagnie, notamment à titre d'employeur successeur, si celle-ci, à la fois :

a) l'oblige envers des employés ou anciens employés de la compagnie, ou de l'un de ses prédécesseurs, ou découle d'un régime de pension pour le bénéfice de ces employés;

b) existait avant sa nomination ou est calculée par référence à une période la précédant.

Status of liability

(2) A liability referred to in subsection (1) shall not rank as costs of administration.

Liability of other successor employers

(2.1) Subsection (1) does not affect the liability of a successor employer other than the monitor.

Liability in respect of environmental matters

(3) Notwithstanding anything in any federal or provincial law, a monitor is not personally liable in that position for any environmental condition that arose or environmental damage that occurred

- (a) before the monitor's appointment; or
- (b) after the monitor's appointment unless it is established that the condition arose or the damage occurred as a result of the monitor's gross negligence or wilful misconduct.

Reports, etc., still required

(4) Nothing in subsection (3) exempts a monitor from any duty to report or make disclosure imposed by a law referred to in that subsection.

Non-liability re certain orders

(5) Notwithstanding anything in any federal or provincial law but subject to subsection (3), where an order is made which has the effect of requiring a monitor to remedy any environmental condition or environmental damage affecting property involved in a proceeding under this Act, the monitor is not personally liable for failure to comply with the order, and is not personally liable for any costs that are or would be incurred by any person in carrying out the terms of the order,

- (a) if, within such time as is specified in the order, within ten days after the order is made if no time is so specified, within ten days after the appointment of the monitor, if the order is in effect when the monitor is appointed or during the period of the stay referred to in paragraph (b), the monitor
 - (i) complies with the order, or
 - (ii) on notice to the person who issued the order, abandons, disposes of or otherwise releases any interest in any real property affected by the condition or damage;
- (b) during the period of a stay of the order granted, on application made within the time specified in the order referred to in paragraph (a) or within ten days

Obligation exclue des frais

(2) L'obligation visée au paragraphe (1) ne fait pas partie des frais d'administration.

Responsabilité de l'employeur successeur

(2.1) Le paragraphe (1) ne dégage aucun employeur successeur, autre que le contrôleur, de sa responsabilité.

Responsabilité en matière d'environnement

(3) Par dérogation au droit fédéral et provincial, le contrôleur est, ès qualités, déchargé de toute responsabilité personnelle découlant de tout fait ou dommage lié à l'environnement survenu, avant ou après sa nomination, sauf celui causé par sa négligence grave ou son inconduite délibérée.

Rapports

(4) Le paragraphe (3) n'a pas pour effet de soustraire le contrôleur à l'obligation de faire rapport ou de communiquer des renseignements prévus par le droit applicable en l'espèce.

Immunité — ordonnances

(5) Par dérogation au droit fédéral et provincial, mais sous réserve du paragraphe (3), le contrôleur est, ès qualité, déchargé de toute responsabilité personnelle découlant du non-respect de toute ordonnance de réparation de tout fait ou dommage lié à l'environnement et touchant un bien visé par des procédures intentées au titre de la présente loi, et de toute responsabilité personnelle relativement aux frais engagés par toute personne exécutant l'ordonnance :

- a) si, dans les dix jours suivant l'ordonnance ou dans le délai fixé par celle-ci, dans les dix jours suivant sa nomination si l'ordonnance est alors en vigueur ou pendant la durée de la suspension visée à l'alinéa b) :
 - (i) il s'y conforme,
 - (ii) il abandonne, après avis à la personne ayant rendu l'ordonnance, tout intérêt dans l'immeuble en cause, en dispose ou s'en dessaisit;
- b) pendant la durée de la suspension de l'ordonnance qui est accordée, sur demande présentée dans les dix jours suivant l'ordonnance visée à l'alinéa a) ou dans le délai fixé par celle-ci, ou dans les dix jours suivant sa nomination si l'ordonnance est alors en vigueur :

after the order is made or within ten days after the appointment of the monitor, if the order is in effect when the monitor is appointed, by

(i) the court or body having jurisdiction under the law pursuant to which the order was made to enable the monitor to contest the order, or

(ii) the court having jurisdiction under this Act for the purposes of assessing the economic viability of complying with the order; or

(c) if the monitor had, before the order was made, abandoned or renounced any interest in any real property affected by the condition or damage.

Stay may be granted

(6) The court may grant a stay of the order referred to in subsection (5) on such notice and for such period as the court deems necessary for the purpose of enabling the monitor to assess the economic viability of complying with the order.

Costs for remedying not costs of administration

(7) Where the monitor has abandoned or renounced any interest in real property affected by the environmental condition or environmental damage, claims for costs of remedying the condition or damage shall not rank as costs of administration.

Priority of claims

(8) Any claim by Her Majesty in right of Canada or a province against a debtor company in respect of which proceedings have been commenced under this Act for costs of remedying any environmental condition or environmental damage affecting real property of the company is secured by a charge on the real property and on any other real property of the company that is contiguous thereto and that is related to the activity that caused the environmental condition or environmental damage, and the charge

(a) is enforceable in accordance with the law of the jurisdiction in which the real property is located, in the same way as a mortgage, hypothec or other security on real property; and

(b) ranks above any other claim, right or charge against the property, notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or anything in any other federal or provincial law.

Claim for clean-up costs

(9) A claim against a debtor company for costs of remedying any environmental condition or environmental

(i) soit par le tribunal ou l'autorité qui a compétence relativement à l'ordonnance, en vue de permettre au contrôleur de la contester,

(ii) soit par le tribunal qui a compétence en matière de faillite, en vue d'évaluer les conséquences économiques du respect de l'ordonnance;

c) si, avant que l'ordonnance ne soit rendue, il avait abandonné tout intérêt dans le bien immeuble en cause ou y avait renoncé, ou s'en était dessaisi.

Suspension

(6) En vue de permettre au contrôleur d'évaluer les conséquences économiques du respect de l'ordonnance, le tribunal peut en ordonner la suspension après avis et pour la période qu'il estime indiqués.

Frais

(7) Si le contrôleur a abandonné tout intérêt dans le bien immeuble en cause ou y a renoncé, les réclamations pour les frais de réparation du fait ou dommage lié à l'environnement et touchant le bien ne font pas partie des frais d'administration.

Priorité des réclamations

(8) Dans le cas où des procédures ont été intentées au titre de la présente loi contre une compagnie débitrice, toute réclamation de Sa Majesté du chef du Canada ou d'une province contre elle pour les frais de réparation du fait ou dommage lié à l'environnement et touchant un de ses biens immeubles est garantie par une sûreté sur le bien immeuble en cause et sur ceux qui sont contigus à celui où le dommage est survenu et qui sont liés à l'activité ayant causé le fait ou le dommage; la sûreté peut être exécutée selon le droit du lieu où est situé le bien comme s'il s'agissait d'une hypothèque ou autre garantie sur celui-ci et, par dérogation aux autres dispositions de la présente loi et à toute règle de droit fédéral et provincial, a priorité sur tout autre droit, charge ou réclamation visant le bien.

Précision

(9) La réclamation pour les frais de réparation du fait ou dommage lié à l'environnement et touchant un bien

damage affecting real property of the company shall be a claim under this Act, whether the condition arose or the damage occurred before or after the date on which proceedings under this Act were commenced.

1997, c. 12, s. 124; 2007, c. 36, s. 67.

Disclosure of financial information

11.9 (1) A court may, on any application under this Act in respect of a debtor company, by any person interested in the matter and on notice to any interested person who is likely to be affected by an order made under this section, make an order requiring that person to disclose any aspect of their economic interest in respect of a debtor company, on any terms that the court considers appropriate.

Factors to be considered

(2) In deciding whether to make an order, the court is to consider, among other things,

- (a)** whether the monitor approved the proposed disclosure;
- (b)** whether the disclosed information would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made in respect of the debtor company; and
- (c)** whether any interested person would be materially prejudiced as a result of the disclosure.

Meaning of *economic interest*

(3) In this section, *economic interest* includes

- (a)** a claim, an eligible financial contract, an option or a mortgage, hypothec, pledge, charge, lien or any other security interest;
- (b)** the consideration paid for any right or interest, including those referred to in paragraph (a); or
- (c)** any other prescribed right or interest.

2019, c. 29, s. 139.

Fixing deadlines

12 The court may fix deadlines for the purposes of voting and for the purposes of distributions under a compromise or arrangement.

R.S., 1985, c. C-36, s. 12; 1992, c. 27, s. 90; 1996, c. 6, s. 167; 2004, c. 25, s. 195; 2005, c. 47, s. 130; 2007, c. 36, s. 68.

Leave to appeal

13 Except in Yukon, any person dissatisfied with an order or a decision made under this Act may appeal from

immeuble de la compagnie débitrice constitue une réclamation, que la date du fait ou dommage soit antérieure ou postérieure à celle où des procédures sont intentées au titre de la présente loi.

1997, ch. 12, art. 124; 2007, ch. 36, art. 67.

Divulgence de renseignements financiers

11.9 (1) Sur demande de tout intéressé sous le régime de la présente loi à l'égard d'une compagnie débitrice et sur préavis de la demande à tout intéressé qui sera vraisemblablement touché par l'ordonnance rendue au titre du présent article, le tribunal peut ordonner à cet intéressé de divulguer tout intérêt économique qu'il a dans la compagnie débitrice, aux conditions que le tribunal estime indiquées.

Facteurs à prendre en considération

(2) Pour décider s'il rend l'ordonnance, le tribunal prend en considération, notamment, les facteurs suivants :

- a)** la question de savoir si le contrôleur acquiesce à la divulgation proposée;
- b)** la question de savoir si la divulgation proposée favorisera la conclusion d'une transaction ou d'un arrangement viable à l'égard de la compagnie débitrice;
- c)** la question de savoir si la divulgation proposée causera un préjudice sérieux à tout intéressé.

Définition de *intérêt économique*

(3) Au présent article, *intérêt économique* s'entend notamment :

- a)** d'une réclamation, d'un contrat financier admissible, d'une option ou d'une hypothèque, d'un gage, d'une charge, d'un nantissement, d'un privilège ou d'un autre droit qui grève le bien;
- b)** de la contrepartie payée pour l'obtention, notamment, de tout intérêt ou droit visés à l'alinéa a);
- c)** de tout autre intérêt ou droit prévus par règlement.

2019, ch. 29, art. 139.

Échéances

12 Le tribunal peut fixer des échéances aux fins de votation et aux fins de distribution aux termes d'une transaction ou d'un arrangement.

L.R. (1985), ch. C-36, art. 12; 1992, ch. 27, art. 90; 1996, ch. 6, art. 167; 2004, ch. 25, art. 195; 2005, ch. 47, art. 130; 2007, ch. 36, art. 68.

Permission d'en appeler

13 Sauf au Yukon, toute personne mécontente d'une ordonnance ou décision rendue en application de la

the order or decision on obtaining leave of the judge appealed from or of the court or a judge of the court to which the appeal lies and on such terms as to security and in other respects as the judge or court directs.

R.S., 1985, c. C-36, s. 13; 2002, c. 7, s. 134.

Court of appeal

14 (1) An appeal under section 13 lies to the highest court of final resort in or for the province in which the proceeding originated.

Practice

(2) All appeals under section 13 shall be regulated as far as possible according to the practice in other cases of the court appealed to, but no appeal shall be entertained unless, within twenty-one days after the rendering of the order or decision being appealed, or within such further time as the court appealed from, or, in Yukon, a judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, allows, the appellant has taken proceedings therein to perfect his or her appeal, and within that time he or she has made a deposit or given sufficient security according to the practice of the court appealed to that he or she will duly prosecute the appeal and pay such costs as may be awarded to the respondent and comply with any terms as to security or otherwise imposed by the judge giving leave to appeal.

R.S., 1985, c. C-36, s. 14; 2002, c. 7, s. 135.

Appeals

15 (1) An appeal lies to the Supreme Court of Canada on leave therefor being granted by that Court from the highest court of final resort in or for the province or territory in which the proceeding originated.

Jurisdiction of Supreme Court of Canada

(2) The Supreme Court of Canada shall have jurisdiction to hear and to decide according to its ordinary procedure any appeal under subsection (1) and to award costs.

Stay of proceedings

(3) No appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada shall operate as a stay of proceedings unless and to the extent ordered by that Court.

Security for costs

(4) The appellant in an appeal under subsection (1) shall not be required to provide any security for costs, but, unless he provides security for costs in an amount to be fixed by the Supreme Court of Canada, he shall not be awarded costs in the event of his success on the appeal.

présente loi peut en appeler après avoir obtenu la permission du juge dont la décision fait l'objet d'un appel ou après avoir obtenu la permission du tribunal ou d'un juge du tribunal auquel l'appel est porté et aux conditions que prescrit ce juge ou tribunal concernant le cautionnement et à d'autres égards.

L.R. (1985), ch. C-36, art. 13; 2002, ch. 7, art. 134.

Cour d'appel

14 (1) Cet appel doit être porté au tribunal de dernier ressort de la province où la procédure a pris naissance.

Pratique

(2) Tous ces appels sont régis autant que possible par la pratique suivie dans d'autres causes devant le tribunal saisi de l'appel; toutefois, aucun appel n'est recevable à moins que, dans le délai de vingt et un jours après qu'a été rendue l'ordonnance ou la décision faisant l'objet de l'appel, ou dans le délai additionnel que peut accorder le tribunal dont il est interjeté appel ou, au Yukon, un juge de la Cour suprême du Canada, l'appellant n'y ait pris des procédures pour parfaire son appel, et à moins que, dans ce délai, il n'ait fait un dépôt ou fourni un cautionnement suffisant selon la pratique du tribunal saisi de l'appel pour garantir qu'il poursuivra dûment l'appel et payera les frais qui peuvent être adjugés à l'intimé et se conformera aux conditions relatives au cautionnement ou autres qu'impose le juge donnant la permission d'en appeler.

L.R. (1985), ch. C-36, art. 14; 2002, ch. 7, art. 135.

Appels

15 (1) Un appel peut être interjeté à la Cour suprême du Canada sur autorisation à cet effet accordée par ce tribunal, du plus haut tribunal de dernier ressort de la province ou du territoire où la procédure a pris naissance.

Juridiction de la Cour suprême du Canada

(2) La Cour suprême du Canada a juridiction pour entendre et décider, selon sa procédure ordinaire, tout appel ainsi permis et pour adjuger des frais.

Suspension de procédures

(3) Un tel appel à la Cour suprême du Canada n'a pas pour effet de suspendre les procédures, à moins que ce tribunal ne l'ordonne et dans la mesure où il l'ordonne.

Cautionnement pour les frais

(4) L'appellant n'est pas tenu de fournir un cautionnement pour les frais; toutefois, à moins qu'il ne fournisse un cautionnement pour les frais au montant que fixe la Cour suprême du Canada, il ne lui est pas adjugé de frais en cas de réussite dans son appel.

Decision final

(5) The decision of the Supreme Court of Canada on any appeal under subsection (1) is final and conclusive.

R.S., c. C-25, s. 15; R.S., c. 44(1st Supp.), s. 10.

Order of court of one province

16 Every order made by the court in any province in the exercise of jurisdiction conferred by this Act in respect of any compromise or arrangement shall have full force and effect in all the other provinces and shall be enforced in the court of each of the other provinces in the same manner in all respects as if the order had been made by the court enforcing it.

R.S., c. C-25, s. 16.

Courts shall aid each other on request

17 All courts that have jurisdiction under this Act and the officers of those courts shall act in aid of and be auxiliary to each other in all matters provided for in this Act, and an order of a court seeking aid with a request to another court shall be deemed sufficient to enable the latter court to exercise in regard to the matters directed by the order such jurisdiction as either the court that made the request or the court to which the request is made could exercise in regard to similar matters within their respective jurisdictions.

R.S., c. C-25, s. 17.

18 [Repealed, 2005, c. 47, s. 131]

18.1 [Repealed, 2005, c. 47, s. 131]

18.2 [Repealed, 2005, c. 47, s. 131]

18.3 [Repealed, 2005, c. 47, s. 131]

18.4 [Repealed, 2005, c. 47, s. 131]

18.5 [Repealed, 2005, c. 47, s. 131]

PART III

General

Duty of Good Faith

Good faith

18.6 (1) Any interested person in any proceedings under this Act shall act in good faith with respect to those proceedings.

Décision finale

(5) La décision de la Cour suprême du Canada sur un tel appel est définitive et sans appel.

S.R., ch. C-25, art. 15; S.R., ch. 44(1^{er} suppl.), art. 10.

Ordonnance d'un tribunal d'une province

16 Toute ordonnance rendue par le tribunal d'une province dans l'exercice de la juridiction conférée par la présente loi à l'égard de quelque transaction ou arrangement a pleine vigueur et effet dans les autres provinces, et elle est appliquée devant le tribunal de chacune des autres provinces de la même manière, à tous égards, que si elle avait été rendue par le tribunal la faisant ainsi exécuter.

S.R., ch. C-25, art. 16.

Les tribunaux doivent s'entraider sur demande

17 Tous les tribunaux ayant juridiction sous le régime de la présente loi et les fonctionnaires de ces tribunaux sont tenus de s'entraider et de se faire les auxiliaires les uns des autres en toutes matières prévues par la présente loi, et une ordonnance du tribunal sollicitant de l'aide au moyen d'une demande à un autre tribunal est réputée suffisante pour permettre à ce dernier tribunal d'exercer, en ce qui concerne les questions prescrites par l'ordonnance, la juridiction que le tribunal ayant formulé la demande ou le tribunal auquel est adressée la demande pourrait exercer à l'égard de questions similaires dans les limites de leurs juridictions respectives.

S.R., ch. C-25, art. 17.

18 [Abrogé, 2005, ch. 47, art. 131]

18.1 [Abrogé, 2005, ch. 47, art. 131]

18.2 [Abrogé, 2005, ch. 47, art. 131]

18.3 [Abrogé, 2005, ch. 47, art. 131]

18.4 [Abrogé, 2005, ch. 47, art. 131]

18.5 [Abrogé, 2005, ch. 47, art. 131]

PARTIE III

Dispositions générales

Obligation d'agir de bonne foi

Bonne foi

18.6 (1) Tout intéressé est tenu d'agir de bonne foi dans le cadre d'une procédure intentée au titre de la présente loi.

Good faith — powers of court

(2) If the court is satisfied that an interested person fails to act in good faith, on application by an interested person, the court may make any order that it considers appropriate in the circumstances.

1997, c. 12, s. 125; 2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2019, c. 29, s. 140.

Claims

Claims that may be dealt with by a compromise or arrangement

19 (1) Subject to subsection (2), the only claims that may be dealt with by a compromise or arrangement in respect of a debtor company are

(a) claims that relate to debts or liabilities, present or future, to which the company is subject on the earlier of

(i) the day on which proceedings commenced under this Act, and

(ii) if the company filed a notice of intention under section 50.4 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or commenced proceedings under this Act with the consent of inspectors referred to in section 116 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, the date of the initial bankruptcy event within the meaning of section 2 of that Act; and

(b) claims that relate to debts or liabilities, present or future, to which the company may become subject before the compromise or arrangement is sanctioned by reason of any obligation incurred by the company before the earlier of the days referred to in subparagraphs (a)(i) and (ii).

Exception

(2) A compromise or arrangement in respect of a debtor company may not deal with any claim that relates to any of the following debts or liabilities unless the compromise or arrangement explicitly provides for the claim's compromise and the creditor in relation to that debt has voted for the acceptance of the compromise or arrangement:

(a) any fine, penalty, restitution order or other order similar in nature to a fine, penalty or restitution order, imposed by a court in respect of an offence;

(b) any award of damages by a court in civil proceedings in respect of

Bonne foi — pouvoirs du tribunal

(2) S'il est convaincu que l'intéressé n'agit pas de bonne foi, le tribunal peut, à la demande de tout intéressé, rendre toute ordonnance qu'il estime indiquée.

1997, ch. 12, art. 125; 2005, ch. 47, art. 131; 2019, ch. 29, art. 140.

Réclamations

Réclamations considérées dans le cadre des transactions ou arrangements

19 (1) Les seules réclamations qui peuvent être considérées dans le cadre d'une transaction ou d'un arrangement visant une compagnie débitrice sont :

a) celles se rapportant aux dettes et obligations, présentes ou futures, auxquelles la compagnie est assujettie à celle des dates ci-après qui est antérieure à l'autre :

(i) la date à laquelle une procédure a été intentée sous le régime de la présente loi à l'égard de la compagnie,

(ii) la date d'ouverture de la faillite, au sens de l'article 2 de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*, si elle a déposé un avis d'intention sous le régime de l'article 50.4 de cette loi ou qu'elle a intenté une procédure sous le régime de la présente loi avec le consentement des inspecteurs visés à l'article 116 de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*;

b) celles se rapportant aux dettes et obligations, présentes ou futures, auxquelles elle peut devenir assujettie avant l'acceptation de la transaction ou de l'arrangement, en raison d'une obligation contractée antérieurement à celle des dates mentionnées aux sous-alinéas a)(i) et (ii) qui est antérieure à l'autre.

Exception

(2) La réclamation se rapportant à l'une ou l'autre des dettes ou obligations ci-après ne peut toutefois être ainsi considérée, à moins que la transaction ou l'arrangement ne prévienne expressément la possibilité de transiger sur cette réclamation et que le créancier intéressé n'ait voté en faveur de la transaction ou de l'arrangement proposé :

a) toute ordonnance d'un tribunal imposant une amende, une pénalité, la restitution ou une autre peine semblable;

b) toute indemnité accordée en justice dans une affaire civile :

(i) bodily harm intentionally inflicted, or sexual assault, or

(ii) wrongful death resulting from an act referred to in subparagraph (i);

(c) any debt or liability arising out of fraud, embezzlement, misappropriation or defalcation while acting in a fiduciary capacity or, in Quebec, as a trustee or an administrator of the property of others;

(d) any debt or liability resulting from obtaining property or services by false pretences or fraudulent misrepresentation, other than a debt or liability of the company that arises from an equity claim; or

(e) any debt for interest owed in relation to an amount referred to in any of paragraphs (a) to (d).

R.S., 1985, c. C-36, s. 19; 1996, c. 6, s. 167; 2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2007, c. 36, s. 69.

Determination of amount of claims

20 (1) For the purposes of this Act, the amount represented by a claim of any secured or unsecured creditor is to be determined as follows:

(a) the amount of an unsecured claim is the amount

(i) in the case of a company in the course of being wound up under the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*, proof of which has been made in accordance with that Act,

(ii) in the case of a company that has made an authorized assignment or against which a bankruptcy order has been made under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, proof of which has been made in accordance with that Act, or

(iii) in the case of any other company, proof of which might be made under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, but if the amount so provable is not admitted by the company, the amount is to be determined by the court on summary application by the company or by the creditor; and

(b) the amount of a secured claim is the amount, proof of which might be made under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* if the claim were unsecured, but the amount if not admitted by the company is, in the case of a company subject to pending proceedings under the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act* or the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, to be established by proof in the same manner as an unsecured claim

(i) pour des lésions corporelles causées intentionnellement ou pour agression sexuelle,

(ii) pour décès découlant d'un acte visé au sous-alinéa (i);

(c) toute dette ou obligation résultant de la fraude, du détournement, de la concussion ou de l'abus de confiance alors que la compagnie agissait, au Québec, à titre de fiduciaire ou d'administrateur du bien d'autrui ou, dans les autres provinces, à titre de fiduciaire;

(d) toute dette ou obligation résultant de l'obtention de biens ou de services par des faux-semblants ou la présentation erronée et frauduleuse des faits, autre qu'une dette ou obligation de la compagnie qui découle d'une réclamation relative à des capitaux propres;

(e) toute dette relative aux intérêts dus à l'égard d'une somme visée à l'un des alinéas a) à d).

L.R. (1985), ch. C-36, art. 19; 1996, ch. 6, art. 167; 2005, ch. 47, art. 131; 2007, ch. 36, art. 69.

Détermination du montant de la réclamation

20 (1) Pour l'application de la présente loi, le montant de la réclamation d'un créancier garanti ou chirographaire est déterminé de la façon suivante :

(a) le montant d'une réclamation non garantie est celui :

(i) dans le cas d'une compagnie en voie de liquidation sous le régime de la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations*, dont la preuve a été établie en conformité avec cette loi,

(ii) dans le cas d'une compagnie qui a fait une cession autorisée ou à l'encontre de laquelle une ordonnance de faillite a été rendue sous le régime de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*, dont la preuve a été établie en conformité avec cette loi,

(iii) dans le cas de toute autre compagnie, dont la preuve peut être établie sous le régime de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*, mais si le montant ainsi prouvable n'est pas admis par la compagnie, il est déterminé par le tribunal sur demande sommaire de celle-ci ou du créancier;

(b) le montant d'une réclamation garantie est celui dont la preuve pourrait être établie sous le régime de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* si la réclamation n'était pas garantie, mais ce montant, s'il n'est pas admis par la compagnie, est, dans le cas où celle-ci est assujettie à une procédure pendante sous le régime de la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations* ou de

under the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act* or the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, as the case may be, and, in the case of any other company, the amount is to be determined by the court on summary application by the company or the creditor.

Admission of claims

(2) Despite subsection (1), the company may admit the amount of a claim for voting purposes under reserve of the right to contest liability on the claim for other purposes, and nothing in this Act, the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act* or the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* prevents a secured creditor from voting at a meeting of secured creditors or any class of them in respect of the total amount of a claim as admitted.

R.S., 1985, c. C-36, s. 20; 2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2007, c. 36, s. 70.

Law of set-off or compensation to apply

21 The law of set-off or compensation applies to all claims made against a debtor company and to all actions instituted by it for the recovery of debts due to the company in the same manner and to the same extent as if the company were plaintiff or defendant, as the case may be.

1997, c. 12, s. 126; 2005, c. 47, s. 131.

Classes of Creditors

Company may establish classes

22 (1) A debtor company may divide its creditors into classes for the purpose of a meeting to be held under section 4 or 5 in respect of a compromise or arrangement relating to the company and, if it does so, it is to apply to the court for approval of the division before the meeting is held.

Factors

(2) For the purpose of subsection (1), creditors may be included in the same class if their interests or rights are sufficiently similar to give them a commonality of interest, taking into account

- (a)** the nature of the debts, liabilities or obligations giving rise to their claims;
- (b)** the nature and rank of any security in respect of their claims;
- (c)** the remedies available to the creditors in the absence of the compromise or arrangement being sanctioned, and the extent to which the creditors would recover their claims by exercising those remedies; and

la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*, établi par preuve de la même manière qu'une réclamation non garantie sous le régime de l'une ou l'autre de ces lois, selon le cas, et, s'il s'agit de toute autre compagnie, il est déterminé par le tribunal sur demande sommaire de celle-ci ou du créancier.

Admission des réclamations

(2) Malgré le paragraphe (1), la compagnie peut admettre le montant d'une réclamation aux fins de votation sous réserve du droit de contester la responsabilité quant à la réclamation pour d'autres objets, et la présente loi, la *Loi sur les liquidations et les restructurations* et la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* n'ont pas pour effet d'empêcher un créancier garanti de voter à une assemblée de créanciers garantis ou d'une catégorie de ces derniers à l'égard du montant total d'une réclamation ainsi admis.

L.R. (1985), ch. C-36, art. 20; 2005, ch. 47, art. 131; 2007, ch. 36, art. 70.

Compensation

21 Les règles de compensation s'appliquent à toutes les réclamations produites contre la compagnie débitrice et à toutes les actions intentées par elle en vue du recouvrement de ses créances, comme si elle était demanderesse ou défenderesse, selon le cas.

1997, ch. 12, art. 126; 2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

Catégories de créanciers

Établissement des catégories de créanciers

22 (1) La compagnie débitrice peut établir des catégories de créanciers en vue des assemblées qui seront tenues au titre des articles 4 ou 5 relativement à une transaction ou un arrangement la visant; le cas échéant, elle demande au tribunal d'approuver ces catégories avant la tenue des assemblées.

Critères

(2) Pour l'application du paragraphe (1), peuvent faire partie de la même catégorie les créanciers ayant des droits ou intérêts à ce point semblables, compte tenu des critères énumérés ci-après, qu'on peut en conclure qu'ils ont un intérêt commun :

- a)** la nature des créances et obligations donnant lieu à leurs réclamations;
- b)** la nature et le rang de toute garantie qui s'y rattache;
- c)** les voies de droit ouvertes aux créanciers, abstraction faite de la transaction ou de l'arrangement, et la mesure dans laquelle il pourrait être satisfait à leurs réclamations s'ils s'en prévalaient;

(d) any further criteria, consistent with those set out in paragraphs (a) to (c), that are prescribed.

Related creditors

(3) A creditor who is related to the company may vote against, but not for, a compromise or arrangement relating to the company.

1997, c. 12, s. 126; 2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2007, c. 36, s. 71.

Class — creditors having equity claims

22.1 Despite subsection 22(1), creditors having equity claims are to be in the same class of creditors in relation to those claims unless the court orders otherwise and may not, as members of that class, vote at any meeting unless the court orders otherwise.

2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2007, c. 36, s. 71.

Monitors

Duties and functions

23 (1) The monitor shall

(a) except as otherwise ordered by the court, when an order is made on the initial application in respect of a debtor company,

(i) publish, without delay after the order is made, once a week for two consecutive weeks, or as otherwise directed by the court, in one or more newspapers in Canada specified by the court, a notice containing the prescribed information, and

(ii) within five days after the day on which the order is made,

(A) make the order publicly available in the prescribed manner,

(B) send, in the prescribed manner, a notice to every known creditor who has a claim against the company of more than \$1,000 advising them that the order is publicly available, and

(C) prepare a list, showing the names and addresses of those creditors and the estimated amounts of those claims, and make it publicly available in the prescribed manner;

(b) review the company's cash-flow statement as to its reasonableness and file a report with the court on the monitor's findings;

d) tous autres critères réglementaires compatibles avec ceux énumérés aux alinéas a) à c).

Créancier lié

(3) Le créancier lié à la compagnie peut voter contre, mais non pour, l'acceptation de la transaction ou de l'arrangement.

1997, ch. 12, art. 126; 2005, ch. 47, art. 131; 2007, ch. 36, art. 71.

Catégorie de créanciers ayant des réclamations relatives à des capitaux propres

22.1 Malgré le paragraphe 22(1), les créanciers qui ont des réclamations relatives à des capitaux propres font partie d'une même catégorie de créanciers relativement à ces réclamations, sauf ordonnance contraire du tribunal, et ne peuvent à ce titre voter à aucune assemblée, sauf ordonnance contraire du tribunal.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131; 2007, ch. 36, art. 71.

Contrôleurs

Attributions

23 (1) Le contrôleur est tenu :

a) à moins que le tribunal n'en ordonne autrement, lorsqu'il rend une ordonnance à l'égard de la demande initiale visant une compagnie débitrice :

(i) de publier, sans délai après le prononcé de l'ordonnance, une fois par semaine pendant deux semaines consécutives, ou selon les modalités qui y sont prévues, dans le journal ou les journaux au Canada qui y sont précisés, un avis contenant les renseignements réglementaires,

(ii) dans les cinq jours suivant la date du prononcé de l'ordonnance :

(A) de rendre l'ordonnance publique selon les modalités réglementaires,

(B) d'envoyer un avis, selon les modalités réglementaires, à chaque créancier connu ayant une réclamation supérieure à mille dollars les informant que l'ordonnance a été rendue publique,

(C) d'établir la liste des nom et adresse de chacun de ces créanciers et des montants estimés des réclamations et de la rendre publique selon les modalités réglementaires;

b) de réviser l'état de l'évolution de l'encaisse de la compagnie, en ce qui a trait à sa justification, et de déposer auprès du tribunal un rapport où il présente ses conclusions;

(c) make, or cause to be made, any appraisal or investigation the monitor considers necessary to determine with reasonable accuracy the state of the company's business and financial affairs and the cause of its financial difficulties or insolvency and file a report with the court on the monitor's findings;

(d) file a report with the court on the state of the company's business and financial affairs — containing the prescribed information, if any —

(i) without delay after ascertaining a material adverse change in the company's projected cash-flow or financial circumstances,

(ii) not later than 45 days, or any longer period that the court may specify, after the day on which each of the company's fiscal quarters ends, and

(iii) at any other time that the court may order;

(d.1) file a report with the court on the state of the company's business and financial affairs — containing the monitor's opinion as to the reasonableness of a decision, if any, to include in a compromise or arrangement a provision that sections 38 and 95 to 101 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* do not apply in respect of the compromise or arrangement and containing the prescribed information, if any — at least seven days before the day on which the meeting of creditors referred to in section 4 or 5 is to be held;

(e) advise the company's creditors of the filing of the report referred to in any of paragraphs (b) to (d.1);

(f) file with the Superintendent of Bankruptcy, in the prescribed manner and at the prescribed time, a copy of the documents specified in the regulations;

(f.1) for the purpose of defraying the expenses of the Superintendent of Bankruptcy incurred in performing his or her functions under this Act, pay the prescribed levy at the prescribed time to the Superintendent for deposit with the Receiver General;

(g) attend court proceedings held under this Act that relate to the company, and meetings of the company's creditors, if the monitor considers that his or her attendance is necessary for the fulfilment of his or her duties or functions;

(h) if the monitor is of the opinion that it would be more beneficial to the company's creditors if proceedings in respect of the company were taken under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, so advise the court without delay after coming to that opinion;

(c) de faire ou de faire faire toute évaluation ou investigation qu'il estime nécessaire pour établir l'état des affaires financières et autres de la compagnie et les causes des difficultés financières ou de l'insolvabilité de celle-ci, et de déposer auprès du tribunal un rapport où il présente ses conclusions;

(d) de déposer auprès du tribunal un rapport portant sur l'état des affaires financières et autres de la compagnie et contenant les renseignements réglementaires :

(i) dès qu'il note un changement défavorable important au chapitre des projections relatives à l'ensemble ou de la situation financière de la compagnie,

(ii) au plus tard quarante-cinq jours — ou le nombre de jours supérieur que le tribunal fixe — après la fin de chaque trimestre d'exercice,

(iii) à tout autre moment fixé par ordonnance du tribunal;

(d.1) de déposer auprès du tribunal, au moins sept jours avant la date de la tenue de l'assemblée des créanciers au titre des articles 4 ou 5, un rapport portant sur l'état des affaires financières et autres de la compagnie, contenant notamment son opinion sur le caractère raisonnable de la décision d'inclure dans la transaction ou l'arrangement une disposition prévoyant la non-application à celle-ci des articles 38 et 95 à 101 de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*, et contenant les renseignements réglementaires;

(e) d'informer les créanciers de la compagnie du dépôt du rapport visé à l'un ou l'autre des alinéas b) à d.1);

(f) de déposer auprès du surintendant des faillites, selon les modalités réglementaires, de temps et autre, une copie des documents précisés par règlement;

(f.1) afin de défrayer le surintendant des faillites des dépenses engagées par lui dans l'exercice de ses attributions prévues par la présente loi, de lui verser, pour dépôt auprès du receveur général, le prélèvement réglementaire, et ce au moment prévu par les règlements;

(g) d'assister aux audiences du tribunal tenues dans le cadre de toute procédure intentée sous le régime de la présente loi relativement à la compagnie et aux assemblées de créanciers de celle-ci, s'il estime que sa présence est nécessaire à l'exercice de ses attributions;

(h) dès qu'il conclut qu'il serait plus avantageux pour les créanciers qu'une procédure visant la compagnie

(i) advise the court on the reasonableness and fairness of any compromise or arrangement that is proposed between the company and its creditors;

(j) make the prescribed documents publicly available in the prescribed manner and at the prescribed time and provide the company's creditors with information as to how they may access those documents; and

(k) carry out any other functions in relation to the company that the court may direct.

Monitor not liable

(2) If the monitor acts in good faith and takes reasonable care in preparing the report referred to in any of paragraphs (1)(b) to (d.1), the monitor is not liable for loss or damage to any person resulting from that person's reliance on the report.

2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2007, c. 36, s. 72.

Right of access

24 For the purposes of monitoring the company's business and financial affairs, the monitor shall have access to the company's property, including the premises, books, records, data, including data in electronic form, and other financial documents of the company, to the extent that is necessary to adequately assess the company's business and financial affairs.

2005, c. 47, s. 131.

Obligation to act honestly and in good faith

25 In exercising any of his or her powers or in performing any of his or her duties and functions, the monitor must act honestly and in good faith and comply with the Code of Ethics referred to in section 13.5 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*.

2005, c. 47, s. 131.

Powers, Duties and Functions of Superintendent of Bankruptcy

Public records

26 (1) The Superintendent of Bankruptcy must keep, or cause to be kept, in the form that he or she considers appropriate and for the prescribed period, a public record of prescribed information relating to proceedings under this Act. On request, and on payment of the prescribed fee, the Superintendent of Bankruptcy must provide, or cause to be provided, any information contained in that public record.

soit intentée sous le régime de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*, d'en aviser le tribunal;

i) de conseiller le tribunal sur le caractère juste et équitable de toute transaction ou de tout arrangement proposés entre la compagnie et ses créanciers;

j) de rendre publics selon les modalités réglementaires, de temps et autres, les documents réglementaires et de fournir aux créanciers de la compagnie des renseignements sur les modalités d'accès à ces documents;

k) d'accomplir à l'égard de la compagnie tout ce que le tribunal lui ordonne de faire.

Non-responsabilité du contrôleur

(2) S'il agit de bonne foi et prend toutes les précautions voulues pour bien établir le rapport visé à l'un ou l'autre des alinéas (1)b) à d.1), le contrôleur ne peut être tenu pour responsable des dommages ou pertes subis par la personne qui s'y fie.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131; 2007, ch. 36, art. 72.

Droit d'accès aux biens

24 Dans le cadre de la surveillance des affaires financières et autres de la compagnie et dans la mesure où cela s'impose pour lui permettre de les évaluer adéquatement, le contrôleur a accès aux biens de celle-ci, notamment les locaux, livres, données sur support électronique ou autre, registres et autres documents financiers.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

Diligence

25 Le contrôleur doit, dans l'exercice de ses attributions, agir avec intégrité et de bonne foi et se conformer au code de déontologie mentionné à l'article 13.5 de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

Attributions du surintendant des faillites

Registres publics

26 (1) Le surintendant des faillites conserve ou fait conserver, en la forme qu'il estime indiquée et pendant la période réglementaire, un registre public contenant des renseignements réglementaires sur les procédures intentées sous le régime de la présente loi. Il fournit ou voit à ce qu'il soit fourni à quiconque le demande tous renseignements figurant au registre, sur paiement des droits réglementaires.

Other records

(2) The Superintendent of Bankruptcy must keep, or cause to be kept, in the form that he or she considers appropriate and for the prescribed period, any other records relating to the administration of this Act that he or she considers appropriate.

Agreement to provide compilation

(3) The Superintendent of Bankruptcy may enter into an agreement to provide a compilation of all or part of the information that is contained in the public record.

2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2007, c. 36, s. 73.

Applications to court and right to intervene

27 The Superintendent of Bankruptcy may apply to the court to review the appointment or conduct of a monitor and may intervene, as though he or she were a party, in any matter or proceeding in court relating to the appointment or conduct of a monitor.

2005, c. 47, s. 131.

Complaints

28 The Superintendent of Bankruptcy must receive and keep a record of all complaints regarding the conduct of monitors.

2005, c. 47, s. 131.

Investigations

29 (1) The Superintendent of Bankruptcy may make, or cause to be made, any inquiry or investigation regarding the conduct of monitors that he or she considers appropriate.

Rights

(2) For the purpose of the inquiry or investigation, the Superintendent of Bankruptcy or any person whom he or she appoints for the purpose

(a) shall have access to and the right to examine and make copies of the books, records, data, documents or papers — including those in electronic form — in the possession or under the control of a monitor under this Act; and

(b) may, with the leave of the court granted on an *ex parte* application, examine the books, records, data, documents or papers — including those in electronic form — relating to any compromise or arrangement in respect of which this Act applies that are in the possession or under the control of any other person designated in the order granting the leave, and for that purpose may under a warrant from the court enter and search any premises.

Autres dossiers

(2) Il conserve également, ou fait conserver, en la forme qu'il estime indiquée et pendant la période réglementaire, les autres dossiers qu'il estime indiqués concernant l'application de la présente loi.

Accord visant la fourniture d'une compilation

(3) Enfin, il peut conclure un accord visant la fourniture d'une compilation de tout ou partie des renseignements figurant au registre public.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131; 2007, ch. 36, art. 73.

Demande au tribunal et intervention

27 Le surintendant des faillites peut demander au tribunal d'examiner la nomination ou la conduite de tout contrôleur et intervenir dans toute affaire ou procédure devant le tribunal se rapportant à ces nomination ou conduite comme s'il y était partie.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

Plaintes

28 Le surintendant des faillites reçoit et note toutes les plaintes sur la conduite de tout contrôleur.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

Investigations et enquêtes

29 (1) Le surintendant des faillites effectue ou fait effectuer au sujet de la conduite de tout contrôleur les investigations ou les enquêtes qu'il estime indiquées.

Droit d'accès

(2) Pour les besoins de ces investigations ou enquêtes, le surintendant des faillites ou la personne qu'il nomme à cette fin :

a) a accès aux livres, registres, données, documents ou papiers, sur support électronique ou autre, se trouvant, en vertu de la présente loi, en la possession ou sous la responsabilité du contrôleur et a droit de les examiner et d'en tirer des copies;

b) peut, avec la permission du tribunal donnée *ex parte*, examiner les livres, registres, données, documents ou papiers, sur support électronique ou autre, qui sont en la possession ou sous la responsabilité de toute autre personne désignée dans l'ordonnance et se rapportent aux transactions ou arrangements auxquels la présente loi s'applique et peut, en vertu d'un mandat du tribunal et aux fins d'examen, pénétrer dans tout lieu et y faire des perquisitions.

Staff

(3) The Superintendent of Bankruptcy may engage the services of persons having technical or specialized knowledge, and persons to provide administrative services, to assist the Superintendent of Bankruptcy in conducting an inquiry or investigation, and may establish the terms and conditions of their engagement. The remuneration and expenses of those persons, when certified by the Superintendent of Bankruptcy, are payable out of the appropriation for the office of the Superintendent.

2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2007, c. 36, s. 74.

Powers in relation to licence

30 (1) If, after making or causing to be made an inquiry or investigation into the conduct of a monitor, it appears to the Superintendent of Bankruptcy that the monitor has not fully complied with this Act and its regulations or that it is in the public interest to do so, the Superintendent of Bankruptcy may

- (a)** cancel or suspend the monitor's licence as a trustee under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*; or
- (b)** place any condition or limitation on the licence that he or she considers appropriate.

Notice to trustee

(2) Before deciding whether to exercise any of the powers referred to in subsection (1), the Superintendent of Bankruptcy shall send the monitor written notice of the powers that the Superintendent may exercise and the reasons why they may be exercised and afford the monitor a reasonable opportunity for a hearing.

Summons

(3) The Superintendent of Bankruptcy may, for the purpose of the hearing, issue a summons requiring the person named in it

- (a)** to appear at the time and place mentioned in it;
- (b)** to testify to all matters within their knowledge relative to the subject matter of the inquiry or investigation into the conduct of the monitor; and
- (c)** to bring and produce any books, records, data, documents or papers — including those in electronic form — in their possession or under their control relative to the subject matter of the inquiry or investigation.

Effect throughout Canada

(4) A person may be summoned from any part of Canada by virtue of a summons issued under subsection (3).

Personnel

(3) Le surintendant des faillites peut retenir les services des experts ou autres personnes et du personnel administratif dont il estime le concours utile à l'investigation ou l'enquête et fixer leurs fonctions et leurs conditions d'emploi. La rémunération et les indemnités dues à ces personnes sont, une fois certifiées par le surintendant, imputables sur les crédits affectés à son bureau.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131; 2007, ch. 36, art. 74.

Décision relative à la licence

30 (1) Si, au terme d'une investigation ou d'une enquête sur la conduite du contrôleur, il estime que ce dernier n'a pas observé la présente loi ou les règlements ou que l'intérêt public le justifie, le surintendant des faillites peut annuler ou suspendre la licence que le contrôleur détient, en vertu de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*, à titre de syndic ou soumettre sa licence aux conditions ou restrictions qu'il estime indiquées.

Avis au syndic

(2) Avant de prendre l'une des mesures visées au paragraphe (1), le surintendant des faillites envoie au syndic un avis écrit et motivé de la ou des mesures qu'il peut prendre et lui donne la possibilité de se faire entendre.

Convocation de témoins

(3) Le surintendant des faillites peut, aux fins d'audition, convoquer des témoins par assignation leur enjoignant :

- a)** de comparaître aux date, heure et lieu indiqués;
- b)** de témoigner sur tous faits connus d'eux se rapportant à l'investigation ou à l'enquête sur la conduite du contrôleur;
- c)** de produire tous livres, registres, données, documents ou papiers, sur support électronique ou autre, qui sont pertinents et dont ils ont la possession ou la responsabilité.

Effet

(4) Les assignations visées au paragraphe (3) ont effet sur tout le territoire canadien.

Fees and allowances

(5) Any person summoned under subsection (3) is entitled to receive the like fees and allowances for so doing as if summoned to attend before the Federal Court.

Procedure at hearing

(6) At the hearing, the Superintendent of Bankruptcy

- (a)** has the power to administer oaths;
- (b)** is not bound by any legal or technical rules of evidence in conducting the hearing;
- (c)** shall deal with the matters set out in the notice of the hearing as informally and expeditiously as the circumstances and a consideration of fairness permit; and
- (d)** shall cause a summary of any oral evidence to be made in writing.

Record

(7) The notice referred to in subsection (2) and, if applicable, the summary of oral evidence referred to in paragraph (6)(d), together with any documentary evidence that the Superintendent of Bankruptcy receives in evidence, form the record of the hearing, and that record and the hearing are public unless the Superintendent of Bankruptcy is satisfied that personal or other matters that may be disclosed are of such a nature that the desirability of avoiding public disclosure of those matters, in the interest of a third party or in the public interest, outweighs the desirability of the access by the public to information about those matters.

Decision

(8) The decision of the Superintendent of Bankruptcy after the hearing, together with the reasons for the decision, must be given in writing to the monitor not later than three months after the conclusion of the hearing, and is public.

Review by Federal Court

(9) A decision of the Superintendent of Bankruptcy given under subsection (8) is deemed to be a decision of a federal board, commission or other tribunal that may be reviewed and set aside under the *Federal Courts Act*.

2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2007, c. 36, s. 75.

Delegation

31 (1) The Superintendent of Bankruptcy may, in writing, authorize any person to exercise or perform, subject to any terms and conditions that he or she may specify in the authorization, any of the powers, duties or functions

Frais et indemnités

(5) Toute personne assignée reçoit les frais et indemnités accordés aux témoins assignés devant la Cour fédérale.

Procédure de l'audition

(6) Lors de l'audition, le surintendant :

- a)** peut faire prêter serment;
- b)** n'est lié par aucune règle de droit ou de procédure en matière de preuve;
- c)** règle les questions exposées dans l'avis d'audition avec célérité et sans formalisme, eu égard aux circonstances et à l'équité;
- d)** fait établir un résumé écrit de toute preuve orale.

Dossier et audition

(7) L'audition et le dossier de celle-ci sont publics à moins que le surintendant ne juge que la nature des révélations possibles sur des questions personnelles ou autres est telle que, en l'occurrence, l'intérêt d'un tiers ou l'intérêt public l'emporte sur le droit du public à l'information. Le dossier comprend l'avis prévu au paragraphe (2), le résumé de la preuve orale prévu à l'alinéa (6)d) et la preuve documentaire reçue par le surintendant des faillites.

Décision

(8) La décision du surintendant des faillites est rendue par écrit, motivée et remise au contrôleur dans les trois mois suivant la clôture de l'audition, et elle est publique.

Examen de la Cour fédérale

(9) La décision du surintendant, rendue et remise conformément au paragraphe (8), est assimilée à celle d'un office fédéral et est soumise au pouvoir d'examen et d'annulation prévu par la *Loi sur les Cours fédérales*.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131; 2007, ch. 36, art. 75.

Pouvoir de délégation

31 (1) Le surintendant des faillites peut, par écrit, selon les modalités qu'il précise, déléguer les attributions que lui confèrent les articles 29 et 30.

of the Superintendent of Bankruptcy under sections 29 and 30.

Notification to monitor

(2) If the Superintendent of Bankruptcy delegates in accordance with subsection (1), the Superintendent or the delegate must give notice of the delegation in the prescribed manner to any monitor who may be affected by the delegation.

2005, c. 47, s. 131.

Agreements

Disclaimer or rescission of agreements

32 (1) Subject to subsections (2) and (3), a debtor company may — on notice given in the prescribed form and manner to the other parties to the agreement and the monitor — disclaim or rescind any agreement to which the company is a party on the day on which proceedings commence under this Act. The company may not give notice unless the monitor approves the proposed disclaimer or rescission.

Court may prohibit disclaimer or rescission

(2) Within 15 days after the day on which the company gives notice under subsection (1), a party to the agreement may, on notice to the other parties to the agreement and the monitor, apply to a court for an order that the agreement is not to be disclaimed or rescinded.

Court-ordered disclaimer or rescission

(3) If the monitor does not approve the proposed disclaimer or rescission, the company may, on notice to the other parties to the agreement and the monitor, apply to a court for an order that the agreement be disclaimed or rescinded.

Factors to be considered

(4) In deciding whether to make the order, the court is to consider, among other things,

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

Date of disclaimer or rescission

(5) An agreement is disclaimed or rescinded

Notification

(2) En cas de délégation, le surintendant des faillites ou le délégué en avise, de la manière réglementaire, tout contrôleur qui pourrait être touché par cette mesure.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

Contrats et conventions collectives

Résiliation de contrats

32 (1) Sous réserve des paragraphes (2) et (3), la compagnie débitrice peut — sur préavis donné en la forme et de la manière réglementaires aux autres parties au contrat et au contrôleur et après avoir obtenu l'acquiescement de celui-ci relativement au projet de résiliation — résilier tout contrat auquel elle est partie à la date à laquelle une procédure a été intentée sous le régime de la présente loi.

Contestation

(2) Dans les quinze jours suivant la date à laquelle la compagnie donne le préavis mentionné au paragraphe (1), toute partie au contrat peut, sur préavis aux autres parties au contrat et au contrôleur, demander au tribunal d'ordonner que le contrat ne soit pas résilié.

Absence d'acquiescement du contrôleur

(3) Si le contrôleur n'acquiesce pas au projet de résiliation, la compagnie peut, sur préavis aux autres parties au contrat et au contrôleur, demander au tribunal d'ordonner la résiliation du contrat.

Facteurs à prendre en considération

(4) Pour décider s'il rend l'ordonnance, le tribunal prend en considération, entre autres, les facteurs suivants :

- a)** l'acquiescement du contrôleur au projet de résiliation, le cas échéant;
- b)** la question de savoir si la résiliation favorisera la conclusion d'une transaction ou d'un arrangement viable à l'égard de la compagnie;
- c)** le risque que la résiliation puisse vraisemblablement causer de sérieuses difficultés financières à une partie au contrat.

Résiliation

(5) Le contrat est résilié :

(a) if no application is made under subsection (2), on the day that is 30 days after the day on which the company gives notice under subsection (1);

(b) if the court dismisses the application made under subsection (2), on the day that is 30 days after the day on which the company gives notice under subsection (1) or on any later day fixed by the court; or

(c) if the court orders that the agreement is disclaimed or resiliated under subsection (3), on the day that is 30 days after the day on which the company gives notice or on any later day fixed by the court.

Intellectual property

(6) If the company has granted a right to use intellectual property to a party to an agreement, the disclaimer or resiliation does not affect the party's right to use the intellectual property — including the party's right to enforce an exclusive use — during the term of the agreement, including any period for which the party extends the agreement as of right, as long as the party continues to perform its obligations under the agreement in relation to the use of the intellectual property.

Loss related to disclaimer or resiliation

(7) If an agreement is disclaimed or resiliated, a party to the agreement who suffers a loss in relation to the disclaimer or resiliation is considered to have a provable claim.

Reasons for disclaimer or resiliation

(8) A company shall, on request by a party to the agreement, provide in writing the reasons for the proposed disclaimer or resiliation within five days after the day on which the party requests them.

Exceptions

(9) This section does not apply in respect of

- (a)** an eligible financial contract;
- (b)** a collective agreement;
- (c)** a financing agreement if the company is the borrower; or
- (d)** a lease of real property or of an immovable if the company is the lessor.

2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2007, c. 29, s. 108, c. 36, ss. 76, 112.

a) trente jours après la date à laquelle la compagnie donne le préavis mentionné au paragraphe (1), si aucune demande n'est présentée en vertu du paragraphe (2);

b) trente jours après la date à laquelle la compagnie donne le préavis mentionné au paragraphe (1) ou à la date postérieure fixée par le tribunal, si ce dernier rejette la demande présentée en vertu du paragraphe (2);

c) trente jours après la date à laquelle la compagnie donne le préavis mentionné au paragraphe (3) ou à la date postérieure fixée par le tribunal, si ce dernier ordonne la résiliation du contrat en vertu de ce paragraphe.

Propriété intellectuelle

(6) Si la compagnie a autorisé par contrat une personne à utiliser un droit de propriété intellectuelle, la résiliation n'empêche pas la personne de l'utiliser ni d'en faire respecter l'utilisation exclusive, à condition qu'elle respecte ses obligations contractuelles à l'égard de l'utilisation de ce droit, et ce pour la période prévue au contrat et pour toute période additionnelle dont elle peut et décide de se prévaloir de son propre gré.

Pertes découlant de la résiliation

(7) En cas de résiliation du contrat, toute partie à celui-ci qui subit des pertes découlant de la résiliation est réputée avoir une réclamation prouvable.

Motifs de la résiliation

(8) Dans les cinq jours qui suivent la date à laquelle une partie au contrat le lui demande, la compagnie lui expose par écrit les motifs de son projet de résiliation.

Exceptions

(9) Le présent article ne s'applique pas aux contrats suivants :

- a)** les contrats financiers admissibles;
- b)** les conventions collectives;
- c)** les accords de financement au titre desquels la compagnie est l'emprunteur;
- d)** les baux d'immeubles ou de biens réels au titre desquels la compagnie est le locateur.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131; 2007, ch. 29, art. 108, ch. 36, art. 76 et 112.

Collective agreements

33 (1) If proceedings under this Act have been commenced in respect of a debtor company, any collective agreement that the company has entered into as the employer remains in force, and may not be altered except as provided in this section or under the laws of the jurisdiction governing collective bargaining between the company and the bargaining agent.

Application for authorization to serve notice to bargain

(2) A debtor company that is a party to a collective agreement and that is unable to reach a voluntary agreement with the bargaining agent to revise any of the provisions of the collective agreement may, on giving five days notice to the bargaining agent, apply to the court for an order authorizing the company to serve a notice to bargain under the laws of the jurisdiction governing collective bargaining between the company and the bargaining agent.

Conditions for issuance of order

(3) The court may issue the order only if it is satisfied that

- (a)** a viable compromise or arrangement could not be made in respect of the company, taking into account the terms of the collective agreement;
- (b)** the company has made good faith efforts to renegotiate the provisions of the collective agreement; and
- (c)** a failure to issue the order is likely to result in irreparable damage to the company.

No delay on vote

(4) The vote of the creditors in respect of a compromise or an arrangement may not be delayed solely because the period provided in the laws of the jurisdiction governing collective bargaining between the company and the bargaining agent has not expired.

Claims arising from termination or amendment

(5) If the parties to the collective agreement agree to revise the collective agreement after proceedings have been commenced under this Act in respect of the company, the bargaining agent that is a party to the agreement is deemed to have a claim, as an unsecured creditor, for an amount equal to the value of concessions granted by the bargaining agent with respect to the remaining term of the collective agreement.

Conventions collectives

33 (1) Si une procédure a été intentée sous le régime de la présente loi à l'égard d'une compagnie débitrice, toute convention collective que celle-ci a conclue à titre d'employeur demeure en vigueur et ne peut être modifiée qu'en conformité avec le présent article ou les règles de droit applicables aux négociations entre les parties.

Demande pour que le tribunal autorise le début de négociations en vue de la révision

(2) Si elle est partie à une convention collective à titre d'employeur et qu'elle ne peut s'entendre librement avec l'agent négociateur sur la révision de celle-ci, la compagnie débitrice peut, après avoir donné un préavis de cinq jours à l'agent négociateur, demander au tribunal de l'autoriser, par ordonnance, à donner à l'agent négociateur un avis de négociations collectives pour que celui-ci entame les négociations collectives en vue de la révision de la convention collective conformément aux règles de droit applicables aux négociations entre les parties.

Cas où l'autorisation est accordée

(3) Le tribunal ne rend l'ordonnance que s'il est convaincu, à la fois :

- a)** qu'une transaction ou un arrangement viable à l'égard de la compagnie ne pourrait être fait compte tenu des dispositions de la convention collective;
- b)** que la compagnie a tenté de bonne foi d'en négocier de nouveau les dispositions;
- c)** qu'elle subirait vraisemblablement des dommages irréparables si l'ordonnance n'était pas rendue.

Vote sur la proposition

(4) Le vote des créanciers sur la transaction ou l'arrangement ne peut être retardé pour la seule raison que le délai imparti par les règles de droit applicables aux négociations collectives entre les parties à la convention collective n'est pas expiré.

Réclamation consécutive à la révision

(5) Si les parties parviennent à une entente sur la révision de la convention collective après qu'une procédure a été intentée sous le régime de la présente loi à l'égard d'une compagnie, l'agent négociateur en cause est réputé avoir une réclamation à titre de créancier chirographaire pour une somme équivalant à la valeur des concessions accordées à l'égard de la période non écoulée de la convention.

Order to disclose information

(6) On the application of the bargaining agent and on notice to the person to whom the application relates, the court may, subject to any terms and conditions it specifies, make an order requiring the person to make available to the bargaining agent any information specified by the court in the person's possession or control that relates to the company's business or financial affairs and that is relevant to the collective bargaining between the company and the bargaining agent. The court may make the order only after the company has been authorized to serve a notice to bargain under subsection (2).

Parties

(7) For the purpose of this section, the parties to a collective agreement are the debtor company and the bargaining agent that are bound by the collective agreement.

Unrevised collective agreements remain in force

(8) For greater certainty, any collective agreement that the company and the bargaining agent have not agreed to revise remains in force, and the court shall not alter its terms.

2005, c. 47, s. 131.

Certain rights limited

34 (1) No person may terminate or amend, or claim an accelerated payment or forfeiture of the term under, any agreement, including a security agreement, with a debtor company by reason only that proceedings commenced under this Act or that the company is insolvent.

Lease

(2) If the agreement referred to in subsection (1) is a lease, the lessor may not terminate or amend the lease by reason only that proceedings commenced under this Act, that the company is insolvent or that the company has not paid rent in respect of any period before the commencement of those proceedings.

Public utilities

(3) No public utility may discontinue service to a company by reason only that proceedings commenced under this Act, that the company is insolvent or that the company has not paid for services rendered or goods provided before the commencement of those proceedings.

Certain acts not prevented

(4) Nothing in this section is to be construed as

Ordonnance de communication

(6) Sur demande de l'agent négociateur partie à la convention collective et sur avis aux personnes qui ont un intérêt, le tribunal peut ordonner à celles-ci de communiquer au demandeur, aux conditions qu'il précise, tout renseignement qu'elles ont en leur possession ou à leur disposition sur les affaires et la situation financière de la compagnie pertinent pour les négociations collectives. Le tribunal ne peut rendre l'ordonnance qu'après l'envoi à l'agent négociateur de l'avis de négociations collectives visé au paragraphe (2).

Parties

(7) Pour l'application du présent article, les parties à la convention collective sont la compagnie débitrice et l'agent négociateur liés par elle.

Maintien en vigueur des conventions collectives

(8) Il est entendu que toute convention collective que la compagnie et l'agent négociateur n'ont pas convenu de réviser demeure en vigueur et que les tribunaux ne peuvent en modifier les termes.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

Limitation de certains droits

34 (1) Il est interdit de résilier ou de modifier un contrat — notamment un contrat de garantie — conclu avec une compagnie débitrice ou de se prévaloir d'une clause de déchéance du terme figurant dans un tel contrat au seul motif qu'une procédure a été intentée sous le régime de la présente loi à l'égard de la compagnie ou que celle-ci est insolvable.

Baux

(2) Lorsque le contrat visé au paragraphe (1) est un bail, l'interdiction prévue à ce paragraphe vaut également dans le cas où la compagnie est insolvable ou n'a pas payé son loyer à l'égard d'une période antérieure à l'introduction de la procédure.

Entreprise de service public

(3) Il est interdit à toute entreprise de service public d'interrompre la prestation de ses services auprès d'une compagnie débitrice au seul motif qu'une procédure a été intentée sous le régime de la présente loi à l'égard de la compagnie, que celle-ci est insolvable ou qu'elle n'a pas payé des services ou marchandises fournis avant l'introduction de la procédure.

Exceptions

(4) Le présent article n'a pas pour effet :

(a) prohibiting a person from requiring payments to be made in cash for goods, services, use of leased property or other valuable consideration provided after the commencement of proceedings under this Act;

(b) requiring the further advance of money or credit; or

(c) [Repealed, 2012, c. 31, s. 421]

Provisions of section override agreement

(5) Any provision in an agreement that has the effect of providing for, or permitting, anything that, in substance, is contrary to this section is of no force or effect.

Powers of court

(6) On application by a party to an agreement or by a public utility, the court may declare that this section does not apply — or applies only to the extent declared by the court — if the applicant satisfies the court that the operation of this section would likely cause the applicant significant financial hardship.

Eligible financial contracts

(7) Subsection (1) does not apply

(a) in respect of an eligible financial contract; or

(b) to prevent a member of the Canadian Payments Association from ceasing to act as a clearing agent or group clearer for a company in accordance with the *Canadian Payments Act* and the by-laws and rules of that Association.

Permitted actions

(8) The following actions are permitted in respect of an eligible financial contract that is entered into before proceedings under this Act are commenced in respect of the company and is terminated on or after that day, but only in accordance with the provisions of that contract:

(a) the netting or setting off or compensation of obligations between the company and the other parties to the eligible financial contract; and

(b) any dealing with financial collateral including

(i) the sale or foreclosure or, in the Province of Quebec, the surrender of financial collateral, and

(ii) the setting off or compensation of financial collateral or the application of the proceeds or value of financial collateral.

a) d'empêcher une personne d'exiger que soient effectués des paiements en espèces pour toute contrepartie de valeur — marchandises, services, biens loués ou autres — fournie après l'introduction d'une procédure sous le régime de la présente loi;

b) d'exiger la prestation de nouvelles avances de fonds ou de nouveaux crédits.

c) [Abrogé, 2012, ch. 31, art. 421]

Incompatibilité

(5) Le présent article l'emporte sur les dispositions incompatibles de tout contrat, celles-ci étant sans effet.

Pouvoirs du tribunal

(6) À la demande de l'une des parties à un contrat ou d'une entreprise de service public, le tribunal peut déclarer le présent article inapplicable, ou applicable uniquement dans la mesure qu'il précise, s'il est établi par le demandeur que son application lui causerait vraisemblablement de sérieuses difficultés financières.

Contrats financiers admissibles

(7) Le paragraphe (1) ne s'applique pas aux contrats financiers admissibles et n'a pas pour effet d'empêcher un membre de l'Association canadienne des paiements de cesser d'agir, pour une compagnie, à titre d'agent de compensation ou d'adhérent correspondant de groupe conformément à la *Loi canadienne sur les paiements* et aux règles et règlements administratifs de l'association.

Opérations permises

(8) Si le contrat financier admissible conclu avant qu'une procédure soit intentée sous le régime de la présente loi à l'égard de la compagnie est résilié à la date d'introduction de la procédure ou par la suite, il est permis d'effectuer les opérations ci-après en conformité avec le contrat :

a) la compensation des obligations entre la compagnie et les autres parties au contrat;

b) toute opération à l'égard de la garantie financière afférente, notamment :

(i) la vente, la demande en forclusion ou, dans la province de Québec, la demande en délaissement,

(ii) la compensation, ou l'affectation de son produit ou de sa valeur.

Restriction

(9) No order may be made under this Act if the order would have the effect of staying or restraining the actions permitted under subsection (8).

Net termination values

(10) If net termination values determined in accordance with an eligible financial contract referred to in subsection (8) are owed by the company to another party to the eligible financial contract, that other party is deemed to be a creditor of the company with a claim against the company in respect of those net termination values.

Priority

(11) No order may be made under this Act if the order would have the effect of subordinating financial collateral.

2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2007, c. 29, s. 109, c. 36, ss. 77, 112; 2012, c. 31, s. 421.

Obligations and Prohibitions

Obligation to provide assistance

35 (1) A debtor company shall provide to the monitor the assistance that is necessary to enable the monitor to adequately carry out the monitor's functions.

Obligation to duties set out in section 158 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*

(2) A debtor company shall perform the duties set out in section 158 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* that are appropriate and applicable in the circumstances.

2005, c. 47, s. 131.

Restriction on disposition of business assets

36 (1) A debtor company in respect of which an order has been made under this Act may not sell or otherwise dispose of assets outside the ordinary course of business unless authorized to do so by a court. Despite any requirement for shareholder approval, including one under federal or provincial law, the court may authorize the sale or disposition even if shareholder approval was not obtained.

Notice to creditors

(2) A company that applies to the court for an authorization is to give notice of the application to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the proposed sale or disposition.

Restriction

(9) Aucune ordonnance rendue au titre de la présente loi ne peut avoir pour effet de suspendre ou de restreindre le droit d'effectuer les opérations visées au paragraphe (8).

Valeurs nettes dues à la date de résiliation

(10) Si, aux termes du contrat financier admissible visé au paragraphe (8), des sommes sont dues par la compagnie à une autre partie au contrat au titre de valeurs nettes dues à la date de résiliation, cette autre partie est réputée être un créancier de la compagnie relativement à ces sommes.

Rang

(11) Il ne peut être rendu, au titre de la présente loi, aucune ordonnance dont l'effet serait d'assigner un rang inférieur à toute garantie financière.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131; 2007, ch. 29, art. 109, ch. 36, art. 77 et 112; 2012, ch. 31, art. 421.

Obligations et interdiction

Assistance

35 (1) La compagnie débitrice est tenue d'aider le contrôleur à remplir adéquatement ses fonctions.

Obligations visées à l'article 158 de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*

(2) Elle est également tenue de satisfaire aux obligations visées à l'article 158 de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* selon ce qui est indiqué et applicable dans les circonstances.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131.

Restriction à la disposition d'actifs

36 (1) Il est interdit à la compagnie débitrice à l'égard de laquelle une ordonnance a été rendue sous le régime de la présente loi de disposer, notamment par vente, d'actifs hors du cours ordinaire de ses affaires sans l'autorisation du tribunal. Le tribunal peut accorder l'autorisation sans qu'il soit nécessaire d'obtenir l'acquiescement des actionnaires, et ce malgré toute exigence à cet effet, notamment en vertu d'une règle de droit fédérale ou provinciale.

Avis aux créanciers

(2) La compagnie qui demande l'autorisation au tribunal en avise les créanciers garantis qui peuvent vraisemblablement être touchés par le projet de disposition.

Factors to be considered

(3) In deciding whether to grant the authorization, the court is to consider, among other things,

- (a)** whether the process leading to the proposed sale or disposition was reasonable in the circumstances;
- (b)** whether the monitor approved the process leading to the proposed sale or disposition;
- (c)** whether the monitor filed with the court a report stating that in their opinion the sale or disposition would be more beneficial to the creditors than a sale or disposition under a bankruptcy;
- (d)** the extent to which the creditors were consulted;
- (e)** the effects of the proposed sale or disposition on the creditors and other interested parties; and
- (f)** whether the consideration to be received for the assets is reasonable and fair, taking into account their market value.

Additional factors — related persons

(4) If the proposed sale or disposition is to a person who is related to the company, the court may, after considering the factors referred to in subsection (3), grant the authorization only if it is satisfied that

- (a)** good faith efforts were made to sell or otherwise dispose of the assets to persons who are not related to the company; and
- (b)** the consideration to be received is superior to the consideration that would be received under any other offer made in accordance with the process leading to the proposed sale or disposition.

Related persons

(5) For the purpose of subsection (4), a person who is related to the company includes

- (a)** a director or officer of the company;
- (b)** a person who has or has had, directly or indirectly, control in fact of the company; and
- (c)** a person who is related to a person described in paragraph (a) or (b).

Facteurs à prendre en considération

(3) Pour décider s'il accorde l'autorisation, le tribunal prend en considération, entre autres, les facteurs suivants :

- a)** la justification des circonstances ayant mené au projet de disposition;
- b)** l'acquiescement du contrôleur au processus ayant mené au projet de disposition, le cas échéant;
- c)** le dépôt par celui-ci d'un rapport précisant que, à son avis, la disposition sera plus avantageuse pour les créanciers que si elle était faite dans le cadre de la faillite;
- d)** la suffisance des consultations menées auprès des créanciers;
- e)** les effets du projet de disposition sur les droits de tout intéressé, notamment les créanciers;
- f)** le caractère juste et raisonnable de la contrepartie reçue pour les actifs compte tenu de leur valeur marchande.

Autres facteurs

(4) Si la compagnie projette de disposer d'actifs en faveur d'une personne à laquelle elle est liée, le tribunal, après avoir pris ces facteurs en considération, ne peut accorder l'autorisation que s'il est convaincu :

- a)** d'une part, que les efforts voulus ont été faits pour disposer des actifs en faveur d'une personne qui n'est pas liée à la compagnie;
- b)** d'autre part, que la contrepartie offerte pour les actifs est plus avantageuse que celle qui découlerait de toute autre offre reçue dans le cadre du projet de disposition.

Personnes liées

(5) Pour l'application du paragraphe (4), les personnes ci-après sont considérées comme liées à la compagnie :

- a)** le dirigeant ou l'administrateur de celle-ci;
- b)** la personne qui, directement ou indirectement, en a ou en a eu le contrôle de fait;
- c)** la personne liée à toute personne visée aux alinéas a) ou b).

Assets may be disposed of free and clear

(6) The court may authorize a sale or disposition free and clear of any security, charge or other restriction and, if it does, it shall also order that other assets of the company or the proceeds of the sale or disposition be subject to a security, charge or other restriction in favour of the creditor whose security, charge or other restriction is to be affected by the order.

Restriction — employers

(7) The court may grant the authorization only if the court is satisfied that the company can and will make the payments that would have been required under paragraphs 6(5)(a) and (6)(a) if the court had sanctioned the compromise or arrangement.

Restriction — intellectual property

(8) If, on the day on which an order is made under this Act in respect of the company, the company is a party to an agreement that grants to another party a right to use intellectual property that is included in a sale or disposition authorized under subsection (6), that sale or disposition does not affect that other party's right to use the intellectual property — including the other party's right to enforce an exclusive use — during the term of the agreement, including any period for which the other party extends the agreement as of right, as long as the other party continues to perform its obligations under the agreement in relation to the use of the intellectual property.

2005, c. 47, s. 131; 2007, c. 36, s. 78; 2017, c. 26, s. 14; 2018, c. 27, s. 269.

Preferences and Transfers at Undervalue

Application of sections 38 and 95 to 101 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*

36.1 (1) Sections 38 and 95 to 101 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* apply, with any modifications that the circumstances require, in respect of a compromise or arrangement unless the compromise or arrangement provides otherwise.

Interpretation

(2) For the purposes of subsection (1), a reference in sections 38 and 95 to 101 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*

(a) to “date of the bankruptcy” is to be read as a reference to “day on which proceedings commence under this Act”;

Autorisation de disposer des actifs en les libérant de restrictions

(6) Le tribunal peut autoriser la disposition d'actifs de la compagnie, purgés de toute charge, sûreté ou autre restriction, et, le cas échéant, est tenu d'assujettir le produit de la disposition ou d'autres de ses actifs à une charge, sûreté ou autre restriction en faveur des créanciers touchés par la purge.

Restriction à l'égard des employeurs

(7) Il ne peut autoriser la disposition que s'il est convaincu que la compagnie est en mesure d'effectuer et effectuera les paiements qui auraient été exigés en vertu des alinéas 6(5)a) et (6)a) s'il avait homologué la transaction ou l'arrangement.

Restriction à l'égard de la propriété intellectuelle

(8) Si, à la date à laquelle une ordonnance est rendue à son égard sous le régime de la présente loi, la compagnie est partie à un contrat qui autorise une autre partie à utiliser un droit de propriété intellectuelle qui est compris dans la disposition d'actifs autorisée en vertu du paragraphe (6), cette disposition n'empêche pas l'autre partie d'utiliser le droit en question ni d'en faire respecter l'utilisation exclusive, à condition que cette autre partie respecte ses obligations contractuelles à l'égard de l'utilisation de ce droit, et ce, pour la période prévue au contrat et pour toute prolongation de celle-ci dont elle se prévaut de plein droit.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131; 2007, ch. 36, art. 78; 2017, ch. 26, art. 14; 2018, ch. 27, art. 269.

Traitements préférentiels et opérations sous-évaluées

Application des articles 38 et 95 à 101 de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*

36.1 (1) Les articles 38 et 95 à 101 de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité* s'appliquent, avec les adaptations nécessaires, à la transaction ou à l'arrangement sauf disposition contraire de ceux-ci.

Interprétation

(2) Pour l'application du paragraphe (1), la mention, aux articles 38 et 95 à 101 de la *Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité*, de la date de la faillite vaut mention de la date à laquelle une procédure a été intentée sous le régime de la présente loi, celle du syndic vaut mention du contrôleur et celle du failli, de la personne insolvable ou du débiteur vaut mention de la compagnie débitrice.

2005, ch. 47, art. 131; 2007, ch. 36, art. 78.

TAB B

2015 ONSC 2066

Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Target Canada Co., Re

2015 CarswellOnt 5211, 2015 ONSC 2066, 251 A.C.W.S. (3d) 377, 30 C.B.R. (6th) 335

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

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.

Morawetz R.S.J.

Heard: March 30, 2015

Judgment: April 2, 2015

Docket: CV-15-10832-00CL

Proceedings: full reasons to *Target Canada Co., Re* (2015), 2015 CarswellOnt 4745, Morawetz R.S.J. (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List])

Counsel: Shawn Irving, Robert Carson, for Applicants, 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

Jay Swartz, for Target Corporation

Harvey Chaiton, for Directors and Officers

Alan Mark, Melaney Wagner, for Monitor, Alvarez & Marsal Inc.

Lad Kucis (Agent), for Pharmacy Franchisee Association Canada

Subject: Insolvency

FULL REASONS to judgment reported at *Target Canada Co., Re* (2015), 2015 CarswellOnt 4745 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]), concerning motion for approval of asset purchase agreement.

Morawetz R.S.J.:

1 The Applicants bring this motion for approval of the Asset Purchase Agreement (the "APA") among Target Canada Co. ("TCC"), Target Brands, Inc. ("Target Brands") and Target Corporation, and vesting TCC's right, title and interest in and to the Purchased Assets (as defined in the APA) in Target Corporation.

2 The requested relief was not opposed.

3 The Purchased Assets consist of certain goods bearing the Target logos, trademarks and other proprietary elements. The Applicants take the position that the Purchased Assets cannot be sold by the Agent in the Inventory Liquidation Process unless expressly designated by TCC, because of the rights of Target Brands (a subsidiary of Target Corporation) to control the use of the intellectual property (the "Target IP").

4 The criteria for approval of the Purchased Assets to Target Corporation, a related party, is set out in sections 36(3) and (4) of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C., 1985, c. C-36 (CCAA).

36(3) Factors to be considered — In deciding whether to grant authorization, the court is to consider, among other things,

- (a) whether the process leading to the proposed sale or disposition was reasonable in the circumstances;
- (b) whether the monitor approved the process leading to the proposed sale or disposition;
- (c) whether the monitor filed with the court a report stating that in their opinion the sale or disposition would be more beneficial to the creditors than a sale or disposition under a bankruptcy;
- (d) the extent to which the creditors were consulted;
- (e) the effects of the proposed sale or disposition on the creditors and other interested parties; and
- (f) whether the consideration to be received for the assets is reasonable and fair, taking into account their market value.

36(4) Additional Factors — related persons — If the proposed sale or disposition is to a person who is related to the company, the court may, after considering the factors referred to in subsection (3), grant the authorization only if it is satisfied that

- (a) good faith efforts were made to sell or otherwise dispose of the assets to persons who are not related to the company; and
- (b) the consideration to be received is superior to the consideration that would be received under any other offer made in accordance with the process leading to the proposed sale or disposition.

5 All of the Purchased Assets represent various categories of Target Branded items, such as shopping carts, shopping baskets and the exterior signage on TCC stores. The Purchased Assets are unique in that they incorporate logos, trademarks or other indicia of TCC or its affiliates.

6 Target Brands views the Purchased Assets as using or displaying IP that is proprietary to Target Brands. Target Brands has not agreed to allow the Purchased Assets to be sold by the Agent. The Applicants are of the view that Target Brands would also likely contest any sale of the Purchased Assets to a third party purchaser.

7 The record establishes that the Applicants requested bids for the Purchased Assets from the liquidation firms which applied to be selected as agent. By following this process, the Applicants submit they sought good faith offers by which TCC could sell the assets to an unrelated third party. Only one bidder included some of the items in its bid.

8 Separately from the auction process, Target Corporation submitted an offer to purchase a number of the assets.

9 The Applicants and the Monitor formed the view that if a third party purchaser for the items could be found, such purchaser would likely discount its price to take into account the impact of the IP. That impact included the cost to remove brand or other IP elements and/or the litigation risks associated with a potential challenge by Target Brands to any unauthorized use of its IP.

10 The Applicants and the Monitor submit that it would not be beneficial to stakeholders as a whole to incur additional costs in seeking to market these unique assets. Instead, the Applicants and the Monitor sought to establish objective benchmarks to ensure that the price offered by Target Corporation was reasonable and fair, and exceeded any third party offer that might be made.

11 The Applicants have established that the price offered by Target Corporation, viewed in isolation, exceeds all three independent valuations of the Purchased Assets obtained by the Applicants and the Monitor. In addition, Target Corporation will assume the substantial costs associated with removing the exterior signage on TCC stores.

12 TCC, Target Brands and Target Corporation entered into the APA as of March 23, 2015. Under the Agreement, Target Corporation has agreed to purchase the Purchased Assets for U.S. \$2,215,020.

13 The Applicants are of the view that Target Corporation is effectively the only logical purchaser for the Purchased Assets due to their unique nature.

14 The Applicants submit that, taking into account the factors listed in section 36(3) of the CCAA, the test set out in section 36(4) of the CCAA, and the general interpretative principles underlying the CCAA, the Court should grant the approval and vesting order. Further, the Applicants submit that in the absence of any indication that the Applicants have acted improvidently, the informed business judgment of the Applicants — which is supported by the advice and the consent of the Monitor, that the APA is in the best interests of the Applicants and their stakeholders and is entitled to deference by the Court.

15 I note that the factors listed in section 36(3) are not intended to be exhaustive, nor are they intended to be a formulaic check-list that must be followed in every sale transaction under the CCAA. Further, I also note that the factors overlap, to a certain degree, with the factors set out in *Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp.*, [1991] O.J. No. 1137 (Ont. C.A.) ("*Soundair*"). The *Soundair* factors were applied in approving sale transactions under pre-amendment CCAA case law. Under section 36(4) of the CCAA, the Court must be satisfied, overall, that sufficient safeguards were adopted to ensure that a related party transaction is in the best interests of the stakeholders of the Applicants and that the risk to the estate associated with a related party transaction have been mitigated.

16 I am satisfied that the risk theoretically associated with a related party transaction has been satisfactorily addressed through the efforts of the Applicants and the Monitor to evaluate the salability of the Purchased Assets to an unrelated party.

17 I am also satisfied that the process was reasonable in light of the unique assets involved. Whether or not a legal challenge by Target Brands would ultimately be successful, the litigation risks would, in my view, be expected to materially affect the value of the Purchased Assets to an unrelated third party. Further, the uniqueness of the Purchased Assets makes Target Corporation the only realistic purchaser. Only Hilco Global ("Hilco") submitted a bid with respect to some, but not all, of the assets included in the Initial Offer. None of the remaining bidders elected to submit an offer. Given that only one of the liquidation firms submitted a bid, the Applicants and the Monitor considered whether the proposed sale to Target Corporation was fair and reasonable. They came to the conclusion that the likely price to be obtained by an unrelated third party did not support the sale of the Purchased Assets to an unrelated third party.

18 As required by section 36 of the CCAA, the Monitor has been involved throughout the proposed transaction. The Monitor's Seventh Report comments at length on the transaction, and specifically whether it would be fair and reasonable to accept the offer from Target Corporation. The Monitor supports the conclusion that the purchase price offered by Target Corporation far exceeds the estimated liquidation values obtained. The Monitor is of the opinion that the APA benefits the creditors of the Applicants. The Monitor supports the motion for approval of the APA.

19 I am satisfied that the transaction is in the best interests of stakeholders. The transaction does provide some enhanced economic value to the estate. Further, the APA Agreement allows the Monitor, TCC and Target Corporation to agree upon the timetable for delivery of the Purchased Assets. This flexibility is of assistance to TCC and its Inventory Liquidation Process. In addition, there are no fees or commission payable on the transaction and the Agreement does provide certain guaranteed value to TCC.

20 The Applicants submit that all of the other statutory requirements for obtaining relief under section 36 have been satisfied. In particular, no parties have registered security interests against the Purchased Assets.

21 I am also satisfied that the requirements of section 36(7) have been satisfied. This section provides a degree of protection to employees and former employees for unpaid wages the employees would have been entitled to receive under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, in addition to amounts that are owing for post-filing services to a debtor company. I also accept the Applicants' submissions that because they have been paying employees for all post-filing services and the Employee Trust will satisfy claims arising from any early termination of eligible employees, the requirements of section 36(7) have been satisfied.

22 For the foregoing reasons, the Asset Purchase Agreement is approved and the Approval and Vesting Order is granted.

Order accordingly.

End of Document

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

TAB C

Most Negative Treatment: Distinguished

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

1991 CarswellOnt 205
Ontario Court of Appeal

Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp.

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

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

Goodman, McKinlay and Galligan JJ.A.

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

Judgment: July 3, 1991

Docket: Doc. CA 318/91

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

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

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

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

W.G. Horton , for Ontario Express Limited.

N.J. Spies , for Frontier Air Limited.

Subject: Corporate and Commercial; Insolvency

Appeal from order approving sale of assets by receiver.

Galligan J.A. :

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(1) Did the receiver act properly when it entered into an agreement to sell Air Toronto to OEL?

(2) What effect does the support of the 922 offer by the secured creditors have on the result?

13 I will deal with the two issues separately.

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

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

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

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

1. It should consider whether the receiver has made a sufficient effort to get the best price and has not acted improvidently.

2. It should consider the interests of all parties.

3. It should consider the efficacy and integrity of the process by which offers are obtained.

4. It should consider whether there has been unfairness in the working out of the process.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[Emphasis added.]

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

In my opinion if the decision of the receiver to enter into an agreement of sale, subject to court approval, with respect to certain assets is reasonable and sound under the circumstances *at the time existing* it should not be set aside simply because a later and higher bid is made. To do so would literally create chaos in the commercial world and receivers and purchasers would never be sure they had a binding agreement.

[Emphasis added.]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[Emphasis added.]

30 What those cases show is that the prices in other offers have relevance only if they show that the price contained in the offer accepted by the receiver was so unreasonably low as to demonstrate that the receiver was improvident in accepting it. I am of the opinion, therefore, that if they do not tend to show that the receiver was improvident, they should not be considered upon a motion to confirm a sale recommended by a court-appointed receiver. If they were, the process would be changed from a sale by a receiver, subject to court approval, into an auction conducted by the court at the time approval is sought. In my opinion, the latter course is unfair to the person who has entered bona fide into an agreement with the receiver, can only lead to chaos, and must be discouraged.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. Consideration of the Interests of all Parties

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[Emphasis added.]

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

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

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

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

4. Was there unfairness in the process?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I agree.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

McKinlay J.A. :

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

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

Goodman J.A. (dissenting):

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

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

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

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

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

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

78 I agree with that statement completely. It is apparent that the difference between the two offers insofar as cash on closing is concerned amounts to approximately \$3 million to \$4 million. The bank submitted that it did not wish to gamble any further with respect to its investment, and that the acceptance and court approval of the OEL offer in effect supplanted its position as a secured creditor with respect to the amount owing over and above the down payment and placed it in the position of a joint entrepreneur, but one with no control. This results from the fact that the OEL offer did not provide for any security for any funds which might be forthcoming over and above the initial down payment on closing.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

85 I am in agreement with that statement as a matter of general principle. Saunders J. further stated that he adopted the principles stated by Macdonald J.A. in *Cameron* , supra, quoted by Galligan J.A. in his reasons. In *Cameron* , the remarks of Macdonald J.A. related to situations involving the calling of bids and fixing a time limit for the making of such bids. In those circumstances the process is so clear as a matter of commercial practice that an interference by the court in such process might have a deleterious effect on the efficacy of receivership proceedings in other cases. But Macdonald J.A. recognized that even in bid or tender cases where the offeror for whose bid approval is sought has complied with all requirements, a court might not approve the agreement of purchase and sale entered into by the receiver. He said at pp. 11-12 [C.B.R.]:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

96 By amending agreement dated June 19, 1990, the receiver was released from its covenant to refrain from negotiating for the sale of the Air Toronto business and assets to any person other than Air Canada. By virtue of this amending agreement, the receiver had put itself in the position of having a firm offer in hand, with the right to negotiate and accept offers from other

persons. Air Canada, in these circumstances, was in the subservient position. The receiver, in the exercise of its judgment and discretion, allowed the Air Canada offer to lapse. On July 20, 1990, Air Canada served a notice of termination of the April 30, 1990 agreement.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

105 It was not until March 1, 1991, that CCFL had obtained sufficient information to enable it to make a bid through 922. It succeeded in so doing through its own efforts through sources other than the receiver. By that time the receiver had already entered into the letter of intent with OEL. Notwithstanding the fact that the receiver knew since December of 1990 that CCFL wished to make a bid for the assets of Air Toronto (and there is no evidence to suggest that at that time such a bid would be in conjunction with Air Canada or that Air Canada was in any way connected with CCFL), it took no steps to provide CCFL

with information necessary to enable it to make an intelligent bid, and indeed suggested delaying the making of the bid until an offering memorandum had been prepared and provided. In the meantime, by entering into the letter of intent with OEL, it put itself in a position where it could not negotiate with CCFL or provide the information requested.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

124 In conclusion, I feel that I must comment on the statement made by Galligan J.A. in his reasons to the effect that the suggestion made by counsel for 922 constitutes evidence of lack of prejudice resulting from the absence of an offering memorandum. It should be pointed out that the court invited counsel to indicate the manner in which the problem should be resolved in the event that the court concluded that the order approving the OEL offer should be set aside. There was no evidence before the court with respect to what additional information may have been acquired by CCFL since March 8, 1991, and no inquiry was made in that regard. Accordingly, I am of the view that no adverse inference should be drawn from the proposal made as a result of the court's invitation.

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

Appeal dismissed.

TAB D

Most Negative Treatment: Distinguished

Most Recent Distinguished: T.Z. v. P.V.R. | 2022 SKQB 129, 2022 CarswellSask 256 | (Sask. Q.B., May 17, 2022)

2021 SCC 25, 2021 CSC 25

Supreme Court of Canada

Sherman Estate v. Donovan

2021 CarswellOnt 8339, 2021 CarswellOnt 8340, 2021 SCC 25, 2021 CSC 25, [2021] S.C.J. No. 25, 331 A.C.W.S. (3d) 489, 458 D.L.R. (4th) 361, 66 C.P.C. (8th) 1, 67 E.T.R. (4th) 163, 72 C.R. (7th) 223, EYB 2021-391973

Estate of Bernard Sherman and Trustees of the Estate and Estate of Honey Sherman and Trustees of the Estate (Appellants) and Kevin Donovan and Toronto Star Newspapers Ltd. (Respondents) and Attorney General of Ontario, Attorney General of British Columbia, Canadian Civil Liberties Association, Income Security Advocacy Centre, Ad IDEM/Canadian Media Lawyers Association, Postmedia Network Inc., CTV, a Division of Bell Media Inc., Global News, a division of Corus Television Limited Partnership, The Globe and Mail Inc., Citytv, a division of Rogers Media Inc., British Columbia Civil Liberties Association, HIV & AIDS Legal Clinic Ontario, HIV Legal Network and Mental Health Legal Committee (Intervenors)

Wagner C.J.C., Moldaver, Karakatsanis, Brown, Rowe, Martin, Kasirer JJ.

Heard: October 6, 2020

Judgment: June 11, 2021

Docket: 38695

Proceedings: affirming *Donovan v. Sherman Estate* (2019), 56 C.P.C. (8th) 82, 47 E.T.R. (4th) 1, 2019 CarswellOnt 6867, 2019 ONCA 376, C.W. Hourigan J.A., Doherty J.A., Paul Rouleau J.A. (Ont. C.A.); reversing *Toronto Star Newspapers Ltd. v. Sherman Estate* (2018), 41 E.T.R. (4th) 126, 2018 CarswellOnt 13017, 2018 ONSC 4706, 28 C.P.C. (8th) 102, 417 C.R.R. (2d) 321, S.F. Dunphy J. (Ont. S.C.J.)

Counsel: Chantelle Cseh, Timothy Youdan, for Appellants

Iris Fischer, Skye A. Sepp, for Respondents

Peter Scrutton, for Intervener, Attorney General of Ontario

Jacqueline Hughes, for Intervener, Attorney General of British Columbia

Ryder Gilliland, for Intervener, Canadian Civil Liberties Association

Ewa Krajewska, for Intervener, Income Security Advocacy Centre

Robert S. Anderson, Q.C., for Intervenors, Ad IDEM/Canadian Media Lawyers Association, Postmedia Network Inc., CTV, a Division of Bell Media Inc., Global News, a division of Corus Television Limited Partnership, The Globe and Mail Inc. and Citytv, a division of Rogers Media Inc.

Adam Goldenberg, for Intervener, British Columbia Civil Liberties Association

Khalid Janmohamed, for Intervenors, HIV & AIDS Legal Clinic Ontario, the HIV Legal Network and the Mental Health Legal Committee

Subject: Civil Practice and Procedure; Criminal; Estates and Trusts

APPEAL by estate trustees from judgment reported at *Donovan v. Sherman Estate* (2019), 2019 ONCA 376, 2019 CarswellOnt 6867, 47 E.T.R. (4th) 1, 56 C.P.C. (8th) 82 (Ont. C.A.), allowing appeal from judgment imposing sealing orders.

POURVOI formé par les fiduciaires d'une succession à l'encontre d'un jugement publié à *Donovan v. Sherman Estate* (2019), 2019 ONCA 376, 2019 CarswellOnt 6867, 47 E.T.R. (4th) 1, 56 C.P.C. (8th) 82 (Ont. C.A.), ayant accueilli l'appel interjeté à l'encontre d'un jugement imposant une ordonnance de mise sous scellés.

Kasirer J. (Wagner C.J.C. and Moldaver, Karakatsanis, Brown, Rowe and Martin JJ. concurring):

I. Overview

1 This Court has been resolute in recognizing that the open court principle is protected by the constitutionally-entrenched right of freedom of expression and, as such, it represents a central feature of a liberal democracy. As a general rule, the public can attend hearings and consult court files and the press — the eyes and ears of the public — is left free to inquire and comment on the workings of the courts, all of which helps make the justice system fair and accountable.

2 Accordingly, there is a strong presumption in favour of open courts. It is understood that this allows for public scrutiny which can be the source of inconvenience and even embarrassment to those who feel that their engagement in the justice system brings intrusion into their private lives. But this discomfort is not, as a general matter, enough to overturn the strong presumption that the public can attend hearings and that court files can be consulted and reported upon by the free press.

3 Notwithstanding this presumption, exceptional circumstances do arise where competing interests justify a restriction on the open court principle. Where a discretionary court order limiting constitutionally-protected openness is sought — for example, a sealing order, a publication ban, an order excluding the public from a hearing, or a redaction order — the applicant must demonstrate, as a threshold requirement, that openness presents a serious risk to a competing interest of public importance. That this requirement is considered a high bar serves to maintain the strong presumption of open courts. Moreover, the protection of open courts does not stop there. The applicant must still show that the order is necessary to prevent the risk and that, as a matter of proportionality, the benefits of that order restricting openness outweigh its negative effects.

4 This appeal turns on whether concerns advanced by persons seeking an exception to the ordinarily open court file in probate proceedings — the concerns for privacy of the affected individuals and their physical safety — amount to important public interests that are at such serious risk that the files should be sealed. The parties to this appeal agree that physical safety is an important public interest that could justify a sealing order but disagree as to whether that interest would be at serious risk, in the circumstances of this case, should the files be unsealed. They further disagree whether privacy is in itself an important interest that could justify a sealing order. The appellants say that privacy is a public interest of sufficient import that can justify limits on openness, especially in light of the threats individuals face as technology facilitates widespread dissemination of personally sensitive information. They argue that the Court of Appeal was mistaken to say that personal concerns for privacy, without more, lack the public interest component that is properly the subject-matter of a sealing order.

5 This Court has, in different settings, consistently championed privacy as a fundamental consideration in a free society. Pointing to cases decided in other contexts, the appellants contend that privacy should be recognized here as a public interest that, on the facts of this case, substantiates their plea for orders sealing the probate files. The respondents resist, recalling that privacy has generally been seen as a poor justification for an exception to openness. After all, they say, virtually every court proceeding entails some disquiet for the lives of those concerned and these intrusions on privacy must be tolerated because open courts are essential to a healthy democracy.

6 This appeal offers, then, an occasion to decide whether privacy can amount to a public interest in the open court jurisprudence and, if so, whether openness puts privacy at serious risk here so as to justify the kind of orders sought by the appellants.

7 For the reasons that follow, I propose to recognize an aspect of privacy as an important public interest for the purposes of the relevant test from *Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)*, 2002 SCC 41, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522. Proceedings in open court can lead to the dissemination of highly sensitive personal information that would result not just in discomfort or embarrassment, but in an affront to the affected person's dignity. Where this narrower dimension of privacy, rooted in what I

see as the public interest in protecting human dignity, is shown to be at serious risk, an exception to the open court principle may be justified.

8 In this case, and with this interest in mind, it cannot be said that the risk to privacy is sufficiently serious to overcome the strong presumption of openness. The same is true of the risk to physical safety here. The Court of Appeal was right in the circumstances to set aside the sealing orders and I would therefore dismiss the appeal.

II. Background

9 Prominent in business and philanthropic circles, Bernard Sherman and Honey Sherman were found dead in their Toronto home in December of 2017. Their deaths had no apparent explanation and generated intense public interest and press scrutiny. In January of the following year, the Toronto Police Service announced that the deaths were being investigated as homicides. As the present matter came before the courts, the identity and motive of those responsible remained unknown.

10 The couple's estates and estate trustees (collectively the "Trustees")¹ sought to stem the intense press scrutiny prompted by the events. The Trustees hoped to see to the orderly transfer of the couple's property, at arm's length from what they saw as the public's morbid interest in the unexplained deaths and the curiosity around apparently great sums of money involved.

11 When the time came to obtain certificates of appointment of estate trustee from the Superior Court of Justice, the Trustees sought a sealing order so that the estate trustees and beneficiaries ("affected individuals") might be spared any further intrusions into their privacy and be protected from what was alleged to be a risk to their safety. The Trustees argued that if the information in the court files was revealed to the public, the safety of the affected individuals would be at risk and their privacy compromised as long as the deaths were unexplained and those responsible for the tragedy remained at large. In support of their request, they argued that there was a real and substantial risk that the affected individuals would suffer serious harm from the public exposure of the materials in the circumstances.

12 Initially granted, the sealing orders were challenged by Kevin Donovan, a journalist who had written a series of articles on the couple's deaths, and Toronto Star Newspapers Ltd., for which he wrote (collectively the "Toronto Star").² The Toronto Star said the orders violated its constitutional rights of freedom of expression and freedom of the press, as well as the attending principle that the workings of the courts should be open to the public as a means of guaranteeing the fair and transparent administration of justice.

III. Proceedings Below

A. Ontario Superior Court of Justice, 2018 ONSC 4706, 41 E.T.R. (4th) 126 (Dunphy J.)

13 In addressing whether the circumstances warranted interference with the open court principle, the application judge relied on this Court's judgment in *Sierra Club*. He noted that a confidentiality order should only be granted when: "(1) such an order is necessary ... to prevent a serious risk to an important interest because reasonable alternative measures will not prevent the risk; and (2) the salutary effects of the confidentiality order outweigh its deleterious effects, including the effects on the right to free expression and the public interest in open and accessible court proceedings" (para. 13(d)).

14 The application judge considered whether the Trustees' interests would be served by granting the sealing orders. In his view, the Trustees had correctly identified two legitimate interests in support of making an exception to the open court principle: "protecting the privacy and dignity of victims of crime and their loved ones" and "a reasonable apprehension of risk on behalf of those known to have an interest in receiving or administering the assets of the deceased" (paras. 22-25). With respect to the first interest, the application judge found that "[t]he degree of intrusion on that privacy and dignity has already been extreme and ... excruciating" (para. 23). For the second interest, although he noted that "it would have been preferable to include objective evidence of the gravity of that risk from, for example, the police responsible for the investigation", he concluded that "the lack of such evidence is not fatal" (para. 24). Rather, the necessary inferences could be drawn from the circumstances notably the "willingness of the perpetrator(s) of the crimes to resort to extreme violence to pursue whatever motive existed" (*ibid.*). He

concluded that the "current uncertainty" was the source of a reasonable apprehension of the risk of harm and, further, that the foreseeable harm was "grave" (*ibid.*).

15 The application judge ultimately accepted the Trustees' submission that these interests "very strongly outweigh" what he called the proportionately narrow public interest in the "essentially administrative files" at issue (paras. 31 and 33). He therefore concluded that the harmful effects of the sealing orders were substantially outweighed by the salutary effects on the rights and interests of the affected individuals.

16 Finally, the application judge considered what order would protect the affected individuals while infringing upon the open court principle to the minimum extent possible. He decided no meaningful part of either file could be disclosed if one were to make the redactions necessary to protect the interests he had identified. Open-ended sealing orders did not, however, sit well with him. The application judge therefore sealed the files for an initial period of two years, with the possibility of renewal.

B. Court of Appeal for Ontario, 2019 ONCA 376, 47 E.T.R. (4th) 1 (Doherty, Rouleau and Hourigan JJ.A.)

17 The Toronto Star's appeal was allowed, unanimously, and the sealing orders were lifted.

18 The Court of Appeal considered the two interests advanced before the application judge in support of the orders to seal the probate files. As to the need to protect the privacy and dignity of the victims of violent crime and their loved ones, it recalled that the kind of interest that is properly protected by a sealing order must have a public interest component. Citing *Sierra Club*, the Court of Appeal wrote that "[p]ersonal concerns cannot, without more, justify an order sealing material that would normally be available to the public under the open court principle" (para. 10). It concluded that the privacy interest for which the Trustees sought protection lacked this quality of public interest.

19 While it recognized the personal safety of individuals as an important public interest generally, the Court of Appeal wrote that there was no evidence in this case that could warrant a finding that disclosure of the contents of the estate files posed a real risk to anyone's physical safety. The application judge had erred on this point: "the suggestion that the beneficiaries and trustees are somehow at risk because the Shermans were murdered is not an inference, but is speculation. It provides no basis for a sealing order" (para. 16).

20 The Court of Appeal concluded that the Trustees had failed the first stage of the test for obtaining orders sealing the probate files. It therefore allowed the appeal and set aside the orders.

C. Subsequent Proceedings

21 The Court of Appeal's order setting aside the sealing orders has been stayed pending the disposition of this appeal. The Toronto Star brought a motion to adduce new evidence on this appeal, comprised of land titles documents, transcripts of the cross-examination of a detective on the murder investigation, and various news articles. This evidence, it says, supports the conclusion that the sealing orders should be lifted. The motion was referred to this panel.

IV. Submissions

22 The Trustees have appealed to this Court seeking to restore the sealing orders made by the application judge. In addition to contesting the motion for new evidence, they maintain that the orders are necessary to prevent a serious risk to the privacy and physical safety of the affected individuals and that the salutary effects of sealing the court probate files outweigh the harmful effects of limiting court openness. The Trustees argue that two legal errors led the Court of Appeal to conclude otherwise.

23 First, they submit the Court of Appeal erred in holding that privacy is a personal concern that cannot, without more, constitute an important interest under *Sierra Club*. The Trustees say the application judge was right to characterize privacy and dignity as an important public interest which, as it was subject to a serious risk, justified the orders. They ask this Court to recognize that privacy in itself is an important public interest for the purposes of the analysis.

24 Second, the Trustees submit that the Court of Appeal erred in overturning the application judge's conclusion that there was a serious risk of physical harm. They argue that the Court of Appeal failed to recognize that courts have the ability to draw reasonable inferences by applying reason and logic even in the absence of specific evidence of the alleged risk.

25 The Trustees say that these errors led the Court of Appeal to mistakenly set aside the sealing orders. In answer to questions at the hearing, the Trustees acknowledged that an order redacting certain documents in the file or a publication ban could assist in addressing some of their concerns, but maintained neither is a reasonable alternative to the sealing orders in the circumstances.

26 The Trustees submit further that the protection of these interests outweighs the deleterious effects of the orders. They argue that the importance of the open court principle is attenuated by the nature of these probate proceedings. Given that it is non-contentious and not strictly speaking necessary for the transfer of property at death, probate is a court proceeding of an "administrative" character, which diminishes the imperative of applying the open court principle here (paras. 113-14).

27 The Toronto Star takes the position that the Court of Appeal made no mistake in setting aside the sealing orders and that the appeal should be dismissed. In the Toronto Star's view, while privacy can be an important interest where it evinces a public component, the Trustees have only identified a subjective desire for the affected individuals in this case to avoid further publicity, which is not inherently harmful. According to the Toronto Star and some of the interveners, the Trustees' position would allow that measure of inconvenience and embarrassment that arises in every court proceeding to take precedence over the interest in court openness protected by the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* in which all of society has a stake. The Toronto Star argues further that the information in the court files is not highly sensitive. On the issue of whether the sealing orders were necessary to protect the affected individuals from physical harm, the Toronto Star submits that the Court of Appeal was right to conclude that the Trustees had failed to establish a serious risk to this interest.

28 In the alternative, even if there were a serious risk to one or another important interest, the Toronto Star says the sealing orders are not necessary because the risk could be addressed by an alternative, less onerous order. Furthermore, it says the orders are not proportionate. In seeking to minimize the importance of openness in probate proceedings, the Trustees invite an inflexible approach to balancing the effects of the order that is incompatible with the principle that openness applies to all court proceedings. In any event, there is a public interest in openness specifically here, given that the certificates sought can affect the rights of third parties and that openness ensures the fairness of the proceedings, whether they are contested or not.

V. Analysis

29 The outcome of the appeal turns on whether the application judge should have made the sealing orders pursuant to the test for discretionary limits on court openness from this Court's decision in *Sierra Club*.

30 Court openness is protected by the constitutional guarantee of freedom of expression and is essential to the proper functioning of our democracy (*Canadian Broadcasting Corp. v. New Brunswick (Attorney General)*, [1996] 3 S.C.R. 480, at para. 23; *Vancouver Sun (Re)*, 2004 SCC 43, [2004] 2 S.C.R. 332, at paras. 23-26). Reporting on court proceedings by a free press is often said to be inseparable from the principle of open justice. "In reporting what has been said and done at a public trial, the media serve as the eyes and ears of a wider public which would be absolutely entitled to attend but for purely practical reasons cannot do so" (*Khuja v. Times Newspapers Ltd.*, 2017 UKSC 49, [2019] A.C. 161 (U.K. S.C.), at para. 16, citing *Edmonton Journal v. Alberta (Attorney General)*, [1989] 2 S.C.R. 1326, at pp. 1326-39, per Cory J.). Limits on openness in service of other public interests have been recognized, but sparingly and always with an eye to preserving a strong presumption that justice should proceed in public view (*Dagenais v. Canadian Broadcasting Corp.*, [1994] 3 S.C.R. 835, at p. 878; *R. v. Mentuck*, 2001 SCC 76, [2001] 3 S.C.R. 442, at paras. 32-39; *Sierra Club*, at para. 56). The test for discretionary limits on court openness is directed at maintaining this presumption while offering sufficient flexibility for courts to protect these other public interests where they arise (*Mentuck*, at para. 33). The parties agree that this is the appropriate framework of analysis for resolving this appeal.

31 The parties and the courts below disagree, however, about how this test applies to the facts of this case and this calls for clarification of certain points of the *Sierra Club* analysis. Most centrally, there is disagreement about how an important interest

in the protection of privacy could be recognized such that it would justify limits on openness, and in particular when privacy can be a matter of public concern. The parties bring two settled principles of this Court's jurisprudence to bear in support of their respective positions. First, this Court has often observed that privacy is a fundamental value necessary to the preservation of a free and democratic society (*Lavigne v. Canada (Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages)*, 2002 SCC 53, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 773, at para. 25; *Dagg v. Canada (Minister of Finance)*, [1997] 2 S.C.R. 403, at paras. 65-66, per La Forest J. (dissenting but not on this point); *New Brunswick*, at para. 40). Courts have invoked privacy, in some instances, as the basis for an exception to openness under the *Sierra Club* test (see, e.g., *R. v. Henry*, 2009 BCCA 86, 270 B.C.A.C. 5, at paras. 11 and 17). At the same time, the jurisprudence acknowledges that some degree of privacy loss — resulting in inconvenience, even in upset or embarrassment — is inherent in any court proceeding open to the public (*New Brunswick*, at para. 40). Accordingly, upholding the presumption of openness has meant recognizing that neither individual sensibilities nor mere personal discomfort associated with participating in judicial proceedings are likely to justify the exclusion of the public from court (*Attorney General of Nova Scotia v. MacIntyre*, [1982] 1 S.C.R. 175, at p. 185; *New Brunswick*, at para. 41). Determining the role of privacy in the *Sierra Club* analysis requires reconciling these two ideas, which is the nub of the disagreement between the parties. The right of privacy is not absolute; the open court principle is not without exceptions.

32 For the reasons that follow, I disagree with the Trustees that the ostensibly unbounded privacy interest they invoke qualifies as an important public interest within the meaning of *Sierra Club*. Their broad claim fails to focus on the elements of privacy that are deserving of public protection in the open court context. That is not to say, however, that privacy can never ground an exceptional measure such as the sealing orders sought in this case. While the mere embarrassment caused by the dissemination of personal information through the open court process does not rise to the level justifying a limit on court openness, circumstances do exist where an aspect of a person's private life has a plain public interest dimension.

33 Personal information disseminated in open court can be more than a source of discomfort and may result in an affront to a person's dignity. Insofar as privacy serves to protect individuals from this affront, it is an important public interest relevant under *Sierra Club*. Dignity in this sense is a related but narrower concern than privacy generally; it transcends the interests of the individual and, like other important public interests, is a matter that concerns the society at large. A court can make an exception to the open court principle, notwithstanding the strong presumption in its favour, if the interest in protecting core aspects of individuals' personal lives that bear on their dignity is at serious risk by reason of the dissemination of sufficiently sensitive information. The question is not whether the information is "personal" to the individual concerned, but whether, because of its highly sensitive character, its dissemination would occasion an affront to their dignity that society as a whole has a stake in protecting.

34 This public interest in privacy appropriately focuses the analysis on the impact of the dissemination of sensitive personal information, rather than the mere fact of this dissemination, which is frequently risked in court proceedings and is necessary in a system that privileges court openness. It is a high bar — higher and more precise than the sweeping privacy interest relied upon here by the Trustees. This public interest will only be seriously at risk where the information in question strikes at what is sometimes said to be the core identity of the individual concerned: information so sensitive that its dissemination could be an affront to dignity that the public would not tolerate, even in service of open proceedings.

35 I hasten to say that applicants for an order making exception to the open court principle cannot content themselves with an unsubstantiated claim that this public interest in dignity is compromised any more than they could by an unsubstantiated claim that their physical integrity is endangered. Under *Sierra Club*, the applicant must show on the facts of the case that, as an important interest, this dignity dimension of their privacy is at "serious risk". For the purposes of the test for discretionary limits on court openness, this requires the applicant to show that the information in the court file is sufficiently sensitive such that it can be said to strike at the biographical core of the individual and, in the broader circumstances, that there is a serious risk that, without an exceptional order, the affected individual will suffer an affront to their dignity.

36 In the present case, the information in the court files was not of this highly sensitive character that it could be said to strike at the core identity of the affected persons; the Trustees have failed to show how the lifting of the sealing orders engages the dignity of the affected individuals. I am therefore not convinced that the intrusion on their privacy raises a serious risk to an important public interest as required by *Sierra Club*. Moreover, as I shall endeavour to explain, there was no serious risk

of physical harm to the affected individuals by lifting the sealing orders. Accordingly, this is not an appropriate case in which to make sealing orders, or any order limiting access to these court files. In the circumstances, the admissibility of the Toronto Star's new evidence is moot. I propose to dismiss the appeal.

A. The Test for Discretionary Limits on Court Openness

37 Court proceedings are presumptively open to the public (*MacIntyre*, at p. 189; *A.B. v. Bragg Communications Inc.*, 2012 SCC 46, [2012] 2 S.C.R. 567, at para. 11).

38 The test for discretionary limits on presumptive court openness has been expressed as a two-step inquiry involving the necessity and proportionality of the proposed order (*Sierra Club*, at para. 53). Upon examination, however, this test rests upon three core prerequisites that a person seeking such a limit must show. Recasting the test around these three prerequisites, without altering its essence, helps to clarify the burden on an applicant seeking an exception to the open court principle. In order to succeed, the person asking a court to exercise discretion in a way that limits the open court presumption must establish that:

(1) court openness poses a serious risk to an important public interest;

(2) the order sought is necessary to prevent this serious risk to the identified interest because reasonably alternative measures will not prevent this risk; and,

(3) as a matter of proportionality, the benefits of the order outweigh its negative effects.

Only where all three of these prerequisites have been met can a discretionary limit on openness — for example, a sealing order, a publication ban, an order excluding the public from a hearing, or a redaction order — properly be ordered. This test applies to all discretionary limits on court openness, subject only to valid legislative enactments (*Toronto Star Newspapers Ltd. v. Ontario*, 2005 SCC 41, [2005] 2 S.C.R. 188, at paras. 7 and 22).

39 The discretion is structured and controlled in this way to protect the open court principle, which is understood to be constitutionalized under the right to freedom of expression at s. 2(b) of the Charter (*New Brunswick*, at para. 23). Sustained by freedom of expression, the open court principle is one of the foundations of a free press given that access to courts is fundamental to newsgathering. This Court has often highlighted the importance of open judicial proceedings to maintaining the independence and impartiality of the courts, public confidence and understanding of their work and ultimately the legitimacy of the process (see, e.g., *Vancouver Sun*, at paras. 23-26). In *New Brunswick*, La Forest J. explained the presumption in favour of court openness had become "one of the hallmarks of a democratic society" (citing *Re Southam Inc. and The Queen (No.1)*, (1983), 41 O.R. (2d) 113 (C.A.), at p. 119), that "acts as a guarantee that justice is administered in a non-arbitrary manner, according to the rule of law ... thereby fostering public confidence in the integrity of the court system and understanding of the administration of justice" (para. 22). The centrality of this principle to the court system underlies the strong presumption — albeit one that is rebuttable — in favour of court openness (para. 40; *Mentuck*, at para. 39).

40 The test ensures that discretionary orders are subject to no lower standard than a legislative enactment limiting court openness would be (*Mentuck*, at para. 27; *Sierra Club*, at para. 45). To that end, this Court developed a scheme of analysis by analogy to the *Oakes* test, which courts use to understand whether a legislative limit on a right guaranteed under the Charter is reasonable and demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society (*Sierra Club*, at para. 40, citing *R. v. Oakes*, [1986] 1 S.C.R. 103; see also *Dagenais*, at p. 878; *Vancouver Sun*, at para. 30).

41 The recognized scope of what interests might justify a discretionary exception to open courts has broadened over time. In *Dagenais*, Lamer C.J. spoke of a requisite risk to the "fairness of the trial" (p. 878). In *Mentuck*, Iacobucci J. extended this to a risk affecting the "proper administration of justice" (para. 32). Finally, in *Sierra Club*, Iacobucci J., again writing for a unanimous Court, restated the test to capture any serious risk to an "important interest, including a commercial interest, in the context of litigation" (para. 53). He simultaneously clarified that the important interest must be expressed as a public interest. For example, on the facts of that case, a harm to a particular business interest would not have been sufficient, but the "general commercial interest of preserving confidential information" was an important interest because of its public character (para. 55).

This is consistent with the fact that this test was developed in reference to the *Oakes* jurisprudence that focuses on the "pressing and substantial" objective of legislation of general application (*Oakes*, at pp. 138-39; see also *Mentuck*, at para. 31). The term "important interest" therefore captures a broad array of public objectives.

42 While there is no closed list of important public interests for the purposes of this test, I share Iacobucci J.'s sense, explained in *Sierra Club*, that courts must be "cautious" and "alive to the fundamental importance of the open court rule" even at the earliest stage when they are identifying important public interests (para. 56). Determining what is an important public interest can be done in the abstract at the level of general principles that extend beyond the parties to the particular dispute (para. 55). By contrast, whether that interest is at "serious risk" is a fact-based finding that, for the judge considering the appropriateness of an order, is necessarily made in context. In this sense, the identification of, on the one hand, an important interest and, on the other, the seriousness of the risk to that interest are, theoretically at least, separate and qualitatively distinct operations. An order may therefore be refused simply because a valid important public interest is not at serious risk on the facts of a given case or, conversely, that the identified interests, regardless of whether they are at serious risk, do not have the requisite important public character as a matter of general principle.

43 The test laid out in *Sierra Club* continues to be an appropriate guide for judicial discretion in cases like this one. The breadth of the category of "important interest" transcends the interests of the parties to the dispute and provides significant flexibility to address harm to fundamental values in our society that unqualified openness could cause (see, e.g., P. M. Perell and J. W. Morden, *The Law of Civil Procedure in Ontario* (4th ed. 2020), at para. 3.185; J. Bailey and J. Burkell, "Revisiting the Open Court Principle in an Era of Online Publication: Questioning Presumptive Public Access to Parties' and Witnesses' Personal Information" (2016), 48 *Ottawa L. Rev.* 143, at pp. 154-55). At the same time, however, the requirement that a serious risk to an important interest be demonstrated imposes a meaningful threshold necessary to maintain the presumption of openness. Were it merely a matter of weighing the benefits of the limit on court openness against its negative effects, decision-makers confronted with concrete impacts on the individuals appearing before them may struggle to put adequate weight on the less immediate negative effects on the open court principle. Such balancing could be evasive of effective appellate review. To my mind, the structure provided by *Dagenais*, *Mentuck*, and *Sierra Club* remains appropriate and should be affirmed.

44 Finally, I recall that the open court principle is engaged by all judicial proceedings, whatever their nature (*MacIntyre* at pp. 185-86; *Vancouver Sun*, at para. 31). To the extent the Trustees suggested, in their arguments about the negative effects of the sealing orders, that probate in Ontario does not engage the open court principle or that the openness of these proceedings has no public value, I disagree. The certificates the Trustees sought from the court are issued under the seal of that court, thereby bearing the imprimatur of the court's authority. The court's decision, even if rendered in a non-contentious setting, will have an impact on third parties, for example by establishing the testamentary paper that constitutes a valid will (see *Otis v. Otis*, (2004), 7 E.T.R. (3d) 221 (Ont. S.C.), at paras. 23-24). Contrary to what the Trustees argue, the matters in a probate file are not quintessentially private or fundamentally administrative. Obtaining a certificate of appointment of estate trustee in Ontario is a court proceeding and the fundamental rationale for openness — discouraging mischief and ensuring confidence in the administration of justice through transparency — applies to probate proceedings and thus to the transfer of property under court authority and other matters affected by that court action.

45 It is true that other non-probate estate planning mechanisms may allow for the transfer of wealth outside the ordinary avenues of testate or intestate succession — that is the case, for instance, for certain insurance and pension benefits, and for certain property held in co-ownership. But this does not change the necessarily open court character of probate proceedings. That non-probate transfers keep certain information related to the administration of an estate out of public view does not mean that the Trustees here, by seeking certificates from the court, somehow do not engage this principle. The Trustees seek the benefits that flow from the public judicial probate process: transparency ensures that the probate court's authority is administered fairly and efficiently (*Vancouver Sun*, at para. 25; *New Brunswick*, at para. 22). The strong presumption in favour of openness plainly applies to probate proceedings and the Trustees must satisfy the test for discretionary limits on court openness.

B. The Public Importance of Privacy

46 As mentioned, I disagree with the Trustees that an unbounded interest in privacy qualifies as an important public interest under the test for discretionary limits on court openness. Yet in some of its manifestations, privacy does have social importance beyond the person most immediately concerned. On that basis, it cannot be excluded as an interest that could justify, in the right circumstances, a limit to court openness. Indeed, the public importance of privacy has been recognized by this Court in various settings, and this sheds light on why the narrower aspect of privacy related to the protection of dignity is an important public interest.

47 I respectfully disagree with the manner in which the Court of Appeal disposed of the claim by the Trustees that there is a serious risk to the interest in protecting personal privacy in this case. For the appellate judges, the privacy concerns raised by the Trustees amounted to "[p]ersonal concerns" which cannot, "without more", satisfy the requirement from *Sierra Club* that an important interest be framed as a public interest (para. 10). The Court of Appeal in our case relied, at para. 10, on *H. (M.E.) v. Williams*, 2012 ONCA 35, 108 O.R. (3d) 321, in which it was held that "[p]urely personal interests cannot justify non-publication or sealing orders" (para. 25). Citing as authority judgments of this Court in *MacIntyre* and *Sierra Club*, the court continued by observing that "personal concerns of a litigant, including concerns about the very real emotional distress and embarrassment that can be occasioned to litigants when justice is done in public, will not, standing alone, satisfy the necessity branch of the test" (para. 25). Respectfully stated, the emphasis that the Court of Appeal placed on personal concerns as a means of deciding that the sealing orders failed to meet the necessity requirement in this case and in *Williams* is, I think, mistaken. Personal concerns that relate to aspects of the privacy of an individual who is before the courts can coincide with a public interest in confidentiality.

48 Like the Court of Appeal, I do agree with the view expressed particularly in the pre-*Charter* case of *MacIntyre*, that where court openness results in an intrusion on privacy which disturbs the "sensibilities of the individuals involved" (p. 185), that concern is generally insufficient to justify a sealing or like order and does not amount to an important public interest under *Sierra Club*. But I disagree with the Court of Appeal in this case and in *Williams* that this is because the intrusion only occasions "personal concerns". Certain personal concerns — even "without more" — can coincide with important public interests within the meaning of *Sierra Club*. To invoke the expression of Binnie J. in *F.N. (Re)*, 2000 SCC 35, [2000] 1 S.C.R. 880, at para. 10, there is a "public interest in confidentiality" that is felt, first and foremost, by the person involved and is most certainly a personal concern. Even in *Williams*, the Court of Appeal was careful to note that where, without privacy protection, an individual would face "a substantial risk of serious debilitating emotional ... harm", an exception to openness should be available (paras. 29-30). The means of discerning whether a privacy interest reflects a "public interest in confidentiality" is therefore not whether the interest reflects or is rooted in "personal concerns" for the privacy of the individuals involved. Some personal concerns relating to privacy overlap with public interests in confidentiality. These interests in privacy can be, in my view, important public interests within the meaning of *Sierra Club*. It is true that an individual's privacy is pre-eminently important to that individual. But this Court has also long recognized that the protection of privacy is, in a variety of settings, in the interest of society as a whole.

49 The proposition that privacy is important, not only to the affected individual but to our society, has deep roots in the jurisprudence of this Court outside the context of the test for discretionary limits on court openness. This background helps explain why privacy cannot be rejected as a mere personal concern. However, the key differences in these contexts are such that the public importance of privacy cannot be transposed to open courts without adaptation. Only specific aspects of privacy interests can qualify as important public interests under *Sierra Club*.

50 In the context of s. 8 of the Charter and public sector privacy legislation, La Forest J. cited American privacy scholar Alan F. Westin for the proposition that privacy is a fundamental value of the modern state, first in *R. v. Dyment*, [1988] 2 S.C.R. 417, at pp. 427-28 (concurring), and then in *Dagg*, at para. 65 (dissenting but not on this point). In the latter case, La Forest J. wrote: "The protection of privacy is a fundamental value in modern, democratic states. An expression of an individual's unique personality or personhood, privacy is grounded on physical and moral autonomy — the freedom to engage in one's own thoughts, actions and decisions" (para. 65 (citations omitted)). That statement was endorsed unanimously by this Court in *Lavigne*, at para. 25.

51 Further, in *Alberta (Information and Privacy Commissioner) v. United Food and Commercial Workers, Local 401* 2013 SCC 62, [2013] 3 S.C.R. 733 (“UFCW”), decided in the context of a statute regulating the use of information by organizations, the objective of providing an individual with some control over their information was recognized as “intimately connected to individual autonomy, dignity and privacy, self-evidently significant social values” (para. 24). The importance of privacy, its “quasi-constitutional status” and its role in protecting moral autonomy continues to find expression in our recent jurisprudence (see, e.g., *Lavigne*, at para. 24; *Bragg*, at para. 18, per Abella J., citing *TorontoStar Newspaper Ltd. v. Ontario*, 2012 ONCJ 27, 289 C.C.C. (3d) 549, at paras. 40-41 and 44; *Douez v. Facebook, Inc.*, 2017 SCC 33, [2017] 1 S.C.R. 751, at para. 59). In *Douez*, Karakatsanis, Wagner (as he then was) and Gascon JJ. underscored this same point, adding that “the growth of the Internet, virtually timeless with pervasive reach, has exacerbated the potential harm that may flow from incursions to a person’s privacy interests” (para. 59).

52 Privacy as a public interest is underlined by specific aspects of privacy protection present in legislation at the federal and provincial levels (see, e.g., *Privacy Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. P-21; *Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act*, S.C. 2000, c. 5 (“PIPEDA”); *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. F.31; *Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms*, CQLR, c. C-12, s. 5; *Civil Code of Québec*, arts. 35 to 41).³ Further, in assessing the constitutionality of a legislative exception to the open court principle, this Court has recognized that the protection of individual privacy can be a pressing and substantial objective (*Edmonton Journal*, at p. 1345, per Cory J.; see also the concurring reasons of Wilson J., at p. 1354, in which “the public interest in protecting the privacy of litigants generally in matrimonial cases against the public interest in an open court process” was explicitly noted). There is also continued support for the social and public importance of individual privacy in the academic literature (see, e.g., A. J. Cockfield, “Protecting the Social Value of Privacy in the Context of State Investigations Using New Technologies” (2007), 40 U.B.C. L. Rev. 41, at p. 41; K. Hughes, “A Behavioural Understanding of Privacy and its Implications for Privacy Law” (2012), 75 *Modern L. Rev.* 806, at p. 823; P. Gewirtz, “Privacy and Speech” (2001), *Sup. Ct. Rev.* 139, at p. 139). It is therefore inappropriate, in my respectful view, to dismiss the public interest in protecting privacy as merely a personal concern. This does not mean, however, that privacy generally is an important public interest in the context of limits on court openness.

53 The fact that the case before the application judge concerned individuals who were advancing their own privacy interests, which were undeniably important to them as individuals, does not mean that there is no public interest at stake. In *F.N. (Re)*, this was the personal interest that young offenders had in remaining anonymous in court proceedings as a means of encouraging their personal rehabilitation (para. 11). All of society had a stake, according to Binnie J., in the young person’s personal prospect for rehabilitation. This same idea from *F.N. (Re)* was cited in support of finding the interest in *Sierra Club* to be a public interest. That interest, rooted first in an agreement of personal concern to the contracting parties involved, was a private matter that evinced, alongside its personal interest to the parties, a “public interest in confidentiality” (*Sierra Club*, at para. 55). Similarly, while the Trustees have a personal interest in preserving their privacy, this does not mean that the public has no stake in this same interest because — as this Court has made clear — it is related to moral autonomy and dignity which are pressing and substantial concerns.

54 In this appeal, the *Toronto Star* suggests that legitimate privacy concerns would be effectively protected by a discretionary order where there is “something more” to elevate them beyond personal concerns and sensibilities (R.F., at para. 73). The Income Security Advocacy Centre, by way of example, submits that privacy serves the public interests of preventing harm and of ensuring individuals are not dissuaded from accessing the courts. I agree that these concepts are related, but in my view care must be taken not to conflate the public importance of privacy with that of other interests; aspects of privacy, such as dignity, may constitute important public interests in and of themselves. A risk to personal privacy may be tied to a risk to psychological harm, as it was in *Bragg* (para. 14; see also J. Rossiter, *Law of Publication Bans, Private Hearings and Sealing Orders* (loose-leaf), s. 2.4.1). But concerns for privacy may not always coincide with a desire to avoid psychological harm, and may focus instead, for example, on protecting one’s professional standing (see, e.g., *R. v. Paterson* (1998), 102 B.C.A.C. 200, at paras. 76, 78 and 87-88). Similarly, there may be circumstances where the prospect of surrendering the personal information necessary to pursue a legal claim may deter an individual from bringing that claim (see *S. v. Lamontagne*, 2020 QCCA 663, at paras. 34-35 (CanLII)). In the same way, the prospect of surrendering sensitive commercial information would have impaired the

conduct of the party's defence in *Sierra Club* (at para. 71), or could pressure an individual into settling a dispute prematurely (K. Eltis, *Courts, Litigants and the Digital Age* (2nd ed. 2016), at p. 86). But this does not necessarily mean that a public interest in privacy is wholly subsumed by such concerns. I note, for example, that access to justice concerns do not apply where the privacy interest to be protected is that of a third party to the litigation, such as a witness, whose access to the courts is not at stake and who has no choice available to terminate the litigation and avoid any privacy impacts (see, e.g., *Himel v. Greenberg*, 2010 ONSC 2325, 93 R.F.L. (6th) 357, at para. 58; see also *Rossiter*, s. 2.4.2(2)). In any event, the recognition of these related and valid important public interests does not answer the question as to whether aspects of privacy in and of themselves are important public interests and does not diminish the distinctive public character of privacy, considered above.

55 Indeed, the specific harms to privacy occasioned by open courts have not gone unnoticed nor been discounted as merely personal concerns. Courts have exercised their discretion to limit court openness in order to protect personal information from publicity, including to prevent the disclosure of sexual orientation (see, e.g., *Paterson*, at paras. 76, 78 and 87-88), HIV status (see, e.g., *A.B. v. Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2017 FC 629, at para. 9 (CanLII)) and a history of substance abuse and criminality (see, e.g., *R. v. Pickton*, 2010 BCSC 1198, at paras. 11 and 20 (CanLII)). This need to reconcile the public interest in privacy with the open court principle has been highlighted by this Court (see, e.g., *Edmonton Journal*, at p. 1353, per Wilson J.). Writing extra-judicially, McLachlin C.J. explained that "[i]f we are serious about peoples' private lives, we must preserve a modicum of privacy. Equally, if we are serious about our justice system, we must have open courts. The question is how to reconcile these dual imperatives in a fair and principled way" (*"Courts, Transparency and Public Confidence: To the Better Administration of Justice"* (2003), 8 *Deakin L. Rev.* 1, at p. 4). In seeking that reconciliation, the question becomes whether the relevant dimension of privacy amounts to an important public interest that, when seriously at risk, would justify rebutting the strong presumption favouring open courts.

C. The Important Public Interest in Privacy Bears on the Protection of Individual Dignity

56 While the public importance of privacy has clearly been recognized by this Court in various settings, caution is required in deploying this concept in the test for discretionary limits on court openness. It is a matter of settled law that open court proceedings by their nature can be a source of discomfort and embarrassment and these intrusions on privacy are generally seen as of insufficient importance to overcome the presumption of openness. The *Toronto Star* has raised the concern that recognizing privacy as an important public interest will lower the burden for applicants because the privacy of litigants will, in some respects, always be at risk in court proceedings. I agree that the requirement to show a serious risk to an important interest is a key threshold component of the analysis that must be preserved in order to protect the open court principle. The recognition of a public interest in privacy could threaten the strong presumption of openness if privacy is cast too broadly without a view to its public character.

57 Privacy poses challenges in the test for discretionary limits on court openness because of the necessary dissemination of information that openness implies. It bears recalling that when Dickson J., as he then was, wrote in *MacIntyre* that "covertness is the exception and openness the rule", he was explicitly treating a privacy argument, returning to and dismissing the view, urged many times before, "that the 'privacy' of litigants *requires* that the public be excluded from court proceedings" (p. 185 (emphasis added)). Dickson J. rejected the view that personal privacy concerns require closed courtroom doors, explaining that "[a]s a general rule the sensibilities of the individuals involved are no basis for exclusion of the public from judicial proceedings" (p. 185).

58 Though writing before *Dagenais*, and therefore not commenting on the specific steps of the analysis as we now understand them, to my mind, Dickson J. was right to recognize that the open court principle brings necessary limits to the right to privacy. While individuals may have an expectation that information about them will not be revealed in judicial proceedings, the open court principle stands presumptively in opposition to that expectation. For example, in *Lac d'Amiante du Québec Ltée v. 2858-0702 Québec Inc.*, 2001 SCC 51, [2001] 2 S.C.R. 743, LeBel J. held that "a party who institutes a legal proceeding waives his or her right to privacy, at least in part" (para. 42). *MacIntyre* and cases like it recognize — in stating that openness is the rule and covertness the exception — that the right to privacy, however defined, in some measure gives way to the open court ideal. I share the view that the open court principle presumes that this limit on the right to privacy is justified.

59 The Toronto Star is therefore right to say that the privacy of individuals will very often be at some risk in court proceedings. Disputes between and concerning individuals that play out in open court necessarily reveal information that may have otherwise remained out of public view. Indeed, much like the Court of Appeal in this case, courts have explicitly adverted to this concern when concluding that mere inconvenience is insufficient to cross the initial threshold of the test (see, e.g., *3834310 Canada inc. v. Chamberland* 2004 CanLII 4122 (Que. C.A.), at para. 30). Saying that any impact on individual privacy is sufficient to establish a serious risk to an important public interest for the purposes of the test for discretionary limits on court openness could render this initial requirement moot. Many cases would turn on the balancing at the proportionality stage. Such a development would amount to a departure from *Sierra Club*, which is the appropriate framework and one which must be preserved.

60 Further, recognizing an important interest in privacy generally could prove to be too open-ended and difficult to apply. Privacy is a complex and contextual concept (*Dagg*, at para. 67; see also B. McIsaac, K. Klein and S. Brown, *The Law of Privacy in Canada* (loose-leaf), vol. 1, at pp. 1-4; D. J. Solove, "Conceptualizing Privacy" (2002), 90 Cal. L. Rev. 1087, at p. 1090). Indeed, this Court has described the nature of limits of privacy as being in a state of "theoretical disarray" (*R. v. Spencer*, 2014 SCC 43, [2014] 2 S.C.R. 212, at para. 35). Much turns on the context in which privacy is invoked. I agree with the Toronto Star that a bald recognition of privacy as an important interest in the context of the test for discretionary limits on court openness, as the Trustees advance here, would invite considerable confusion. It would be difficult for courts to measure a serious risk to such an interest because of its multi-faceted nature.

61 While I acknowledge these concerns have merit, I disagree that they require that privacy never be considered in determining whether there is a serious risk to an important public interest. I reach this conclusion for two reasons. First, the problem of privacy's complexity can be attenuated by focusing on the purpose underlying the public protection of privacy as it is relevant to the judicial process, in order to fix precisely on that aspect which transcends the interests of the parties in this context. That narrower dimension of privacy is the protection of dignity, an important public interest that can be threatened by open courts. Indeed, rather than attempting to apply a single unwieldy concept of privacy in all contexts, this Court has generally fixed on more specific privacy interests tailored to the particular situation (*Spencer*, at para. 35; *Edmonton Journal*, at p. 1362, per Wilson J.). That is what must be done here, with a view to identifying the public aspect of privacy that openness might inappropriately undermine.

62 Second, I recall that in order to pass the first stage of the analysis one must not simply invoke an important interest, but must also overcome the presumption of openness by showing a serious risk to this interest. The burden of showing a risk to such an interest on the facts of a given case constitutes the true initial threshold on the person seeking to restrict openness. It is never sufficient to plead a recognized important public interest on its own. The demonstration of a serious risk to this interest is still required. What is important is that the interest be accurately defined to capture only those aspects of privacy that engage legitimate public objectives such that showing a serious risk to that interest remains a high bar. In this way, courts can effectively maintain the guarantee of presumptive openness.

63 Specifically, in order to preserve the integrity of the open court principle, an important public interest concerned with the protection of dignity should be understood to be seriously at risk only in limited cases. Nothing here displaces the principle that covertness in court proceedings must be exceptional. Neither the sensibilities of individuals nor the fact that openness is disadvantageous, embarrassing or distressing to certain individuals will generally on their own warrant interference with court openness (*MacIntyre*, at p. 185; *New Brunswick*, at para. 40; *Williams*, at para. 30; *Coltsfoot Publishing Ltd. v. Foster-Jacques*, 2012 NSCA 83, 320 N.S.R. (2d) 166, at para. 97). These principles do not preclude recognizing the public character of a privacy interest as important when it is related to the protection of dignity. They merely require that a serious risk be shown to exist in respect of this interest in order to justify, exceptionally, a limit on openness, as is the case with any important public interest under *Sierra Club*. As Professors Sylvette Guillemard and Séverine Menétrey explain, [TRANSLATION] "[t]he confidentiality of the proceedings may be justified, in particular, in order to protect the parties' privacy However, the jurisprudence indicates that embarrassment or shame is not a sufficient reason to order that proceedings be held *in camera* or to impose a publication ban" (*Comprendre la procédure civile québécoise* (2nd ed. 2017), at p. 57).

64 How should the privacy interest at issue be understood as raising an important public interest relevant to the test for discretionary limits on court openness in this context? It is helpful to recall that the orders below were sought to limit access to documents and information in the court files. The Trustees' argument on this point focused squarely on the risk of immediate and widespread dissemination of the personally identifying and other sensitive information contained in the sealed materials by the Toronto Star. The Trustees submit that this dissemination would constitute an unwarranted intrusion into the privacy of the affected individuals beyond the upset they have already suffered as a result of the publicity associated with the death of the Shermans.

65 In my view, there is value in leaving individuals free to restrict when, how and to what extent highly sensitive information about them is communicated to others in the public sphere, because choosing how we present ourselves in public preserves our moral autonomy and dignity as individuals. This Court has had occasion to underscore the connection between the privacy interest engaged by open courts and the protection of dignity specifically. For example, in *Edmonton Journal*, Wilson J. noted that the impugned provision which would limit publication about matrimonial proceedings addressed "a somewhat different aspect of privacy, one more closely related to the protection of one's dignity ... namely the personal anguish and loss of dignity that may result from having embarrassing details of one's private life printed in the newspapers" (pp. 1363-64). In *Bragg*, as a further example, the protection of a young person's ability to control sensitive information was said to foster respect for "dignity, personal integrity and autonomy" (para. 18, citing *Toronto Star Newspaper Ltd.*, at para. 44).

66 Consistent with this jurisprudence, I note by way of example that the Quebec legislature expressly highlighted the preservation of dignity when the *Sierra Club* test was codified in the Code of Civil Procedure, CQLR, c. C-25.01 ("C.C.P."), art. 12 (see also Ministère de la Justice, *Commentaires de la ministre de la Justice: Code de procédure civile, chapitre C-25.01* (2015), art. 12). Under art. 12 C.C.P., a discretionary exception to the open court principle can be made by the court if "public order, in particular the preservation of the dignity of the persons involved or the protection of substantial and legitimate interests", requires it.

67 The concept of public order evidences flexibility analogous to the concept of an important public interest under *Sierra Club* yet it recalls that the interest invoked transcends, in importance and consequence, the purely subjective sensibilities of the persons affected. Like the "important public interest" that must be at serious risk to justify the sealing orders in the present appeal, public order encompasses a wide array of general principles and imperative norms identified by a legislature and the courts as fundamental to a given society (see *Goulet v. Transamerica Life Insurance Co. of Canada*, 2002 SCC 21, [2002] 1 S.C.R. 719, at paras. 42-44, citing *Godbout v. Longueuil (Ville de)*, [1995] R.J.Q. 2561 (C.A.), at p. 2570, aff'd [1997] 3 S.C.R. 844). As one Quebec judge wrote, referring to *Sierra Club* prior to the enactment of art. 12 C.C.P., the interest must be understood as defined [TRANSLATION] "in terms of a public interest in confidentiality" (see *3834310 Canada inc.*, at para. 24, per Gendreau J.A. for the court of appeal). From among the various considerations that make up the concept of public order and other legitimate interests to which art. 12 C.C.P. alludes, it is significant that dignity, and not an untailored reference to either privacy, harm or access to justice, was given pride of place. Indeed, it is that narrow aspect of privacy considered to be a fundamental right that courts had fixed upon before the enactment of art. 12 C.C.P. — [TRANSLATION] "what is part of one's personal life, in short, what constitutes a minimum personal sphere" (*Godbout*, at p. 2569, per Baudouin J.A.; see also *A. v. B.* 1990 CanLII 3132(Que. C.A.), at para. 20, per Rothman J.A.).

68 The "preservation of the dignity of the persons involved" is now consecrated as the archetypal public order interest in art. 12 C.C.P. It is the exemplar of the *Sierra Club* important public interest in confidentiality that stands as justification for an exception to openness (S. Rochette and J.-F. Côté, "Article 12", in L. Chamberland, ed., *Le grand collectif: Code de procédure civile — Commentaires et annotations* (5th ed. 2020), vol. 1, at p. 102; D. Ferland and B. Emery, *Précis de procédure civile du Québec* (6th ed. 2020), vol. 1, at para. 1-111). Dignity gives concrete expression to this public order interest because all of society has a stake in its preservation, notwithstanding its personal connections to the individuals concerned. This codification of *Sierra Club* 's notion of important public interest highlights the superordinate importance of human dignity and the appropriateness of limiting court openness on this basis as against an overbroad understanding of privacy that might be otherwise unsuitable to the open court context.

69 Consistent with this idea, understanding privacy as predicated on dignity has been advanced as useful in connection with challenges brought by digital communications (K. Eltis, "The Judicial System in the Digital Age: Revisiting the Relationship between Privacy and Accessibility in the Cyber Context" (2011), 56 McGill L.J. 289, at p. 314).

70 It is also significant, in my view, that the application judge in this case explicitly recognized, in response to the relevant arguments from the Trustees, an interest in "protecting the privacy *and dignity* of victims of crime and their loved ones" (para. 23 (emphasis added)). This elucidates that the central concern for the affected individuals on this point is not merely protecting their privacy for its own sake but privacy where it coincides with the public character of the dignity interests of these individuals.

71 Violations of privacy that cause a loss of control over fundamental personal information about oneself are damaging to dignity because they erode one's ability to present aspects of oneself to others in a selective manner (D. Matheson, "Dignity and Selective Self-Presentation", in I. Kerr, V. Steeves and C. Lucock, eds., *Lessons from the Identity Trail: Anonymity, Privacy and Identity in a Networked Society* (2009), 319, at pp. 327-28; L. M. Austin, "Re-reading Westin" (2019), 20 *Theor. Inq. L.* 53, at pp. 66-68; Eltis (2016), at p. 13). Dignity, used in this context, is a social concept that involves presenting core aspects of oneself to others in a considered and controlled manner (see generally Matheson, at pp. 327-28; Austin, at pp. 66-68). Dignity is eroded where individuals lose control over this core identity-giving information about themselves, because a highly sensitive aspect of who they are that they did not consciously decide to share is now available to others and may shape how they are seen in public. This was even alluded to by La Forest J., dissenting but not on this point, in *Dagg*, where he referred to privacy as "[a]n expression of an individual's unique personality or personhood" (para. 65).

72 Where dignity is impaired, the impact on the individual is not theoretical but could engender real human consequences, including psychological distress (see generally Bragg, at para. 23). La Forest J., concurring, observed in *Dyment* that privacy is essential to the well-being of individuals (p. 427). Viewed in this way, a privacy interest, where it shields the core information associated with dignity necessary to individual well-being, begins to look much like the physical safety interest also raised in this case, the important and public nature of which is neither debated, nor, in my view, seriously debatable. The administration of justice suffers when the operation of courts threatens physical well-being because a responsible court system is attuned to the physical harm it inflicts on individuals and works to avoid such effects. Similarly, in my view, a responsible court must be attuned and responsive to the harm it causes to other core elements of individual well-being, including individual dignity. This parallel helps to understand dignity as a more limited dimension of privacy relevant as an important public interest in the open court context.

73 I am accordingly of the view that protecting individuals from the threat to their dignity that arises when information revealing core aspects of their private lives is disseminated through open court proceedings is an important public interest for the purposes of the test.

74 Focusing on the underlying value of privacy in protecting individual dignity from the exposure of private information in open court overcomes the criticisms that privacy will always be at risk in open court proceedings and is theoretically complex. Openness brings intrusions on personal privacy in virtually all cases, but dignity as a public interest in protecting an individual's core sensibility is more rarely in play. Specifically, and consistent with the cautious approach to the recognition of important public interests, this privacy interest, while determined in reference to the broader factual setting, will be at serious risk only where the sensitivity of the information strikes at the subject's more intimate self.

75 If the interest is ultimately about safeguarding a person's dignity, that interest will be undermined when the information reveals something sensitive about them as an individual, as opposed to generic information that reveals little if anything about who they are as a person. Therefore the information that will be revealed by court openness must consist of intimate or personal details about an individual — what this Court has described in its jurisprudence on s. 8 of the Charter as the "biographical core" — if a serious risk to an important public interest is to be recognized in this context (*R. v. Plant*, [1993] 3 S.C.R. 281, at p. 293; *R. v. Tessling*, 2004 SCC 67, [2004] 3 S.C.R. 432, at para. 60; *R. v. Cole*, 2012 SCC 53, [2012] 3 S.C.R. 34, at para. 46). Dignity transcends personal inconvenience by reason of the highly sensitive nature of the information that might be revealed. This Court in *Cole* drew a similar line between the sensitivity of personal information and the public interest in protecting that information

in reference to the biographical core. It held that "reasonable and informed Canadians" would be more willing to recognize the existence of a privacy interest where the relevant information cuts to the "biographical core" or, "[p]ut another way, the more personal and confidential the information" (para. 46). The presumption of openness means that mere discomfort associated with lesser intrusions of privacy will generally be tolerated. But there is a public interest in ensuring that openness does not unduly entail the dissemination of this core information that threatens dignity — even if it is "personal" to the affected person.

76 The test for discretionary limits on court openness imposes on the applicant the burden to show that the important public interest is at serious risk. Recognizing that privacy, understood in reference to dignity, is only at serious risk where the information in the court file is sufficiently sensitive erects a threshold consistent with the presumption of openness. This threshold is fact specific. It addresses the concern, noted above, that personal information can frequently be found in court files and yet finding this sufficient to pass the serious risk threshold in every case would undermine the structure of the test. By requiring the applicant to demonstrate the sensitivity of the information as a necessary condition to the finding of a serious risk to this interest, the scope of the interest is limited to only those cases where the rationale for not revealing core aspects of a person's private life, namely protecting individual dignity, is most actively engaged.

77 There is no need here to provide an exhaustive catalogue of the range of sensitive personal information that, if exposed, could give rise to a serious risk. It is enough to say that courts have demonstrated a willingness to recognize the sensitivity of information related to stigmatized medical conditions (see, e.g., *A.B.*, at para. 9), stigmatized work (see, e.g., *Work Safe Twerk Safe v. Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Ontario*, 2021 ONSC 1100, at para. 28 (CanLII)), sexual orientation (see, e.g., *Paterson*, at paras. 76, 78 and 87-88), and subsection to sexual assault or harassment (see, e.g., *Fedeli v. Brown*, 2020 ONSC 994, at para. 9 (CanLII)). I would also note the submission of the intervener the Income Security Advocacy Centre, that detailed information about family structure and work history could in some circumstances constitute sensitive information. The question in every case is whether the information reveals something intimate and personal about the individual, their lifestyle or their experiences.

78 I pause here to note that I refer to cases on s. 8 of the Charter above for the limited purpose of providing insight into types of information that are more or less personal and therefore deserving of public protection. If the impact on dignity as a result of disclosure is to be accurately measured, it is critical that the analysis differentiate between information in this way. Helpfully, one factor in determining whether an applicant's subjective expectation of privacy is objectively reasonable in the s. 8 jurisprudence focuses on the degree to which information is private (see, e.g., *R. v. Marakah*, 2017 SCC 59, [2017] 2 S.C.R. 608, at para. 31; *Cole*, at paras. 44-46). But while these decisions may assist for this limited purpose, this is not to say that the remainder of the s. 8 analysis has any relevance to the application of the test for discretionary limits on court openness. For example, asking what the Trustees' reasonable expectation of privacy was here could invite a circular analysis of whether they reasonably expected their court files to be open to the public or whether they reasonably expected to be successful in having them sealed. Therefore, it is only for the limited purpose described above that the s. 8 jurisprudence is useful.

79 In cases where the information is sufficiently sensitive to strike at an individual's biographical core, a court must then ask whether a serious risk to the interest is made out in the full factual context of the case. While this is obviously a fact-specific determination, some general observations may be made here to guide this assessment.

80 I note that the seriousness of the risk may be affected by the extent to which information would be disseminated without an exception to the open court principle. If the applicant raises a risk that the personal information will come to be known by a large segment of the public in the absence of an order, this is a plainly more serious risk than if the result will be that a handful of people become aware of the same information, all else being equal. In the past, the requirement that one be physically present to acquire information in open court or from a court record meant that information was, to some extent, protected because it was "practically obscure" (D. S. Ardia, "Privacy and Court Records: Online Access and the Loss of Practical Obscurity" (2017), 4 U. Ill. L. Rev. 1385, at p. 1396). However, today, courts should be sensitive to the information technology context, which has increased the ease with which information can be communicated and cross-referenced (see *Bailey and Burkell*, at pp. 169-70; *Ardia*, at pp. 1450-51). In this context, it may well be difficult for courts to be sure that information will not be broadly disseminated in the absence of an order.

81 It will be appropriate, of course, to consider the extent to which information is already in the public domain. If court openness will simply make available what is already broadly and easily accessible, it will be difficult to show that revealing the information in open court will actually result in a meaningful loss of that aspect of privacy relating to the dignity interest to which I refer here. However, just because information is already accessible to some segment of the public does not mean that making it available through the court process will not exacerbate the risk to privacy. Privacy is not a binary concept, that is, information is not simply either private or public, especially because, by reason of technology in particular, absolute confidentiality is best thought of as elusive (see generally *R. v. Quesnelle*, 2014 SCC 46, [2014] 2 S.C.R. 390, at para. 37; *UFCW*, at para. 27). The fact that certain information is already available somewhere in the public sphere does not preclude further harm to the privacy interest by additional dissemination, particularly if the feared dissemination of highly sensitive information is broader or more easily accessible (see generally Solove, at p. 1152; Ardia, at p. 1393-94; E. Paton-Simpson, "Privacy and the Reasonable Paranoid: The Protection of Privacy in Public Places" (2000), 50 U.T.L.J. 305, at p. 346).

82 Further, the seriousness of the risk is also affected by the probability that the dissemination the applicant suggests will occur actually occurs. I hasten to say that implicit in the notion of risk is that the applicant need not establish that the feared dissemination will certainly occur. However, the risk to the privacy interest related to the protection of dignity will be more serious the more likely it is that the information will be disseminated. While decided in a different context, this Court has held that the magnitude of risk is a product of both the gravity of the feared harm and its probability (*R. v. Mabior*, 2012 SCC 47, [2012] 2 S.C.R. 584, at para. 86).

83 That said, the likelihood that an individual's highly sensitive personal information will be disseminated in the absence of privacy protection will be difficult to quantify precisely. It is best to note as well that probability in this context need not be identified in mathematical or numerical terms. Rather, courts may merely discern probability in light of the totality of the circumstances and balance this one factor alongside other relevant factors.

84 Finally, and as discussed above, individual sensitivities alone, even if they can be notionally associated with "privacy", are generally insufficient to justify a restriction on court openness where they do not rise above those inconveniences and discomforts that are inherent to court openness (*MacIntyre*, at p. 185). An applicant will only be able to establish that the risk is sufficient to justify a limit on openness in exceptional cases, where the threatened loss of control over information about oneself is so fundamental that it strikes meaningfully at individual dignity. These circumstances engage "social values of superordinate importance" beyond the more ordinary intrusions inherent to participating in the judicial process that Dickson J. acknowledged could justify curtailing public openness (pp. 186-87).

85 To summarize, the important public interest in privacy, as understood in the context of the limits on court openness, is aimed at allowing individuals to preserve control over their core identity in the public sphere to the extent necessary to preserve their dignity. The public has a stake in openness, to be sure, but it also has an interest in the preservation of dignity: the administration of justice requires that where dignity is threatened in this way, measures be taken to accommodate this privacy concern. Although measured by reference to the facts of each case, the risk to this interest will be serious only where the information that would be disseminated as a result of court openness is sufficiently sensitive such that openness can be shown to meaningfully strike at the individual's biographical core in a manner that threatens their integrity. Recognizing this interest is consistent with this Court's emphasis on the importance of privacy and the underlying value of individual dignity, but is also tailored to preserve the strong presumption of openness.

D. The Trustees Have Failed to Establish a Serious Risk to an Important Public Interest

86 As *Sierra Club* made plain, a discretionary order limiting court openness can only be made where there is a serious risk to an important public interest. The arguments on this appeal concerned whether privacy is an important public interest and whether the facts here disclose the existence of serious risks to privacy and safety. While the broad privacy interest invoked by the Trustees cannot be relied on to justify a limit on openness, the narrower concept of privacy understood in relation to dignity is an important public interest for the purposes of the test. I also recognize that a risk to physical safety is an important public interest, a point on which there is no dispute here. Accordingly, the relevant question at the first step is whether there is a serious

risk to one or both of these interests. For reasons that follow, the Trustees have failed to establish a serious risk to either. This alone is sufficient to conclude that the sealing orders should not have been issued.

(1) The Risk to Privacy Alleged in this Case Is Not Serious

87 As I have said, the important public interest in privacy must be understood as one tailored to the protection of individual dignity and not the broadly defined interest the Trustees have asked this Court to recognize. In order to establish a serious risk to this interest, the information in the court files about which the Trustees are concerned must be sufficiently sensitive in that it strikes at the biographical core of the affected individuals. If it is not, there is no serious risk that would justify an exception to openness. If it is, the question becomes whether a serious risk is made out in light of the facts of this case.

88 The application judge never explicitly identified a serious risk to the privacy interest he identified but, to the extent he implicitly reached this conclusion, I respectfully do not share his view. His finding was limited to the observation that "[t]he degree of intrusion on that privacy and dignity [i.e., that of the victims and their loved ones] has already been extreme and, I am sure, excruciating" (para. 23). But the intense scrutiny faced by the Shermans up to the time of the application is only part of the equation. As the sealing orders can only protect against the disclosure of the information in these court files relating to probate, the application judge was required to consider the sensitivity of the specific information they contained. He made no such measure. His conclusion about the seriousness of the risk then focused entirely on the risk of physical harm, with no indication that he found that the Trustees met their burden as to the serious risk to the privacy interest. Said very respectfully and with the knowledge that the application judge did not have the benefit of the above framework, the failure to assess the sensitivity of the information constituted a failure to consider a required element of the legal test. This warranted intervention on appeal.

89 Applying the appropriate framework to the facts of this case, I conclude that the risk to the important public interest in the affected individuals' privacy, as I have defined it above in reference to dignity, is not serious. The information the Trustees seek to protect is not highly sensitive and this alone is sufficient to conclude that there is no serious risk to the important public interest in privacy so defined.

90 There is little controversy in this case about the likelihood and extent of dissemination of the information contained in the estate files. There is near certainty that the Toronto Star will publish at least some aspects of the estate files if it is provided access. Given the breadth of the audience of its media organization, and the high-profile nature of the events surrounding the death of the Shermans, I have no difficulty in concluding that the affected individuals would lose control over this information to a significant extent should the files be open.

91 With regard to the sensitivity of the information, however, the information contained in these files does not reveal anything particularly private about the affected individuals. What would be revealed might well cause inconvenience and perhaps embarrassment, but it has not been shown that it would strike at their biographical core in a way that would undermine their control over the expression of their identities. Their privacy would be troubled, to be sure, but the relevant privacy interest bearing on the dignity of the affected persons has not been shown to be at serious risk. At its highest, the information in these files will reveal something about the relationship between the deceased and the affected individuals, in that it may reveal to whom the deceased entrusted the administration of their estates and those who they wished or were deemed to wish to be beneficiaries of their property at death. It may also reveal some basic personal information, such as addresses. Some of the beneficiaries might well, it may fairly be presumed, bear family names other than Sherman. I am mindful that the deaths are being investigated as homicides by the Toronto Police Service. However, even in this context, none of this information provides significant insight into who they are as individuals, nor would it provoke a fundamental change in their ability to control how they are perceived by others. The fact of being linked through estate documents to victims of an unsolved murder is not in itself highly sensitive. It may be the source of discomfort but has not been shown to constitute an affront to dignity in that it does not probe deeply into the biographical core of these individuals. As a result, the Trustees have failed to establish a serious risk to an important public interest as required by *Sierra Club*.

92 The fact that some of the affected individuals may be minors is also insufficient to cross the seriousness threshold. While the law recognizes that minors are especially vulnerable to intrusions of privacy (see Bragg, at para. 17), the mere fact that

information concerns minors does not displace the generally applicable analysis (see, e.g., Bragg, at para. 11). Even taking into account the increased vulnerability of minors who may be affected individuals in the probate files, there is no evidence that they would lose control of information about themselves that reveals something close to the core of their identities. Merely associating the beneficiaries or trustees with the Shermans' unexplained deaths is not enough to constitute a serious risk to the identified important public interest in privacy, defined in reference to dignity.

93 Further, while the intense media scrutiny on the family following the deaths suggests that the information would likely be widely disseminated, it is not in itself indicative of the sensitivity of the information contained in the probate files.

94 Showing that the information that would be revealed by court openness is sufficiently sensitive and private such that it goes to the biographical core of the affected individual is a necessary prerequisite to showing a serious risk to the relevant public interest aspect of privacy. The Trustees did not advance any specific reason why the contents of these files are more sensitive than they may seem at first glance. When asserting a privacy risk, it is essential to show not only that information about individuals will escape the control of the person concerned — which will be true in every case — but that this particular information concerns who the individuals are as people in a manner that undermines their dignity. This the Trustees have not done.

95 Therefore, while some of the material in the court files may well be broadly disseminated, the nature of the information has not been shown to give rise to a serious risk to the important public interest in privacy, as appropriately defined in this context in reference to dignity. For that reason alone, I conclude that the Trustees have failed to show a serious risk to this interest.

(2) The Risk to Physical Safety Alleged in this Case is Not Serious

96 Unlike the privacy interest raised in this case, there was no controversy that there is an important public interest in protecting individuals from physical harm. It is worth underscoring that the application judge correctly treated the protection from physical harm as a distinct important interest from that of the protection of privacy and found that this risk of harm was "foreseeable" and "grave" (paras. 22-24). The issue is whether the Trustees have established a serious risk to this interest for the purpose of the test for discretionary limits on court openness. The application judge observed that it would have been preferable to include objective evidence of the seriousness of the risk from the police service conducting the homicide investigation. He nevertheless concluded there was sufficient proof of risk to the physical safety of the affected individuals to meet the test. The Court of Appeal says that was a misreading of the evidence, and the Toronto Star agrees that the application judge's conclusion as to the existence of a serious risk to safety was mere speculation.

97 At the outset, I note that direct evidence is not necessarily required to establish a serious risk to an important interest. This Court has held that it is possible to identify objectively discernable harm on the basis of logical inferences (*Bragg*, at paras. 15-16). But this process of inferential reasoning is not a licence to engage in impermissible speculation. An inference must still be grounded in objective circumstantial facts that reasonably allow the finding to be made inferentially. Where the inference cannot reasonably be drawn from the circumstances, it amounts to speculation (*R. v. Chanmany*, 2016 ONCA 576, 352 O.A.C. 121, at para. 45).

98 As the Trustees correctly argue, it is not just the probability of the feared harm, but also the gravity of the harm itself that is relevant to the assessment of serious risk. Where the feared harm is particularly serious, the probability that this harm materialize need not be shown to be likely, but must still be more than negligible, fanciful or speculative. The question is ultimately whether this record allowed the application judge to objectively discern a serious risk of physical harm.

99 This conclusion was not open to the application judge on this record. There is no dispute that the feared physical harm is grave. I agree with the Toronto Star, however, that the probability of this harm occurring was speculative. The application judge's conclusion as to the seriousness of the risk of physical harm was grounded on what he called "the degree of mystery that persists regarding both the perpetrator and the motives" associated with the deaths of the Shermans and his supposition that this motive might be "transported" to the trustees and beneficiaries (para. 5; see also paras. 19 and 23). The further step in reasoning that the unsealed estate files would lead to the perpetrator's next crime, to be visited upon someone mentioned in the files, is based on speculation, not the available affidavit evidence, and cannot be said to be a proper inference or some kind of

objectively discerned harm or risk thereof. If that were the case, the estate files of every victim of an unsolved murder would pass the initial threshold of the test for a sealing order.

100 Further, I recall that what is at issue here is not whether the affected individuals face a safety risk in general, but rather whether they face such a risk as a result of the openness of these court files. In light of the contents of these files, the Trustees had to point to some further reason why the risk posed by this information becoming publicly available was more than negligible.

101 The speculative character of the chain of reasoning leading to the conclusion that a serious risk of physical harm exists in this case is underlined by differences between these facts and those cases relied on by the Trustees. In *X. v. Y.*, 2011 BCSC 943, 21 B.C.L.R. (5th) 410, the risk of physical harm was inferred on the basis that the plaintiff was a police officer who had investigated "cases involving gang violence and dangerous firearms" and wrote sentencing reports for such offenders which identified him by full name (para. 6). In *R. v. Esseghaier*, 2017 ONCA 970, 356 C.C.C. (3d) 455, Watt J.A. considered it "self-evident" that the disclosure of identifiers of an undercover operative working in counter-terrorism would compromise the safety of the operative (para. 41). In both cases, the danger flowed from facts establishing that the applicants were in antagonistic relationships with alleged criminal or terrorist organizations. But in this case, the Trustees asked the application judge to infer not only the fact that harm would befall the affected individuals, but also that a person or persons exist who wish to harm them. To infer all this on the basis of the Shermans' deaths and the association of the affected individuals with the deceased is not reasonably possible on this record. It is not a reasonable inference but, as the Court of Appeal noted, a conclusion resting on speculation.

102 Were the mere assertion of grave physical harm sufficient to show a serious risk to an important interest, there would be no meaningful threshold in the analysis. Instead, the test requires the serious risk asserted to be well grounded in the record or the circumstances of the particular case (*Sierra Club*, at para. 54; *Bragg*, at para. 15). This contributes to maintaining the strong presumption of openness.

103 Again, in other cases, circumstantial facts may allow a court to infer the existence of a serious risk of physical harm. Applicants do not necessarily need to retain experts who will attest to the physical or psychological risk related to the disclosure. But on this record, the bare assertion that such a risk exists fails to meet the threshold necessary to establish a serious risk of physical harm. The application judge's conclusion to the contrary was an error warranting the intervention of the Court of Appeal.

E. There Would Be Additional Barriers to a Sealing Order on the Basis of the Alleged Risk to Privacy

104 While not necessary to dispose of the appeal, it bears mention that the Trustees would have faced additional barriers in seeking the sealing orders on the basis of the privacy interest they advanced. I recall that to meet the test for discretionary limits on court openness, a person must show, in addition to a serious risk to an important interest, that the particular order sought is necessary to address the risk and that the benefits of the order outweigh its negative effects as a matter of proportionality (*Sierra Club*, at para. 53).

105 Even if the Trustees had succeeded in showing a serious risk to the privacy interest they assert, a publication ban — less constraining on openness than the sealing orders — would have likely been sufficient as a reasonable alternative to prevent this risk. The condition that the order be necessary requires the court to consider whether there are alternatives to the order sought and to restrict the order as much as reasonably possible to prevent the serious risk (*Sierra Club*, at para. 57). An order imposing a publication ban could restrict the dissemination of personal information to only those persons consulting the court record for themselves and prohibit those individuals from spreading the information any further. As I have noted, the likelihood and extent of dissemination may be relevant factors in determining the seriousness of a risk to privacy in this context. While the Toronto Star would be able to consult the files subject to a publication ban, for example, which may assist it in its investigations, it would not be able to publish and thereby broadly disseminate the contents of the files. A publication ban would seem to protect against this latter harm, which has been the focus of the Trustees' argument, while allowing some access to the file, which is not possible under the sealing orders. Therefore, even if a serious risk to the privacy interest had been made out, it would likely not have justified a sealing order, because a less onerous order would have likely been sufficient to mitigate this risk effectively.

I hasten to add, however, that a publication ban is not available here since, as noted, the seriousness of the risk to the privacy interest at play has not been made out.

106 Further, the Trustees would have had to show that the benefits of any order necessary to protect from a serious risk to the important public interest outweighed the harmful effects of the order, including the negative impact on the open court principle (*Sierra Club*, at para. 53). In balancing the privacy interests against the open court principle, it is important to consider whether the information the order seeks to protect is peripheral or central to the judicial process (paras. 78 and 86; *Bragg*, at paras. 28-29). There will doubtless be cases where the information that poses a serious risk to privacy, bearing as it does on individual dignity, will be central to the case. But the interest in important and legally relevant information being aired in open court may well overcome any concern for the privacy interests in that same information. This contextual balancing, informed by the importance of the open court principle, presents a final barrier to those seeking a discretionary limit on court openness for the purposes of privacy protection.

VI. Conclusion

107 The conclusion that the Trustees have failed to establish a serious risk to an important public interest ends the analysis. In such circumstances, the Trustees are not entitled to any discretionary order limiting the open court principle, including the sealing orders they initially obtained. The Court of Appeal rightly concluded that there was no basis for asking for redactions because the Trustees had failed at this stage of the test for discretionary limits on court openness. This is dispositive of the appeal. The decision to set aside the sealing orders rendered by the application judge should be affirmed. Given that I propose to dismiss the appeal on the existing record, I would dismiss the Toronto Star's motion for new evidence as being moot.

108 For the foregoing reasons, I would dismiss the appeal. The Toronto Star requests no costs given the important public issues in dispute. As such, there will be no order as to costs.

Appeal dismissed.

Pourvoi rejeté.

Footnotes

- 1 As noted in the title of proceedings, the appellants in this matter have been referred to consistently as the "Estate of Bernard Sherman and Trustees of the Estate and Estate of Honey Sherman and Trustees of the Estate." In these reasons the appellants are referred to throughout as the "Trustees" for convenience.
- 2 The use of "Toronto Star" as a collective term referring to both respondents should not be taken to suggest that only Toronto Star Newspapers Ltd. is participating in this appeal. Mr. Donovan is the only respondent to have been a party throughout. Toronto Star Newspapers Ltd. was a party in first instance, but was removed as a party on consent at the Court of Appeal. By order of Karakatsanis J. dated March 25, 2020, Toronto Star Newspapers Ltd. was added as a respondent in this Court.
- 3 At the time of writing the House of Commons is considering a bill that would replace part one of *PIPEDA*: Bill C-11, *An Act to enact the Consumer Privacy Protection Act and the Personal Information and Data Protection Tribunal Act and to make consequential and related amendments to other Acts*, 2nd Sess., 43rd Parl., 2020.

TAB E

Most Negative Treatment: Recently added (treatment not yet designated)

Most Recent Recently added (treatment not yet designated): Ontario Securities Commission v. Bridging Finance Inc. | 2023 ONSC 4203, 2023 CarswellOnt 11304 | (Ont. S.C.J., Jul 17, 2023)

2021 ONSC 4347

Ontario Superior Court of Justice

Ontario Securities Commission v. Bridging Finance Inc.

2021 CarswellOnt 9200, 2021 ONSC 4347, 333 A.C.W.S. (3d) 243, 90 C.B.R. (6th) 102

ONTARIO SECURITIES COMMISSION (Applicant) and BRIDGING FINANCE INC., BRIDGING INCOME FUND LP, BRIDGING MID-MARKET DEBT FUND LP, SB FUND GP INC., BRIDGING FINANCE GP INC., BRIDGING INCOME RSP FUND, BRIDGING MID-MARKET DEBT RSP FUND, BRIDGING PRIVATE DEBT INSTITUTIONAL LP, BRIDGING REAL ESTATE LENDING FUND LP, BRIDGING SMA 1 LP, BRIDGING INFRASTRUCTURE FUND LP, BRIDGING MJ GP INC., BRIDGING INDIGENOUS IMPACT FUND, BRIDGING FERN ALTERNATIVE CREDIT FUND, BRIDGING SMA 2 LP, BRIDGING SMA 2 GP INC., and BRIDGING PRIVATE DEBT INSTITUTIONAL RSP FUND (Respondents)

G.B. Morawetz C.J. Ont. S.C.J.

Heard: June 16, 2021

Judgment: June 22, 2021

Docket: CV-21-00661458-00CL

Counsel: John Finnigan, Grant Moffat, Adam Driedger, for Receiver

Carlo Rossi, Adam Gotfried, for Ontario Securities Commission

Lawrence Thacker, for Natasha Sharpe

David Bish, for Coco Group, 2693600 Ontario Inc., Rocky Coco and Jenny Coco

Marc Wasserman, Justine Erickson, for BlackRock Financial Management, Inc.

Kyla Mahar, for RC Morris Capital Management Ltd. and RCM NGB Holdings Limited

Alex MacFarlane, James MacLellan, Charlotte Chien, for Zurich Insurance Company Ltd

Natasha MacParland, for Willoughby Asset Management Inc.

Steven Weisz, Shaun Parsons, for University of Minnesota Foundation

Steve Graff, for Investors in various Bridging Funds

Melissa MacKewn, for David Sharpe

Fraser Dickson, for Former Employee of Bridging Finance Inc.

Caitlin Fell, Sharon Kour, Pat Corney, Andy Kent, for Ad-Hoc Group of Retail Investors

David Ullmann, for Respondents, Thomas Canning (Maidstone) Limited, William Thomas, Robert Thomas, and 2190330 Ontario Ltd.

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

MOTION by receiver for relief including approval of retention plan; MOTION by investors in bankrupt company for appointment of representative counsel.

G.B. Morawetz C.J. Ont. S.C.J.:

1 This endorsement addresses the motion brought by PricewaterhouseCoopers Inc. ("PwC"), receiver of each of the Respondents (the "Receiver") for an order requesting, among other things, approval of the Key Employee Retention Plan ("KERP") and the KERP Charge; approving the formation, composition, and mandate of the Limited Partner Advisory Committees; tolling the applicable limitation periods in respect of any Misrepresentation Rights until the Tolling Termination Date; approving the Receiver's recommended course of action in connection with partial repayment of amounts owing under a credit facility made available by certain of the Respondents as described in Confidential Appendix "B" to the Third Report of the Receiver, dated June 9, 2021 (the "Third Report"); sealing Confidential Appendix "A" and Confidential Appendix "B" to the Third Report until further Order of the Court; and approval of the Third Report.

2 This endorsement also addresses the motion brought by a group of retail investors in the Bridging Funds (the "Ad Hoc Group of Retail Investors") for an order appointing Weisz, Fell, Kour LLP ("WFK") as representative counsel ("Representative Counsel") for all retail investors holding units of the Bridging Funds, excluding investment advisors and institutional investors (the "Retail Investors").

3 Capitalized terms not expressly defined herein are as defined in the Third Report.

4 The factual background is set out in the Third Report.

5 The Receiver is in the process of developing and implementing a strategy to maximize value for all stakeholders. This strategy will include a review of the consolidated portfolio of loans held by all of the Bridging Funds. There will also have to be a reconciliation of inter-fund accounts and review of inter-fund cash allocations.

6 The objective of all stakeholders should be aligned with respect to the development and implementation of a strategy to maximize the value of the loan portfolio.

7 However, the alignment of interests may very well be different when it comes to the reconciliation of inter-fund accounts and the review of inter-fund cash allocations. The Third Report indicates that investors participated through the purchase of units of the Bridging Funds. The Bridging Funds marketed to investors include five limited partnership fund offerings, three RSP fund offerings and two investment trust fund offerings.

8 It is premature to comment on how the assets realized from the loan portfolio will be divided among the funds, but it is conceivable that there will be disputes between the various funds with respect to asset allocation.

9 It is against this background that the motions have to be considered.

10 Certain relief sought by the Receiver was not opposed.

11 The Receiver is of the view that in order to incentivize certain eligible employees to remain as employees of Bridging Finance Inc. ("BFI") during the course of these proceedings, a KERP should be approved, together with a related charge on the property of the Respondents in the maximum amount of \$366,000 (the "KERP Charge") as security for payments under the KERP, which will rank subordinate to the Receiver's Charge, the Receiver's Borrowing Charge and each Intercompany Charge, but in priority to all other security interests.

12 As set out in Confidential Appendix "A" to the Third Report, the Receiver has allocated among Eligible Employees approximately \$266,000 of the requested KERP Payments. The remaining \$100,000 may be allocated among Eligible Employees or additional key Employees provided they meet certain criteria set out in the Bridging KERP.

13 Courts have frequently recognized the utility and importance of KERPs in restructuring proceedings and have approved KERPs in numerous debtor-in-possession proceedings under both the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* (the "CCAA") and receivership proceedings pursuant to the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* (the "BIA") and the *Courts of Justice Act* (the "CJA").

14 The CCAA, the BIA and the CJA, as well as the *Securities Act* are silent with respect to the approval of KERPs and the granting of a charge to secure a KERP. Counsel to the Receiver submits that as such, the approval of a KERP and a KERP Charge are matters within the discretion of the court, grounded in the court's inherent and/or statutory jurisdiction to make any orders it sees fit. (See, for example: *Aralez Pharmaceuticals Inc(Re)*, 2018 ONSC 6980 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) ; *Cinram International Inc., (Re)*, 2012 ONSC 3767 and *Grant Forest Products Inc., (Re)*, [2009] O.J. No. 3344.)

15 The factual and legal basis for the granting of the KERP is set out in the Receiver's factum at paragraphs 5 — 14.

16 The Receiver recommends that the court exercise its discretion to approve the Bridging KERP and grant the KERP Charge.

17 I accept this recommendation. The KERP and the KERP Charge are approved.

18 The Receiver also seeks an order tolling the statutory limitation periods applicable to any "Misrepresentation Rights", as defined at paragraph 16 of the factum, until the stay of proceedings imposed against the Respondents and the Property pursuant to the Appointment Orders is terminated.

19 The factual and legal basis for granting such relief is set out at paragraphs 16 — 22 of the factum.

20 The Receiver recommends that the proposed Tolling Order be granted.

21 I accept this recommendation. The Tolling Order is granted.

22 The Receiver also recommends that its proposed course of action, as described in Confidential Appendix "B" to the Third Report in connection with a partial repayment of amounts owing under a Credit Facility made available to a borrower by certain of the Respondents should be approved. Having reviewed Confidential Appendix "B" to the Third Report, I am satisfied that the Receiver's recommended course of action should be approved.

23 The considerations involved in the granting of sealing order must take into account the recent Supreme Court decision in *Sherman Estate v. Donovan*, 2021 SCC 25 (S.C.C.) at paras. 37 — 38, where Kasirer J. wrote that:

[37] Court proceedings are presumptively open to the public (*MacIntyre*, at p. 189; *A.B. v. Bragg Communications Inc.*, 2012 SCC 46, [2012] 2 S.C.R. 567, at para. 11).

[38] The test for discretionary limits on presumptive court openness has been expressed as a two-step inquiry involving the necessity and proportionality of the proposed order (*Sierra Club*, at para. 53). Upon examination, however, this test rests upon three core prerequisites that a person seeking such a limit must show. Recasting the test around these three prerequisites, without altering its essence, helps to clarify the burden on an applicant seeking an exception to the open court principle. In order to succeed, the person asking a court to exercise discretion in a way that limits the open court presumption must establish that:

(1) court openness poses a serious risk to an important public interest;

(2) the order sought is necessary to prevent this serious risk to the identified interest because reasonably alternative measures will not prevent this risk; and

(3) as a matter of proportionality, the benefits of the order outweigh its negative effects.

Only where all three of these prerequisites have been met can a discretionary limit on openness — for example, a sealing order, a publication ban, an order excluding the public from a hearing, or redaction order — properly be ordered. This test applies to all discretionary limits on court openness, subject only to valid legislative enactments (*Toronto Star Newspaper Ltd. v. Ontario*, 2005, SCC 41, [2005] 2 S.C.R. 188, at paras. 7 and 22).

24 Having reviewed the Confidential Appendices, I am satisfied that the three prerequisites have been satisfied. There is a public interest in ensuring the integrity of the Sales Process and any arbitration. There is no reasonable alternative measure to preserve the integrity of the Sales Process and any arbitration. Finally, as a matter of proportionality, I am satisfied that the benefits of the order outweigh its negative effects. As such, the Sealing Order should be granted, pending further order of the court.

25 Confidential Appendix "A" contains the Bridging KERP, which contains confidential and personal information with respect to the compensation of each Eligible Employee.

26 Confidential Appendix "B" contains the Receiver's recommended course of action in connection with the proposed transaction. The terms of the proposed transactions are confidential and the Receiver submits the disclosure of such confidential commercially sensitive information at this time would undermine its efforts to maximize value for stakeholders.

27 I am satisfied that no stakeholders will be materially prejudiced by sealing the Confidential Appendices and that the salutary effects of granting the Sealing Order outweigh any deleterious effects. As such, I am satisfied that the sealing order should be granted, pending further order of the court.

28 In its Notice of Motion, the Receiver requested approval of payments to RC Morris. The request for such approval was deferred.

29 The Receiver also requested approval of its activities as set out in the draft order. There was no opposition to this request which is granted.

30 The balance of this endorsement addresses the Receiver's request for approval of limited partner advisory committees and the motion of the Ad Hoc Group of Retail Investors.

31 The Receiver seeks court approval of the following two Limited Partner Advisory Committees:

- (a) a limited partner advisory committee comprised of Unitholders representing Unitholders in the Bridging Funds generally (the "LPAC"); and
- (b) a limited partner advisory committee comprised of Unitholders representing Unitholders in the Bridging Indigenous Impact Fund (the "BIIF LPAC").

(the LPAC and the BIIF LPAC are referred to as the "Committees").

32 The Receiver states that the primary functions of the Committees, will be to, among other things:

- (a) provide the Receiver with a confidential forum to obtain input and feedback on behalf of Unitholders in the Bridging Funds regarding actions or decisions of the Receiver, as considered appropriate by the Receiver; and
- (b) provide such other input and assistance to the Receiver regarding matters involving Bridging as the Receiver may reasonably request from time to time.

33 The Receiver contends that the Committees will provide an efficient and cost-effective means for Unitholders to provide direct input to the Receiver but will not have any decision-making authority with respect to any of the Respondents or the Property. The proposed Committee Members represent a diverse cross-section of both retail and institutional Unitholders and each Committee Member will be bound by a confidentiality agreement satisfactory to the Receiver.

34 Mr. Graff states that he represents 15 different investors in various Bridging Funds with over \$400MM of claims, and he does not oppose the relief requested by the Receiver. He points out that his clients have received regular and effective communications from the Receiver.

35 The appointment of the Committees is challenged by the Ad Hoc Group of Retail Investors. The Ad Hoc Group of Retail Investors are of the view that it is more appropriate to appoint WFK as Representative Counsel for all Retail Investors holding units of the Bridging Funds, excluding investment advisors and institutional investors.

36 In its factum, counsel points out that the Retail Investors are concerned about recovery of their investments and the protection of their rights and are most concerned about fairness. There are over 25,000 Retail Investors who will bear the brunt of any shortfall. Counsel submits that this receivership was not commenced with the Retail Investors in mind and makes reference to an OSC publicly made statement that, "as a regulatory body, we do not normally recover money for investors."

37 Counsel submits that the receivership proceeding lacks meaningful input from the Retail Investors. Counsel also submits that it is not clear from the materials filed by the Receiver as to what role the Committees will perform, since the Receiver has not described what matters it proposes to consult with the Committees. Further, counsel raises concerns that the Committees will be dominated by investment advisors and institutional or professional investors, and this presents the appearance of conflicts.

38 The gist of the submissions put forward by counsel is that the Retail Investors require representation by counsel whose sole focus and loyalty is to them. The appointment of Representative Counsel will also generally improve the efficiency of the receivership; communication with Retail Investors will be streamlined and a multiplicity of legal retainers avoided.

39 I have concluded that the relief requested by the Receiver for the appointment of the LPACs should be granted — albeit with certain time limitations.

40 As noted above, the Receiver is currently involved in the development and implementation of a strategy to maximize value for all stakeholders. A strategic review of the portfolio is in process and the Receiver is not in a position to confirm valuations for certain funds.

41 It seems to me that the Committees will be in a position to provide the Receiver with meaningful input and feedback on behalf of Unitholders regarding actions or decisions of the Receiver. At this time the focus is on maximizing realizations for the benefit of Unitholders and the Committees may very well be in a position to provide meaningful assistance to the Receiver.

42 I also note that although the OSC may have made a statement to the effect that "as a regulatory body, we do not normally recover money for investors", it is necessary to take into account that the Receiver was appointed pursuant to the provisions of section 129 of the Securities Act in a particular section 129(2) which provides:

129 [2] No order shall be made under subsection (1) unless the court is satisfied that,

(a) the appointment of a receiver, receiver and manager, trustee or liquidator of all or any part of the property of the person or company *is in the best interests of the creditors* of the person or company or of persons or companies any of whose property is in the possession or under the control of the person or company or the security holders of our subscribers to the person or company; or

(b) it is appropriate for the due administration of Ontario securities law.

(Emphasis added)

43 I am also satisfied that the Receiver will take into account the best interests of all Unitholders.

44 Counsel to the Ad Hoc Group of Retail Investors also questioned the proposed mandate of the Committees. At this point in time, the focus of the Committees is to provide input to the Receiver in connection with a strategic review of the portfolio in an effort to maximize value for all stakeholders. This review take some time but should not be extended for an unlimited time. For this reason, it seems to me that the appointment of the Committees should be time-limited to 60 days, subject to extension by court order. It is my expectation that at the end of 60 days, the Receiver should be in a position to report to the court on the portfolio review and also to provide information with respect to the reconciliation of inter-fund accounts.

45 Accordingly, I am satisfied that it is appropriate to approve the Committees as requested by the Receiver, on the terms set out in the proposed order, with the proviso that the appointment of the Committees is time-limited to 60 days, subject to extension by court order.

46 With respect to the appointment of Representative Counsel, I am satisfied that the court has jurisdiction to appoint representative counsel under section 101 of the CJA, together with Rules 10.01 and 12.07 of the Rules of Civil Procedure.

47 The issue is whether the appointment of Representative Counsel should be entertained at this time, or whether it is more appropriate to defer consideration of this issue until such time as the Receiver is in a position to report to the court on the portfolio review and also to provide information with respect to the reconciliation of interfund accounts. I have concluded that it is appropriate to defer consideration of this issue for the following reasons.

48 First, the focus at the present time should be on the portfolio review and developing a strategy to maximize value for all stakeholders.

49 Second, when the Receiver reports on this issue and provides information with respect to the reconciliation of interfund accounts, it may become clearer as to the role that Representative Counsel can play. It could very well be that the entitlement or potential entitlement of Unitholders in the various funds will differ, which could in turn require the appointment of different Representative Counsel for different funds. In my view, the potential role of Representative Counsel should focus on allocation issues as opposed to realization issues.

50 The relief requested by the Ad Hoc Group of Retina Investors is dismissed, with leave to reassess the requested relief in 60 days.

51 The appointment of Representative Counsel can be revisited at the time that the Receiver makes its report in 60 days.

52 An order shall issue to reflect the foregoing.

Receiver's motion granted; investors' motion dismissed as premature.

TAB F

Most Negative Treatment: Recently added (treatment not yet designated)

Most Recent Recently added (treatment not yet designated): Triple-I Capital Partners Limited v. 12411300 Canada Inc. | 2023 ONSC 3400, 2023 CarswellOnt 8707 | (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List], Jun 6, 2023)

2015 ONSC 7574

Ontario Superior Court of Justice

Target Canada Co., Re

2015 CarswellOnt 19174, 2015 ONSC 7574, 261 A.C.W.S. (3d) 518, 31 C.B.R. (6th) 311

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.

Morawetz R.S.J.

Judgment: December 11, 2015

Docket: CV-15-10832-00CL

Counsel: J. Swatz, Dina Milivojevic, for Target Corporation

Jeremy Dacks, for Target Canada Entities

Susan Philpott, for Employees

Richard Swan, S. Richard Orzy, for Rio Can Management Inc. and KingSett Capital Inc.

Jay Carfagnini, Alan Mark, for Monitor, Alvarez & Marsal

Jeff Carhart, for Ginsey Industries

Lauren Epstein, for Trustee of the Employee Trust

Lou Brzezinski, Alexandra Teodescu, for Nintendo of Canada Limited, Universal Studios, Thyssenkrupp Elevator (Canada) Limited, United Cleaning Services, RPJ Consulting Inc., Blue Vista, Farmer Brothers, East End Project, Trans Source, E One Entertainment, Foxy Originals

Linda Galesiere, for Various Landlords

Subject: Insolvency

APPLICATION by monitor for approval of reports and activities set out in reports.

Morawetz R.S.J.:

1 Alvarez & Marsal Canada Inc., in its capacity as Monitor of the Applicants (the "Monitor") seeks approval of Monitor's Reports 3-18, together with the Monitor's activities set out in each of those Reports.

2 Such a request is not unusual. A practice has developed in proceedings under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act ("CCAA") whereby the Monitor will routinely bring a motion for such approval. In most cases, there is no opposition to such requests, and the relief is routinely granted.

3 Such is not the case in this matter.

4 The requested relief is opposed by Rio Can Management Inc. ("Rio Can") and KingSett Capital Inc. ("KingSett"), two landlords of the Applicants (the "Target Canada Estates"). The position of these landlords was supported by Mr. Brzezinski

on behalf of his client group and as agent for Mr. Solmon, who acts for ISSI Inc., as well as Ms. Galessiere, acting on behalf of another group of landlords.

5 The essence of the opposition is that the request of the Monitor to obtain approval of its activities — particularly in these liquidation proceedings — is both premature and unnecessary and that providing such approval, in the absence of full and complete disclosure of all of the underlying facts, would be unfair to the creditors, especially if doing so might in future be asserted and relied upon by the Applicants, or any other party, seeking to limit or prejudice the rights of creditors or any steps they may wish to take.

6 Further, the objecting parties submit that the requested relief is unnecessary, as the Monitor has the full protections provided to it in the Initial Order and subsequent orders, and under the CCAA.

7 Alternatively, the objecting parties submit that if such approval is to be granted, it should be specifically limited by the following words:

provided, however, that only the Monitor, in its personal capacity and only with respect to its own personal liability, shall be entitled to rely upon or utilize in any way such approval.

8 The CCAA mandates the appointment of a monitor to monitor the business and financial affairs of the company (section 11.7).

9 The duties and functions of the monitor are set forth in Section 23(1). Section 23(2) provides a degree of protection to the monitor. The section reads as follows:

(2) Monitor not liable — if the monitor acts in good faith and takes reasonable care in preparing the report referred to in any of paragraphs (1)(b) to (d.1), the monitor is not liable for loss or damage to any person resulting from that person's reliance on the report.

10 Paragraphs 1(b) to (d.1) primarily relate to review and reporting issues on specific business and financial affairs of the debtor.

11 In addition, paragraph 51 of the Amended and Restated Order provides that:

... in addition to the rights, and protections afforded the Monitor under the CCAA or as an officer of the Court, the Monitor shall incur no liability or obligation as a result of its appointment or the carrying out of the provisions of this Order, including for great certainty in the Monitor's capacity as Administrator of the Employee Trust, save and except for any gross negligence or wilful misconduct on its part.

12 The Monitor sets out a number of reasons why it believes that the requested relief is appropriate in these circumstances. Such approval

(a) allows the monitor and stakeholders to move forward confidently with the next step in the proceeding by fostering the orderly building-block nature of CCAA proceedings;

(b) brings the monitor's activities in issue before the court, allowing an opportunity for the concerns of the court or stakeholders to be addressed, and any problems to be rectified in a timely way;

(c) provides certainty and finality to processes in the CCAA proceedings and activities undertaken (eg., asset sales), all parties having been given an opportunity to raise specific objections and concerns;

(d) enables the court, tasked with supervising the CCAA process, to satisfy itself that the monitor's court-mandated activities have been conducted in a prudent and diligent manner;

(e) provides protection for the monitor, not otherwise provided by the CCAA; and

(f) protects creditors from the delay in distribution that would be caused by:

- a. re-litigation of steps taken to date; and
- b. potential indemnity claims by the monitor.

13 Counsel to the Monitor also submits that the doctrine of issue estoppel applies (as do related doctrines of collateral attack and abuse of process) in respect of approval of the Monitor's activities as described in its reports. Counsel submits that given the functions that court approval serves, the availability of the doctrine (and related doctrines) is important to the CCAA process. Counsel submits that actions mandated and authorized by the court, and the activities taken by the Monitor to carry them out, are not interim measure that ought to remain open for second guessing or re-litigating down the road and there is a need for finality in a CCAA process for the benefit of all stakeholders.

14 Prior to consideration of these arguments, it is helpful to review certain aspects of the doctrine of *res judicata* and its relationship to both issue estoppel and cause of action estoppel. The issue was recently considered in *Forrest v. Vriend*, 2015 CarswellBC 2979 (B.C. S.C.), where Ehrcke J. stated:

25. "TD and Vriend point out that the doctrine of *res judicata* is not limited to issue estoppel, but includes cause of action estoppel as well. The distinction between these two related components of *res judicata* was concisely explained by Cromwell J.A., as he then was, in *Hoque v. Montreal Trust Co. of Canada* (1997), 162 N.S.R. (2d) 321 (C.A.) at para. 21:

21 *Res judicata* is mainly concerned with two principles. First, there is a principle that "... prevents the contradiction of that which was determined in the previous litigation, by prohibiting the relitigation of issues already actually addressed.": see Sopinka, Lederman and Bryant, *The Law of Evidence in Canada* (1991) at p. 997. The second principle is that parties must bring forward all of the claims and defences with respect to the cause of action at issue in the first proceeding and that, if they fail to do so, they will be barred from asserting them in a subsequent action. This "... prevents fragmentation of litigation by prohibiting the litigation of matters that were never actually addressed in the previous litigation, but which properly belonged to it.": *ibid* at 998. Cause of action estoppel is usually concerned with the application of this second principle because its operation bars all of the issues properly belonging to the earlier litigation.

.....

30. It is salutary to keep in mind Mr. Justice Cromwell's caution against an overly broad application of cause of action estoppel. In *Hoque* at paras. 25, 30 and 37, he wrote:

25. The appellants submit, relying on these and similar statements, that cause of action estoppel is broad in scope and inflexible in application. With respect, I think this overstates the true position. In my view, this very broad language which suggests an inflexible application of cause of action estoppel to all matters that "could" have been raised does not fully reflect the present law.

.....

30. The submission that all claims that could have been dealt with in the main action are barred is not borne out by the Canadian cases. With respect to matter not actually raised and decided, the test appears to me to be that the party should have raised the matter and, in deciding whether the party should have done so, a number of factors are considered.

.....

37. Although many of these authorities cite with approval the broad language of *Henderson v. Henderson*, *supra*, to the effect that any matter which the parties had the opportunity to raise will be barred, I think, however, that this language is somewhat too wide. The better principle is that those issues which the parties had the opportunity to raise and, in all the circumstances, should have raised, will be barred. In determining whether the matter should have been raised, a court will consider whether proceeding constitutes a collateral attack on the earlier findings, whether it simply asserts a new legal conception of facts previously litigated, whether it relies on "new" evidence that could have been

discovered in the earlier proceeding with reasonable diligence, whether the two proceedings relate to separate and distinct causes of action and whether, in all the circumstances, the second proceeding constitutes an abuse of process.

15 In this case, I accept the submission of counsel to the Monitor to the effect that the Monitor plays an integral part in balancing and protecting the various interests in the CCAA environment.

16 Further, in this particular case, the court has specifically mandated the Monitor to undertake a number of activities, including in connection with the sale of the debtors assets. The Monitor has also, in its various Reports, provided helpful commentary to the court and to Stakeholders on the progress of the CCAA proceedings.

17 Turning to the issue as to whether these Reports should be approved, it is important to consider how Monitor's Reports are in fact relied upon and used by the court in arriving at certain determinations.

18 For example, if the issue before the court is to approve a sales process or to approve a sale of assets, certain findings of fact must be made before making a determination that the sale process or the sale of assets should be approved. Evidence is generally provided by way of affidavit from a representative of the applicant and supported by commentary from the monitor in its report. The approval issue is put squarely before the court and the court must, among other things conclude that the sales process or the sale of assets is, among other things, fair and reasonable in the circumstances.

19 On motions of the type, where the evidence is considered and findings of fact are made, the resulting decision affects the rights of all stakeholders. This is recognized in the jurisprudence with the acknowledgment that res judicata and related doctrines apply to approval of a Monitor's report in these circumstances. (See: *Toronto Dominion Bank v. Preston Springs Gardens Inc.*, [2006] O.J. No. 1834 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]); *Toronto Dominion Bank v. Preston Springs Gardens Inc.*, 2007 ONCA 145 (Ont. C.A.) and *Bank of America Canada v. Willann Investments Ltd.*, [1993] O.J. No. 3039 (Ont. Gen. Div.)).

20 The foregoing must be contrasted with the current scenario, where the Monitor seeks a general approval of its Reports. The Monitor has in its various reports provided commentary, some based on its own observations and work product and some based on information provided to it by the Applicant or other stakeholders. Certain aspects of the information provided by the Monitor has not been scrutinized or challenged in any formal sense. In addition, for the most part, no fact-finding process has been undertaken by the court.

21 In circumstances where the Monitor is requesting approval of its reports and activities in a general sense, it seems to me that caution should be exercised so as to avoid a broad application of res judicata and related doctrines. The benefit of any such approval of the Monitor's reports and its activities should be limited to the Monitor itself. To the extent that approvals are provided, the effect of such approvals should not extend to the Applicant or other third parties.

22 I recognized there are good policy and practical reasons for the court to approve of Monitor's activities and providing a level of protection for Monitors during the CCAA process. These reasons are set out in paragraph [12] above. However, in my view, the protection should be limited to the Monitor in the manner suggested by counsel to Rio Can and KingSett.

23 By proceeding in this manner, Court approval serves the purposes set out by the Monitor above. Specifically, Court approval:

(a) allows the Monitor to move forward with the next steps in the CCAA proceedings;

(b) brings the Monitor's activities before the Court;

(c) allows an opportunity for the concerns of the stakeholders to be addressed, and any problems to be rectified;

(d) enables the Court to satisfy itself that the Monitor's activities have been conducted in prudent and diligent manners;

(e) provides protection for the Monitor not otherwise provided by the CCAA; and

(f) protects the creditors from the delay and distribution that would be caused by:

(i) re-litigation of steps taken to date, and

(ii) potential indemnity claims by the Monitor.

24 By limiting the effect of the approval, the concerns of the objecting parties are addressed as the approval of Monitor's activities do not constitute approval of the activities of parties other than the Monitor.

25 Further, limiting the effect of the approval does not impact on prior court orders which have approved other aspects of these CCAA proceedings, including the sales process and asset sales.

26 The Monitor's Reports 3-18 are approved, but the approval is limited by the inclusion of the wording provided by counsel to Rio Can and KingSett, referenced at paragraph [7].

Application granted in part.