COURT FILE NUMBER **Q.B. No. 1401 of 2019**

COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH FOR SASKATCHEWAN
IN BANKRUPTCY AND INSOLVENCY

JUDICIAL CENTRE	**SASKATOON**
APPLICANT	**PILLAR CAPITAL CORP.**
RESPONDENT	**HARMON INTERNATIONAL INDUSTRIES INC.**

IN THE MATTER OF THE RECEIVERSHIP OF HARMON INTERNATIONAL INDUSTRIES INC.

BRIEF OF LAW ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT, PILLAR CAPITAL CORP.

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This brief of law is submitted on behalf of the Applicant, Pillar Capital Corp. ("**Pillar**"), in support of its application for the appointment of A. Farber & Partners Inc. ("**Farber**") as receiver over the property, assets and undertakings of the Respondent, Harmon International Industries Inc. ("**Harmon**"), pursuant to s. 243(1) of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 (the "***BIA***").

2. Unless otherwise defined herein, capitalized terms shall have the same meaning ascribed to them as in the Affidavit of Steven Dizep sworn on September 30, 2019.

3. Pillar is the senior secured lender of Harmon. Pillar's advances to Harmon are secured against substantially all of Harmon's personal and real property.

4. In order to secure the repayment by Harmon of the Indebtedness, Harmon granted Pillar a security interest pursuant to a General Security Agreement, dated July 26, 2018, (the "**Security Agreement**"), over all present and after-acquired personal property relating to the operation of Harmon's business (the "**Collateral**") and a mortgage over seven acres of land (the "**Lands**") (all of which collectively form the "**Security**").

5. As a result of the continued failure of Harmon to meet its obligations under the Loan Agreement, the apparent insolvency of Harmon, the disconnection of some or all of the utilities servicing the premises where Harmon has stored the personal property, the premises and personal property collectively composing the Security, and Pillar's right to appoint a receiver pursuant to the Security Agreement, Pillar submits that it is just and convenient in the circumstances for the Court to appoint a receiver over the property, assets, and undertakings of Harmon.

II. FACTS

A. General

6. The facts relied upon by Pillar in this Brief of Law are set out in the Affidavit of Steven Dizep sworn September 30, 2019, filed on behalf of Pillar in support of this Application.

7. Harmon was incorporated in 1989 and was, at one time, a manufacturer of equipment, including agricultural equipment. It now appears that Harmon has ceased carrying on business as a going concern.[1]

8. In summer 2018, Harmon and Pillar entered into an agreement whereunder Pillar advanced funds to Harmon. At the time of entry into that agreement, Harmon represented to Pillar that such funds would be used as "bridge financing" in order to retire certain debts registered against six parcels of land representing seven acres – i.e. the Lands. This would, in turn, provide Harmon time to attempt to sell the Lands and extinguish its indebtedness to Pillar..[2]

9. In furtherance of this agreement, Pillar and Harmon executed the Loan Agreement on July 10, 2018, providing a twelve-month term facility to Harmon with a maximum principal amount of $3,300,000. In support of the Loan Agreement, Harmon executed a Promissory

[1] Affidavit of Steven Dizep, sworn September 30, 2019 at paras 6-7 [Dizep Affidavit].
[2] *Ibid* at paras 9 and 11.

Note in favour of Pillar in the principal amount of the Loan Agreement, plus interest and other amounts owing thereunder from time to time.[3]

10. To secure the obligations of Harmon pursuant to the Loan Agreement and the Promissory Note, Harmon executed, delivered, and granted to Pillar the Security, which includes:

    (a) a General Security Agreement dated July 26, 2018, over all of the present and after-acquired personal property of Harmon;

    (b) a Collateral Mortgage dated July 26, 2018, over the Lands; and

    (c) a General Assignment of Rents dated July 26, 2018, in regard to the Lands.[4]

11. As further security, Harmon's principals, Victor Moneo and Calvin Moneo, together with a third-party corporation Amber Hill Farms Ltd., each executed other documents, including, *inter alia*, Guarantees and General Security Agreements over all of their personal property, executed by Calvin Moneo and Victor Moneo dated July 26, 2018.[5]

B. Default by Harmon Under the Loan Agreement, the Promissory Note and the Security

12. Pillar advanced $3,300,000 on August 10, 2018. Harmon made monthly payments in accordance with the Loan Agreement until the payment which was due on May 31, 2019. That payment was eventually received on June 14, 2019 and Harmon has failed to make any payments as they become due since May 31, 2019.[6]

13. On August 19, 2019, Pillar's solicitor sent a formal written demand letter to each of Harmon, Victor Moneo, Calvin Moneo, and Amber Hill Farms Ltd. demanding payment forthwith of $3,430,483.52, being the amount owing as of that date and enclosing a Notice of Intention to Enforce Security pursuant to s. 244(1) of the *BIA* (the "**Ten-Day Notice**").[7]

---

[3] *Ibid* at para 12.
[4] *Ibid* at para 13.
[5] *Ibid* at para 15.
[6] *Ibid* at para 19.
[7] *Ibid* at para 21.

14. Following the provision of the Ten-Day Notice, Pillar endeavoured to facilitate the conclusion of an agreement between itself, Harmon, and a third-party auctioneer for the purpose of arranging for the voluntary liquidation of Harmon's personal property by way of auction.[8] Notwithstanding Pillar's efforts to reach an agreement, no such contract was entered into and discussion concerning the voluntary liquidation of Harmon's assets have since broken down.[9]

15. During September, 2019, Pillar learned that electricity had been shut off by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation at Harmon's primary facility due to the accrual of approximately $30,000.00 worth of arrears on Harmon's electrical bills.[10] It is Pillar's understanding that electricity to Harmon's primary facility (which houses many of the assets subject to Pillar's security interest) remains disconnected. Pillar has no knowledge as to whether Harmon's primary facility is presently heated.[11]

16. As of September 30, 2019, the total aggregate amount of the Indebtedness owing to Pillar is $3,506,479.83 with interest continuing to accrue at a rate of $1,729.22 per day. Despite receipt of the Demands and Notices, Harmon, Victor Moneo, Calvin Moneo, and Amber Hill Farms Ltd. have failed, refused or neglected to make any further payments to Pillar. [12]

III. ISSUES

17. There are two issues to be determined in this determining whether this Honourable Court should exercise its authority to grant the Receivership Order sought by Pillar:

    (a) Harmon is an insolvent person within the meaning of the BIA; and

    (b) It is just or convenient for the Court to appoint a receiver over the property, assets, and undertakings of Harmon.

---

[8] *Ibid* at para 23.
[9] *Ibid*, at para 24.
[10] *Ibid* at para 24.
[11] *Ibid*, at para 24.
[12] *Ibid* at para 22.

IV. ARGUMENT

A. Harmon is an insolvent person within the meaning of the BIA

18. Section 2 of the BIA defines "person" as including a body corporate and "insolvent person" as follows:

> insolvent person means a person who is not bankrupt and who resides, carries on business or has property in Canada, whose liabilities to creditors provable as claims under this Act amount to one thousand dollars, and
>
> (a) who is for any reason unable to meet his obligations as they generally become due;
> (b) who has ceased paying his current obligations in the ordinary course of business as they generally become due, or
> (c) the aggregate of whose property is not, at a fair valuation, sufficient, or if disposed of at a fairly conducted sale under legal process, would not be sufficient to enable payment of all his obligations, due and accruing due…

19. Pillar relies on both subparagraphs (a) and (b) of these disjunctive criteria. As previously noted herein, as of September 30, 2019 Harmon is indebted to Pillar in the amount of $3,506,479.83. Of relevance in determining that Harmon is an insolvent person within the meaning of the *BIA*, the following facts should be noted:

(a) Harmon has failed to pay instalments due to Pillar under the Loan Agreement as they become due and has also failed to pay the Indebtedness in full upon lawful demand by Pillar for immediate payment of the same;

(b) Harmon has failed to pay its electrical utility costs, resulting in the suspension of electrical service to Harmon's buildings;[13] and

(c) Harmon has amounts owing to the City of Saskatoon in respect of property taxes on the Lands that are due and payable.[14]

[13] *Ibid* at para 24.
[14] *Ibid* at para 26.

20. Further, as is deposed to by Steven Dizep, Harmon does not appear to be operating as a going concern and, therefore, would appear to lack any means by which to generate cash-flow to satisfy its indebtedness absent the liquidation of substantially all of its assets.[15]

21. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Harmon is clearly an insolvent person within the meaning of the *BIA*, as it unable to pay its obligations as they become due and has ceased paying current obligations as they become due.

B. It is just or convenient for the Court to make an order appointing a receiver over the property, assets, and undertakings of Harmon

22. Pillar brings the within Application pursuant to s. 243(1) of the BIA, which states as follows:

> (1) Subject to subsection (1.1), on application by a secured creditor, a court may appoint a receiver to do any or all of the following if it considers it to be just or convenient to do so:
>
> (a) Take possession of all or substantially all of the inventory, accounts receivable or other property of an insolvent person or bankrupt that was acquired for or used in relation to a business carried on by the insolvent person or bankrupt;
>
> (b) Exercise any control that the court considers advisable over that property and over the insolvent person's or bankrupt's business; or
>
> (c) Take any other action that the court considers advisable.
>
> (1.1) In the case of an insolvent person in respect of whose property a notice is to be sent under subsection 244(1), the court may not appoint a receiver under subsection (1) before the expiry of 10 days after the day on which the secured creditor sends the notice unless
>
> (a) the insolvent person consents to an earlier enforcement under subsection 244(2); or
>
> (b) the court considers it appropriate to appoint a receiver before then.

23. In this application, Pillar bears the burden of satisfying the Court that it is just or convenient to appoint a receiver. In order to determine whether it is just or convenient to order the appointment of a receiver in other proceedings, courts have had regard to a number of factors.

[15] *Ibid* at para 7.

24. In *Affinity Credit Union 2013 v Vortex Drilling Ltd..*,[16] the Honourable Justice Scherman, relying upon his previous decision in *Golden Opportunities Fund Inc. v Phenomenome Discoveries Inc.*,[17] highlighted the following applicable considerations in determining if it is just or convenient to appoint a receiver under s. 243(1) of the *BIA*, and observed they remain accurate:

> 6. In Carnival the court said the following regarding the just and convenient criteria at para 24 of its reason:
>
> > In Bank of Nova Scotia v. Freure Village on Clair Creek (1996), 40 C.B.R. (3d) 274 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]), Blair J. (as he then was) dealt with a similar situation in which the bank held security that permitted the appointment of a private receiver or an application to court to have a court appointed receiver. He summarized the legal principles involved as follows:
> >
> > > 10 **The Court has the power to appoint a receiver or receiver and manager where it is "just or convenient" to do so**: the Courts of Justice Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. 43, s. 101. **In deciding whether or not to do so, it must have regard to all of the circumstances but in particular the nature of the property and the rights and interests of all parties in relation thereto. The fact that the moving party has a right under its security to appoint a receiver is an important factor to be considered but so, in such circumstances, is the question of whether or not an appointment by the Court is necessary to enable the receiver-manager to carry out its work and duties more efficiently**; see generally Third Generation Realty Ltd. v. Twigg (1991) 6 C.P.C. (3d) 366 at pages 372-374;Confederation Trust Co. v. Dentbram Developments Ltd. (1992), 9 C.P.C. (3d) 399; Royal Trust Corp. of Canada v. D.Q. Plaza Holdings Ltd. (1984), 54 C.B.R. (N.S.) 18 at page 21. **It is not essential that the moving party, a secured creditor, establish that it will suffer irreparable harm if a receiver-manager is not appointed**: Swiss Bank Corp. (Canada) v. Odyssey Industries Inc. (1995), 30 C.B.R. (3d) 49 [emphasis added].[18]

---

[16] 2017 SKQB 228, 50 CBR (6th) 220 [*Vortex Drilling*] [**Tab A**].
[17] (25 February 2016) Saskatoon, QB 1639 of 2015 (Sask QB).
[18] *Vortex*, *supra* note 16 at para 19.

25. Scherman J. also endorsed the non-exhaustive list of factors provided in *Kasten Energy Inc. v Shamrock Oil & Gas Ltd.*,[19] including, *inter alia*:

> a) whether irreparable harm might be caused if no order were made, although it is not essential for a creditor to establish irreparable harm if a receiver is not appointed, particularly where the appointment of a receiver is authorized by the security documentation;
> ...
>
> e) the preservation and protection of the property pending judicial resolution;
>
> f) the balance of convenience to the parties;
>
> g) the fact that the creditor has the right to appoint a receiver under the documentation provided for the loan;
>
> h) the enforcement of rights under a security instrument where the security-holder encounters or expects to encounter difficulty with the debtor and others;
> ...
>
> l) the conduct of the parties;
> ...
>
> o) the likelihood of maximizing return to the parties;
>
> p) the goal of facilitating the duties of the receiver.[20]

26. To this, it should be added that the extraordinary nature of the appointment of a receiver is less acute where a secured creditor is exercising the right to enforce its security and the issue instead becomes whether it is preferable to have a court appointed receiver rather than a private appointment.[21]

27. Applying the above factors to the instant case, it is respectfully submitted that it is both just and convenient for this Honourable Court to grant an order appointing a receiver over the property, assets, and undertakings of Harmon for the following reasons.

---

[19] 2013 ABQB 63, 99 CBR (5th) 178.
[20] *Vortex*, *supra* note 16 at para 19.
[21] *Bank of Montreal v Carnival National Leasing Ltd.*, 2011 ONSC 1007 at para 27, 74 CBR (5th) 300 [*Carnival*] **[Tab B]**.

28. First, given the disconnection of electrical service at the Millar Avenue Building and the declining seasonal temperatures, there is imminent danger of irreparable harm befalling, and thus necessitating the preservation and protection of, the Collateral. In short, it is of paramount importance that Pillar, by way of the appoint of a receiver, ensure that all critical utility services are restored to the Millar Avenue Building. With respect, it is submitted that this Court may reasonably infer that the Millar Avenue Building and its contents stand at risk of damage if utility services are not restored prior to winter. The Receivership Order is thus required, lest Pillar's security be damaged or greatly diminished.

29. Second, Pillar has the contractual right to appoint a receiver under the Security Agreement. Moreover, Pillar anticipates that it will encounter difficulty with Harmon in light of Harmon's withdrawal from negotiations relating to the Proposed Auction Agreement, whereby Pillar attempted to achieve a collaborative resolution to these issues, and Harmon's increasing uncooperativeness and lack of communication.[22]

30. Third, the Security simply cannot be realized upon by either party in its current state. The appointment of a receiver is necessary to remedy the various issues relating to the condition of the Lands and restore utilities to them. Currently, the Lands are in a state of disrepair, so much so that the Millar Avenue Building, despite being listed for sale for the last year, has failed to garner a single offer to purchase within approximately 13 months of listing.[23] A great deal of skill and labour will be needed to inventory the personal property located at the Millar Avenue Building and the 47th Street Building and arrange for sale or disposition thereof so as to facilitate the eventual sale of the buildings and land. Harmon has not shown itself to be motived, let alone equipped, to accomplish this task.

31. Finally, taking a broader view of the matters, it is respectfully submitted that the balance of convenience in this case clearly favours the appointment of a receiver. There is no evidence which suggests that the viability of Harmon to carry on a business as a going concern will

[22] Dizep Affidavit, *supra* note 1, at para 24.
[23] *Ibid* at para 29.

be impacted by the appointment of a receiver. Indeed, Pillar's evidence suggests that Harmon has not carried on any active business for some time. Resultantly, the appointment of a receiver would not appear to impact any customers or employees of Harmon, as the evidence suggests that Harmon presently has neither.

32. Alternately stated, appointing a receiver in this case would not impact the day-to-day operations of Harmon, as it would seem as there are no such day-to-day operations. . ., Thus, as there is evidence to suggest that Harmon is no longer operating as a going-concern,[24] it is respectfully submitted that installing a receiver into the affairs of Harmon would prove beneficial to Harmon and Pillar and any other stakeholders of Harmon. In this circumstance, the appointment of a receiver is not just desirable to ensure the maximization of value in the realization of the assets of Harmon, but is necessary to ensure that it is possible for such realization to occur at all.

V. CONCLUSION

33. Based on the foregoing establishing the insolvency of Harmon, Harmon's failure to pay the Indebtedness in full upon lawful demand, compliance with the notice provisions of s. 244(1) of the *BIA*, the urgent need for protection and preservation of the Security, the anticipated difficulty in dealing with Harmon, the maximization of realization on the Security that can be achieved by a receiver, and the balance of convenience weighing in favour of appointing a receiver, it is therefore respectfully submitted that it is just and convenient for the Court to grant the relief sought herein.

ALL OF WHICH IS RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 1st day of October, 2019.

THE W LAW GROUP LLP

Per: _____

Michael Russell and Kevin N. Hoy, counsel to Pillar Capital Corp.

[24] *Ibid* at para 7.

CONTACT INFORMATION AND ADDRESS FOR SERVICE

Name of Firm:	**The W Law Group LLP**
Name of lawyer in charge of file:	Michael Russell and Kevin N. Hoy
Address of legal firm:	110-21st Street East Saskatoon, SK S7K 0B6
Telephone number:	(306) 244-2242
Facsimile:	(306) 652-0332
Email:	khoy@wlawgroup.com

BOOK OF AUTHORITIES

Jurisprudence

TAB A

2017 SKQB 228
Saskatchewan Court of Queen's Bench

Affinity Credit Union 2013 v. Vortex Drilling Ltd.

2017 CarswellSask 399, 2017 SKQB 228, 282 A.C.W.S. (3d) 773, 50 C.B.R. (6th) 220, 7 P.P.S.A.C. (4th) 195

AFFINITY CREDIT UNION 2013 (PLAINTIFF) and VORTEX DRILLING LTD. (DEFENDANT)

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

IN THE MATTER OF THE SASKATCHEWAN BUSINESS CORPORATIONS ACT, RSS 1978, c B-10

IN THE MATTER OF A PROPOSED PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF VORTEX DRILLING LTD.

B. Scherman J.

Judgment: July 24, 2017
Docket: Saskatoon QBG 783/17, 1030/17

Counsel: Jeffrey M. Lee, Q.C., Paul D. Olfert, for Affinity Credit Union and Radius Credit Union
Mary I.A. Buttery, Jared Enns, for Vortex Drilling
Ian A. Sutherland, Jordan F. Richards, for Receiver
Brent Warga, for Interim Receiver
P. Koliaskis, for Proposed Monitor

Subject: Civil Practice and Procedure; Corporate and Commercial; Insolvency

Related Abridgment Classifications

Bankruptcy and insolvency
IV Receivers
IV.1 Appointment

Bankruptcy and insolvency
XIX Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act
XIX.3 Arrangements
XIX.3.b Approval by court
XIX.3.b.iv Miscellaneous

Debtors and creditors
VII Receivers
VII.3 Appointment
VII.3.b Application for appointment
VII.3.b.iii Grounds
VII.3.b.iii.E Miscellaneous

Headnote

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

Miscellaneous

Defendant company (V Ltd.) was in business of drilling oil wells and was hit hard by price drop of oil — In 2013, plaintiff financial institution (A Co.) advanced V Ltd. nearly $15 million to refinance two drilling rigs and to purchase third — While loan facilities were repayable on demand, prior to demand there was schedule of combined monthly interest and principal payments — Credit agreement also provided that any material change in risk or adverse change in financial condition of V Ltd. would constitute default — After oil prices collapsed, V Ltd. could not make its scheduled payments and A Co. agreed on several occasions to allow V Ltd. to defer principal payments — V Ltd. then failed to make negotiated balloon principal payments and in January 2017 failed to resume regular monthly principal and interest payments as V Ltd. had undertaken to do — A Co. demanded payment in May 2017, allowing V Ltd. 30 days to pay in full — A Co. applied for appointment of receiver; V Ltd. applied for adjournment of A Co.'s application to allow time to respond to A Co.'s affidavits and to apply for relief, including stay of proceedings pursuant to Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA) — Interim receiver was appointed for short period under which interim receiver could investigate, monitor and facilitate V Ltd.'s continuing operation so as to give V Ltd. time to file responses and to make its CCAA application — A Co.'s application granted; V Ltd.'s application dismissed — It was evident that V Ltd. heavily relied on affidavit evidence from self-described Administrative Director and her evidence was based on information and belief that had no basis or establishment and would not be admissible on final order — Significant weight could not be placed on Administrative Director's evidence because reliability could not be assessed — A Co. provided significant relief from contractual terms over two-year period and in practical sense, had effectively provided V Ltd. with much of remedial opportunity contemplated by CCAA — V Ltd. had two-year benefit of debt repayment accommodations and forbearance and opportunity to seek alternate financing.

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Receivers — Appointment

Defendant company (V Ltd.) was in business of drilling oil wells and was hit hard by price drop of oil — In 2013, plaintiff financial institution (A Co.) advanced V Ltd. nearly $15 million to refinance two drilling rigs and to purchase third — While loan facilities were repayable on demand, prior to demand there was schedule of combined monthly interest and principal payments — Credit agreement also provided that any material change in risk or adverse change in financial condition of V Ltd. would constitute default — After oil prices collapsed, V Ltd. could not make its scheduled payments and A Co. agreed on several occasions to allow V Ltd. to defer principal payments — V Ltd. then failed to make negotiated balloon principal payments and in January 2017 failed to resume regular monthly principal and interest payments as V Ltd. had undertaken to do — A Co. demanded payment in May 2017, allowing V Ltd. 30 days to pay in full — A Co. applied for appointment of receiver; V Ltd. applied for adjournment of A Co.'s application to allow time to respond to A Co.'s affidavits and to apply for relief, including stay of proceedings pursuant to Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA) — Interim receiver was appointed for short period under which interim receiver could investigate, monitor and facilitate V Ltd.'s continuing operation so as to give V Ltd. time to file responses and to make its CCAA application — A Co.'s application granted; V Ltd.'s application dismissed — It was evident that V Ltd. heavily relied on affidavit evidence from self-described Administrative Director and her evidence was based on information and belief that had no basis or establishment and would not be admissible on final order — Significant weight could not be placed on Administrative Director's evidence because reliability could not be assessed — A Co. provided significant relief from contractual terms over two-year period and in practical sense, had effectively provided V Ltd. with much of remedial opportunity contemplated by CCAA — V Ltd. had two-year benefit of debt repayment accommodations and forbearance and opportunity to seek alternate financing.

Debtors and creditors --- Receivers — Appointment — Application for appointment — Grounds — Miscellaneous

Defendant company (V Ltd.) was in business of drilling oil wells and was hit hard by price drop of oil — In 2013, plaintiff financial institution (A Co.) advanced V Ltd. nearly $15 million to refinance two drilling rigs and to purchase third — While loan facilities were repayable on demand, prior to demand there was schedule of combined monthly interest and principal payments — Credit agreement also provided that any material change in risk or adverse change in financial condition of V Ltd. would constitute default — After oil prices collapsed, V Ltd. could not make its scheduled payments and A Co. agreed on several occasions to allow V Ltd. to defer principal payments — V Ltd. then failed to make negotiated balloon principal payments and in January 2017 failed to resume regular monthly principal and interest payments as V Ltd. had undertaken to do — A Co. demanded payment in May 2017, allowing V Ltd. 30 days to pay in full — A Co. applied for appointment of receiver; V Ltd. applied for adjournment of A Co.'s application to allow time to respond to A Co.'s affidavits and to apply for relief, including stay of proceedings pursuant to Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCAA) — Interim receiver was appointed for short period under which interim receiver could investigate, monitor and facilitate V Ltd.'s continuing operation so as to give V Ltd. time to file responses and to make its CCAA application — A Co.'s application granted; V Ltd.'s application dismissed — It was evident that V Ltd. heavily relied on affidavit evidence from self-described Administrative Director and her evidence was based on information and belief that had no basis or establishment and would

not be admissible on final order — Significant weight could not be placed on Administrative Director's evidence because reliability could not be assessed — A Co. provided significant relief from contractual terms over two-year period and in practical sense, had effectively provided V Ltd. with much of remedial opportunity contemplated by CCAA — V Ltd. had two-year benefit of debt repayment accommodations and forbearance and opportunity to seek alternate financing.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by *B. Scherman J.*:

Golden Opportunities Fund Inc. v. Phenomenome Discoveries Inc. (2016), 2016 SKQB 306, 2016 CarswellSask 607, 41 C.B.R. (6th) 141 (Sask. Q.B.) — considered

Hongkong Bank of Canada v. Chef Ready Foods Ltd. (1990), 51 B.C.L.R. (2d) 84, 4 C.B.R. (3d) 311, *(*sub nom. *Chef Ready Foods Ltd. v. Hongkong Bank of Canada)* [1991] 2 W.W.R. 136, 1990 CarswellBC 394 (B.C. C.A.) — referred to

Lindsey Estate v. Strategic Metals Corp. (2010), 2010 ABQB 242, 2010 CarswellAlta 641, 67 C.B.R. (5th) 88 (Alta. Q.B.) — referred to

Lindsey Estate v. Strategic Metals Corp. (2010), 2010 ABCA 191, 2010 CarswellAlta 1049, 27 Alta. L.R. (5th) 241, 69 C.B.R. (5th) 42, 487 A.R. 262, 495 W.A.C. 262 (Alta. C.A.) — referred to

Romspen Investment Corp. v. Hargate Properties Inc. (2011), 2011 ABQB 759, 2011 CarswellAlta 2133, 86 C.B.R. (5th) 49 (Alta. Q.B.) — referred to

Ted Leroy Trucking Ltd., Re (2010), 2010 SCC 60, 2010 CarswellBC 3419, 2010 CarswellBC 3420, 12 B.C.L.R. (5th) 1, *(*sub nom. *Century Services Inc. v. A.G. of Canada)* 2011 D.T.C. 5006 (Eng.), *(*sub nom. *Century Services Inc. v. A.G. of Canada)* 2011 G.T.C. 2006 (Eng.), [2011] 2 W.W.R. 383, 72 C.B.R. (5th) 170, 409 N.R. 201, *(*sub nom. *Ted LeRoy Trucking Ltd., Re)* 326 D.L.R. (4th) 577, *(*sub nom. *Century Services Inc. v. Canada (A.G.))* [2010] 3 S.C.R. 379, [2010] G.S.T.C. 186, *(*sub nom. *Leroy (Ted) Trucking Ltd., Re)* 296 B.C.A.C. 1, *(*sub nom. *Leroy (Ted) Trucking Ltd., Re)* 503 W.A.C. 1 (S.C.C.) — referred to

Verlaan v. Lang Estate (2004), 2004 SKQB 376, 2004 CarswellSask 615 (Sask. Q.B.) — referred to

Statutes considered:

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

s. 243 — considered

s. 244(1) — considered

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

s. 11.02(1)(a) [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — considered

s. 11.02(3) [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — considered

s. 11.02(3)(a) [en. 2005, c. 47, s. 128] — considered

Personal Property Security Act, 1993, S.S. 1993, c. P-6.2
s. 64 — considered

APPLICATION by plaintiff financial institution for appointment of receiver; APPLICATION by defendant company for relief including stay of proceedings to permit it to pursue successful arrangement or reorganization.

***B. Scherman J.*:**

Introduction

1 Affinity Credit Union 2013 [Affinity], a secured lender to Vortex Drilling Ltd. [Vortex], is owed in excess of $8,350,000 and has applied for the appointment of a Receiver of all of the assets and properties of Vortex under s. 243 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, RSC 1985, c B-3 [*BIA*] and s. 64 of *The Personal Property Security Act, 1993*, SS 1993, c P-6.2 [*PPSA*].

2 Vortex has applied under s. 11.02(a) of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, RSC 1985, c C-36 [*CCAA*], for an initial order granting various relief including a stay of all proceedings against Vortex for a period of time to permit it to pursue a successful arrangement or reorganization.

3 Vortex is insolvent. The other statutory requirements to permit Affinity to pursue the appointment of a Receiver under the *BIA* and for Vortex to seek an initial order and stay under the *CCAA* have been met or established.

4 Affinity has since early 2015 accommodated financial difficulties being faced by Vortex and agreed, under the terms of various agreements, to interest only payments for periods of time in return for various undertakings of Vortex. It says Vortex has breached those undertakings, has ceased making even interest payments and since April of 2017 has been in default under the terms of its credit agreements. Affinity has demanded payment in full of the indebtedness owed to it, and Vortex has failed to pay what it is contractually obligated to pay.

5 Vortex is in the business of drilling oil wells. It says that its financial difficulties are the direct result of the significant drop in the price of oil that occurred in 2014 and has continued to date. This has caused a related reduction in the demand for drilling rigs to drill new wells. Oil prices peaked well in excess of $100 U.S. per barrel and since 2014 have fallen to $50 U.S. or less per barrel.

6 Vortex argues the economic climate in the Western Canadian oil industry is improving, it is expecting a substantial improvement in its cash flow, Affinity is fully secured for the indebtedness owed and the initial *CCAA* order it seeks should be granted so as to give it an opportunity to seek refinancing from other lenders or to facilitate the making of a compromise or arrangements with its existing creditors so as to permit it to be able to continue in business.

7 The issue to be decided in the context of the competing applications is whether the appropriate order to make is to grant an initial order and stay of proceedings under the *CCAA* or to grant Affinity's application for the appointment of a Receiver.

Background Facts

8 Vortex was created in November of 2010 and subsequently purchased and/or constructed three drilling rigs largely utilizing borrowed funds. Under the terms of an August 12, 2013 Offer to Finance from Affinity [Credit Agreement] accepted and agreed to by Vortex, Affinity advanced Vortex, under three separate loan facilities, a total of $14,910,711 to pay out existing loans in respect of two rigs and to finance the construction of a third drilling rig. The individual loan facilities were each payable on demand, but before demand were to be paid by combined monthly principal and interest payments totalling $325,257. The Credit Agreement expressly provided that any material change in risk or adverse change in the financial condition of Vortex or failure to comply with any condition of the Offer to Finance would constitute an event of default entitling Affinity to demand payment of all sums owing and to realize on the security taken for the loan.

9 As required by the Credit Agreement, Vortex granted to Affinity, under the terms of a general security agreement registered in the personal property registries of each of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta [GSA], a security interest in all

of its present and after acquired property. The terms of the GSA included the right of Affinity, upon the occurrence of an event of default as therein defined, to seize and sell any of Vortex's property or to appoint a Receiver (see paragraphs 9 to 13 of the GSA). Events of default were widely defined and include the insolvency of Vortex.

10 With the collapse of oil prices and the resulting downturn in the oil industry Vortex was unable to make the monthly payments contemplated by the Credit Agreement and sought accommodations from Affinity. By a series of agreements Affinity provided principal repayment deferrals to Vortex, which resulted in Vortex paying only interest for most of the months of 2016. Vortex failed to fulfil its commitments to make balloon principal payments and to resume principal and interest payments by dates and in amounts contemplated by these accommodations or deferral agreements.

11 As of January 2017 regular monthly principal and interest payments of $325,257 were again to resume but Vortex failed to make such payments. In March of 2017 Vortex informed Affinity that it could only afford to make monthly payments of $100,000 rather than the $325,257 per month then required by the Credit Agreement. Affinity prepared an amendment to the Credit Agreement which would have permitted such reduced payments on condition that Vortex approach its shareholders to obtain an injection of equity capital to finance its business operations and reduce the indebtedness owing to Affinity. Vortex did not sign that amending agreement, has not made the required monthly payments, nor remedied the defaults that have occurred under the Credit Agreement, as amended from time to time.

12 By letter of May 1, 2017 Affinity gave Vortex notice of intention to enforce its security pursuant to s. 244(1) of the *BIA* and demanded that the full outstanding obligations (stated to be $8,422,061.01 as at April 28, 2017) be repaid within 30 days, failing which Affinity would proceed to avail itself of its legal remedies including enforcing its security. On June 6, 2017 Affinity filed with this Court its notice of application, returnable June 9, 2017, seeking the appointment of a receiver. By agreement between counsel for Affinity and Vortex this application was adjourned to June 23, 2017.

13 During this adjournment negotiations continued between the parties with Vortex seeking continuing accommodations or forbearance on the part of Affinity. Vortex was representing it had prospects to refinance the indebtedness with other lenders.

14 Affinity takes that position that these negotiations resulted in a concluded agreement under which Affinity was to provide an additional two-week period of forbearance so as to give Vortex additional time to pursue refinancing and would fund current payroll obligations of Vortex, in return for which Vortex would consent to the appointment of a receiver should its refinancing efforts fail. Vortex takes the position that no such agreement was ever concluded.

15 Affinity's application for the appointment of a receiver came before me on June 23, 2017. Vortex sought an adjournment of that application, advancing the position that it needed time to respond to the affidavits filed by Affinity and to bring its own application for *CCAA* relief. In the circumstances I ordered the appointment of an interim receiver for a period ending July 23, 2017 under which the interim receiver could investigate, monitor and facilitate Vortex's continuing operation so as to give Vortex an opportunity to file opposition affidavits and make its *CCAA* application.

16 That application and the affidavit evidence of both Vortex and Affinity on both applications are before me. As stated above, Vortex is insolvent, in the sense of being unable to pay its debts as they become due. The issue to be decided is whether in the circumstances the appointment of a Receiver or an initial order under the *CCAA* is most appropriate in the circumstances.

The Law Respecting CCAA Applications

17 Jurisprudence establishes that the following principles are applicable to *CCAA* applications:

a. The legislative purpose of the *CCAA* is to permit qualifying debtors to carry on business and where possible avoid the social and economic costs of liquidating its assets: See *Ted Leroy Trucking Ltd., Re*, 2010 SCC 60 (S.C.C.) at para 15, [2010] 3 S.C.R. 379 (S.C.C.) [*Century*].

b. The remedial purpose of the *CCAA* is to facilitate the making of a compromise or arrangement between an insolvent debtor company and its creditors to the end that the company is able to continue in business: See *Hongkong Bank of*

Canada v. Chef Ready Foods Ltd. (1990), [1991] 2 W.W.R. 136 (B.C. C.A.).

c. The requirements of appropriateness, good faith and due diligence are baseline considerations that a court should always bear in mind when exercising *CCAA* jurisdiction: *Century* at para 70.

d. Appropriateness is assessed by inquiring whether the order sought advances the remedial purpose of the *CCAA*: *Century* at para 70

e. Section 11.02(3)(a) of the *CCAA* states that the court shall not grant a stay of proceedings unless:

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

18 I proceed on the basis that a *CCAA* applicant bears the burden of establishing each of the requirements of appropriateness, good faith and due diligence.

The Law Respecting Receivership Applications

19 In a previous unreported decision in *Golden Opportunities Fund Inc. v. Phenomenome Discoveries Inc.* [2016 CarswellSask 607 (Sask. Q.B.)]. (25 February 2016) Saskatoon, QB 1639 of 2015, I summarized jurisprudence with respect to applications to appoint a receiver under s. 243 of the *BIA*. I repeat here that summary, which I view as remaining accurate:

5. Under s. 243(1) of the *BIA* this court can, on application of a secured creditor, appoint a receiver where it considers it just and convenient to do so. Instructive decisions on the factors relevant to the court's determination of whether it is "just and convenient" include *Bank of Montreal v. Carnival National Leasing Ltd*. 2011 ONSC 1007 *and Kasten Energy Inc. v. Shamrock Oil & Gas Ltd*. 2013 ABQB 63.

6. In Carnival the court said the following regarding the just and convenient criteria at para 24 of its reason:

In *Bank of Nova Scotia v. Freure Village on Clair Creek* (1996), 40 C.B.R. (3d) 274 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]), Blair J. (as he then was) dealt with a similar situation in which the bank held security that permitted the appointment of a private receiver or an application to court to have a court appointed receiver. He summarized the legal principles involved as follows:

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

7. In *Kasten* the court said the following:

13 Both parties agree that the factors that may be considered in making a determination whether it is just and convenient to appoint a Receiver are listed in a non-exhaustive manner in *Paragon Capital Corp. v. Merchants & Traders Assurance Co.*, 2002 ABQB 430 (Alta. Q.B.) at para 27, (2002), 316 A.R. 128 (Alta. Q.B.) [Paragon Capital], citing from Frank Bennett, Bennett on Receiverships, 2nd ed (Toronto: Thompson Canada Ltd, 1995) at

130] to include:

> a) whether irreparable harm might be caused if no order were made, although it is not essential for a creditor to establish irreparable harm if a receiver is not appointed, particularly where the appointment of a receiver is authorized by the security documentation;
>
> b) the risk to the security holder taking into consideration the size of the debtor's equity in the assets and the need for protection or safeguarding of the assets while litigation takes place;
>
> c) the nature of the property;
>
> d) the apprehended or actual waste of the debtor's assets;
>
> e) the preservation and protection of the property pending judicial resolution;
>
> f) the balance of convenience to the parties;
>
> g) the fact that the creditor has the right to appoint a receiver under the documentation provided for the loan;
>
> h) the enforcement of rights under a security instrument where the security-holder encounters or expects to encounter difficulty with the debtor and others;
>
> i) the principle that the appointment of a receiver is extraordinary relief which should be granted cautiously and sparingly;
>
> j) the consideration of whether a court appointment is necessary to enable the receiver to carry out its' duties more efficiently;
>
> k) the effect of the order upon the parties;
>
> l) the conduct of the parties;
>
> m) the length of time that a receiver may be in place;
>
> n) the cost to the parties;
>
> o) the likelihood of maximizing return to the parties;
>
> p) the goal of facilitating the duties of the receiver.

See also, *Lindsey Estate v. Strategic Metals Corp.*, 2010 ABQB 242 (Alta. Q.B.) at para 32, aff'd 2010 ABCA 191 (Alta. C.A.); and *Romspen Investment Corp. v. Hargate Properties Inc.*, 2011 ABQB 759 (Alta. Q.B.) at para 20.

20 Consistent with my view that a *CCAA* applicant bears the burden of establishing each of the requirements of appropriateness, good faith and due diligence, I am of the view that an applicant under s. 243 of the *BIA* bears the burden of satisfying the Court that it would be just and convenient to appoint a receiver in the circumstances.

The Parties' Positions in Brief

21 Vortex's position is that on a proper application of the legislative and remedial purposes of the *CCAA* it is appropriate

to issue an initial order and grant a stay. It argues that putting Vortex into receivership is going to result in liquidation of its assets and the end of its business with the resulting loss of employment for many individuals as well as the loss of the other economic activity that Vortex generates in its home community.

22 Vortex says that the economic climate in the Western Canadian oil industry is improving and it is expecting a substantial improvement in its cash flow. It says it expects to soon secure additional business and that it is actively pursuing promising refinancing opportunities. Thus it says it is appropriate that it be given an opportunity to pursue such refinancing or a compromise with its creditors so as to avoid the social and economic costs of liquidation. It says that the security that Affinity holds has a value significantly beyond the debt owed by it, and there will be no real prejudice to Affinity by granting an initial order and granting a stay.

23 Affinity says the proper and appropriate order in the circumstances is the receivership order it seeks. It says that Vortex is insolvent, it has the contractual right to appoint a receiver or seize and sell the rigs upon an event of default (which both insolvency and failure to pay the debt owed are), it has already provided Vortex with lengthy and significant accommodations and for good and sufficient cause it has lost trust in Vortex. Affinity says Vortex has repeatedly failed to honour contractual commitments made to Affinity in return for the deferrals granted and that the evidence demonstrates that Vortex has not acted in good faith.

24 Beyond these factors Affinity's position is that, given the realities of the oil industry and Vortex's financial position, the business is unviable now and into the foreseeable future. Over nearly 2 1/2 years Affinity has accepted deferral in payments totalling some $4,500,000, but notwithstanding this accommodation Vortex has been unable to generate cash flow that permitted it to cover its variable operating costs, much less make a contribution to fixed costs. The application made by Vortex does not contain even the germ of a reorganization plan that has any prospect of succeeding. It relies on purported, but unverified, refinancing possibilities. Vortex has had many months' opportunity to obtain refinancing and has not been able to do so.

25 Affinity says that continuing to operate the rigs without generating revenue sufficient to cover the fixed costs (which includes repayment of the loans) means the rigs will continue to depreciate and Affinity's security position will be eroded.

26 For all of these reasons it says to issue an initial order and grant a stay of proceedings under the *CCAA* would be inappropriate and that is just and convenient to appoint a receiver.

Analysis of Vortex's Position that CCAA Relief is Appropriate

i. Evidentiary Concerns

27 At paragraphs 20 to 22 of the Vortex Brief of Law counsel argues as follows:

> 20. A stay of proceedings would fulfill the legislative objective of the CCAA by permitting Vortex to carry on its business operations during the reorganization process. The evidence in support of this application clearly demonstrates that such an order is appropriate in these circumstances:
>
> (a) the industry within which Vortex operates is seasonal, and Vortex's Rigs are generally deployed from the month of June onwards (Twietmeyer Affidavit, at para 18);
>
> (b) as the industry itself is seasonal, so too is Vortex's cash flow (Twietmeyer Affidavit, at para 18);
>
> (c) Vortex's assets are worth significantly more than its debts (Twietmeyer Affidavit, at paras 2 and 17);
>
> (d) two of Vortex's three Rigs are currently deployed and operational for the 2017 season, one for Crescent Point Energy Cop. (sic), which is one of Canada's largest light and medium oil producers, and the second Rig is currently in operation for Aldon Oil Ltd. (Twietmeyer Affidavit, at para 19);
>
> (e) Vortex's general manager and sales consultant are currently deploying significant efforts in order to secure a

> contract in respect of its third Rig. The evidence before this court is that these efforts have successfully generated new business for Vortex, including its most recent contract with Aldon Oil Ltd. Accordingly, and through these ongoing efforts, it is believed that it is highly likely that Vortex will secure a contract for its third Rig (Twietmeyer Affidavit, at para 20); and
>
> (f) assuming all of the relief sought in this application is granted, Vortex's cash-flow projections indicate that, if DIP Financing is approved, Vortex will have enough liquidity to meet its cash flow needs through to the end of the 13-week forecast period (Twietmeyer Affidavit, at para 61).

28 It should be noted that for each of the points in paragraph 20 (a) to (f) counsel references supporting evidence from affidavits of one Tina Twietmeyer. I have concluded that it is not appropriate for me to rely on much of the affidavit evidence of Tina Twietmeyer for the reasons that follow:

a. In paragraph 1 of her affidavit she describes herself as the Administrative Director of Vortex without providing any information or details as to what that job function involves and how it would give her the personal knowledge she claims to have. The evidence establishes she is not and has never been a corporate director of Vortex.

b. Notwithstanding her statement that she has personal knowledge of matters in question, on a close read of her affidavits it is apparent much of her evidence is based on information and belief without the basis for her information and belief being provided.

c. Rule 13-30 of *The Queen's Bench Rules* requires that an affidavit must be confined to facts within the personal knowledge of the person swearing the affidavit except that on an interlocutory application affidavit evidence based on information and belief is permissible provided the basis for the claimed information and belief is disclosed.

d. Applying the test in *Verlaan v. Lang Estate*, 2004 SKQB 376 (Sask. Q.B.), that an application is interlocutory where the decision in respect of it given in one way would finally dispose of the matter but if given in another way would allow the action to go on, I am of the opinion that an application for an initial order and stay of proceedings under the *CCAA* is not an interlocutory application. I fully appreciate that if the initial order is granted a further application approving a restructuring plan would be required. While the current application may lie close to the tipping point between what is a final application and an interlocutory application, it is my conclusion that Vortex's *CCAA* application has more of the characteristics of a final application than of an interlocutory application and thus I find the application to not be an interlocutory application. The result is that affidavit evidence based on information and belief is not admissible and should not be considered.

e. If I am wrong in my conclusion that the application is not interlocutory, then nonetheless, in various instances where Ms. Twietmeyer is giving evidence based upon information and belief for which the basis is not provided, the weight and reliability to be given to much of her evidence cannot be assessed.

f. Beyond these concerns, the Rules applicable to affidavit evidence do not permit opinion, argument, irrelevant matters or hearsay on either an interlocutory or final application. Much of Ms. Twietmeyer's affidavit evidence consists of opinion, argument and hearsay or irrelevant matters and thus should not be considered on those grounds.

g. An example of this is her evidence at paragraph 3 of her referenced affidavit that "the economic climate in the Western Canadian oil industry is improving. As a result, Vortex is experiencing significant growth in its business and is expecting a substantial improvement in its cash flow". This evidence includes inadmissible opinion, speculation and argument.

h. On the basis of all of the evidence, I conclude it is wrong to say that Vortex is experiencing significant growth. Rather it is limping along drilling wells on a "one-off" basis as and when such contracts come available. This work is done at depressed prices that cover the variable costs of operation, if that, and the bulk of its capacity is unused.

i. Ms. Twietmeyer is in no position to provide opinion evidence that the economic climate in the Western Canadian oil industry is improving, and her statement that Vortex is expecting a substantial improvement in its cash flow can at best

be viewed as her hope, but in the context of affidavit evidence is inadmissible speculation.

29 With reference to the points made in paragraph 20 of the Vortex Brief of Law above:

i. The facts stated in paragraphs 20 (a) and (b) that the industry in which Vortex operates and thus its cash flow is seasonal is of no or little relevance. The fact that the oil well drilling industry cash flow is seasonal is simply a fact of the business that should be accommodated in the budgeting. The evidence establishes that over a continuous 2 1/2 years this business has been unviable.

ii. The statement at paragraph 20 (c) that Vortex's assets are worth significantly more that its debts is either or both inadmissible hearsay evidence or inadmissible opinion evidence. Paragraph 17 of Ms. Twietmeyer's affidavit indicated that an appraisal of the equipment had been obtained valuing it at $17,146,000, but Vortex has not filed this appraisal claiming confidentiality. This is not an acceptable reason for not filing an appraisal relied upon. Where appropriate, evidence with confidentiality concerns can be filed on a basis that protects the confidentiality.

iii. Opinion evidence can only be given by an individual found to be qualified to give such opinion evidence. To attempt to bootstrap opinion evidence of value into the record in this way is an attempt to introduce hearsay evidence. It denies Affinity any ability to test the opinion evidence or respond. Opinion evidence of value should be provided directly by the person expressing the opinion accompanied by the details of qualifications and the opinion so as to give the party opposite and this Court an opportunity to assess its reliability.

iv. Given no evidence that establishes the expertise of the provider of such appraisal and other evidence that the daily rates for drilling rigs have declined from in excess of $16,000 per day to under $7,000 per day and that only one out of three of Vortex's rigs has been operating on any regular basis gives significant basis to be concerned about the reliability of such evidence.

v. Paragraph 20 (d) of the Vortex brief argues, based on paragraph 19 of the Twietmeyer affidavit, that two of Vortex's three rigs are operational for the 2017 season. This is misleading as to the true state of affairs. The current evidence, as of the date this matter was heard, was that the second rig had drilled one well for Aldon, over a period of approximately one week, and has since been idle. While there may be two rigs which are in operating condition, the relevant fact is that these two rigs are far from fully engaged.

vi. The argument advanced at paragraph 20(e) of the Vortex brief that "it is believed that it is highly likely that Vortex will secure a contract for its third Rig" is based on an expressed "belief" in paragraph 20 of the Twietmeyer affidavit without Twietmeyer having provided any basis for such belief other than reference to efforts on the part of a Messrs. Geysen and Rae. If there is relevant evidence on efforts and prospects for future work it should be given by these individuals rather than in the second-hand, hearsay manner here attempted. Reduced to its essence this is speculation and argument, not evidence.

30 An applicant seeking relief under the *CCAA* should be placing before the Court the best evidence available. Section 11.02(3) of the *CCAA* requires the applicant to satisfy the Court that circumstances exist that make the order sought appropriate. It is a concern to me that I have a number of affidavits from Ms. Twietmeyer but no affidavit on this application from Mr. Geysen, who is the President and General Manager of Vortex, and thus presumably the responsible person within the company who has the requisite personal knowledge.

31 Counsel for Vortex argues that I should have similar or enhanced concerns with respect to the affidavit evidence filed on behalf of Affinity and says I need to consider Ms. Spencer's affidavits with great care. I do not find reason for overall concern. While Ms. Spencer has expressed opinions or beliefs with regard to the impact on the viability of Vortex given Mr. Big Eagle is no longer on the Board or the Chief Executive Officer of Vortex, I have not relied on that evidence for the decisions I have made.

32 Ms. Spencer's affidavits make it clear that she has had day-to-day responsibility for administration of Affinity's account relating to Vortex and that she has conducted a detailed review of the books, records, files and correspondence of Affinity relating to that account. To the extent to which she provides factual evidence based upon the knowledge of the

books, records, files and correspondence of Affinity, I find the factual evidence provided by Ms. Spencer in her affidavits to be appropriate and reliable. To the extent to which she engaged in measures of speculation, argument or providing evidence that she did not have personal knowledge of, I have not relied on such evidence.

ii. Good Faith Considerations in CCAA Applications

33 I find on the basis of the evidence before me that there have been elements of bad faith in Vortex's dealings with Affinity. Vortex had, arising from both the nature of their relationship and by virtue of express contractual provisions, an obligation to provide complete and accurate financial information to Affinity and to not hide or misrepresent matters relevant to their relationship. Good faith of the applicant is a baseline consideration for a Court when considering *CCAA* applications.

34 As of June 20, 2017, with Affinity's receivership application before this Court, but adjourned while the parties were negotiating a potential forbearance agreement, Vortex represented to Radius Credit Union (a member of the Affinity lending syndicate and independently providing an operating line of credit to Vortex) it had no accounts payable. This it did by writing cheques purporting to pay various accounts payable, but then holding those cheques totalling some $235,548 and not delivering them to the payees. This accounting fiction that accounts payable had been paid was used by Vortex to access, under the Radius margining formula, some $121,000 in operating credits that would not have been available had the facts been accurately disclosed. I find this to be a breach of Vortex's contractual covenants to Affinity to provide honest and accurate financial information to Affinity notwithstanding that the misrepresentation was made to Radius in the first instance. Given the circumstances and Affinity's concerns with respect to Vortex's financial position, this action was a failure to act in good faith. It only came to light by reason of investigations by the Interim Receiver.

35 In a June 30, 2016 revision to the Credit Agreement, which allowed Vortex's request to pay interest only from July through November, Vortex agreed that any financial settlement with one Harvey Turcotte would be funded from outside sources and not from Vortex's cash flow. Notwithstanding this agreement, in February of 2017 Vortex made a payment of $525,000 to Harvey Turcotte from its cash flow in breach of this agreement. This fact was not disclosed by Vortex to Affinity and only came to light by reason of investigations by the Interim Receiver. This I find to be a failure on the part of Vortex to act in good faith.

iii. Is CCAA Relief Appropriate or the Appointment of a Receiver Just and Convenient?

36 On the basis of the totality of the evidence before me, I have concluded that it is not appropriate to make an initial order nor grant a stay of proceedings as requested by Vortex in its *CCAA* application. For reasons that overlap, I find it is just and convenient that a Receiver be appointed. I am assisted in these findings by the information provided in the Interim Receiver's reports. In particular I note the Interim Receiver's statements in his July 18, 2017 report, that:

a. Vortex is not contemplating any debt payment to be made to Affinity during the period July 17, 2017 to September 24, 2017 (para. 39); and

b. "Vortex would not have been able to manage its cash flow needs from ongoing operations without the injection of the July 7, 2017 payroll funded by the Interim Receiver." (para. 41).

37 Vortex bears the burden of satisfying me that the relief they seek is appropriate in the circumstances. I am fully alive to the consequences that appointing a receiver may have upon Vortex's employees, unsecured creditors, shareholders and business associates. However, the evidence satisfies me that:

a. The prospect of Vortex finding a lender to refinance it, at the level required to satisfy all of the indebtedness to Affinity and other creditors without significant equity injections by the shareholders, is remote or non-existent.

b. The shareholders of Vortex have demonstrated over the last 2 1/2 years that they are not prepared to invest further monies in Vortex. While Vortex says it has interest from other lenders in refinancing it, Vortex has chosen not to share with Affinity and the Court the details of such refinancing proposals. In the circumstances I am unable to give weight to

suggestions that there are real prospects of refinancing that do not involve either substantial write-off of current indebtedness or the injection of significant additional equity.

c. Vortex has long known that Affinity wanted additional capital injection to the company. Vortex has, given the accommodations Affinity provided over the last two years, had ample opportunity to pursue alternate financing. At a minimum they have since May 1, 2017 had the knowledge that the need for alternate financing was immediate.

d. Two years of financial statements of Vortex establishes that, given the day rates for drilling rigs and the work available, it is unviable at its current debt levels. To the extent Vortex has been able to generate revenue, that revenue has barely covered, and during some periods not covered, the variable costs of operating those rigs, much less making a contribution to fixed costs. Vortex is currently in breach of its statutory obligation to pay employee withholdings to Canada Revenue Agency.

e. While Vortex argues that the economic prospects are improving, there is no credible evidence provided to support that argument. Rather the evidence is that since 2014 the day rate paid for drilling rigs has been reduced to less than one half of their previous levels and even at these rates Vortex is unable to find work that does more than partially utilize its rigs.

f. Oil prices remain below $50.00 per barrel, and Vortex has provided no evidence to support a conclusion that drill utilization rates or daily charges can or will improve beyond the rates experienced over the last 2 1/2 years. No statistical evidence has been provided that establishes the number of rigs available in Western Canada and their current utilization rates nor economic forecasts or analysis that demonstrates that those utilization rates or the presently available day rates for such rigs will increase.

g. If alternate or takeout financing is not available, then the only other justification for an initial order and stay would be to provide time to Vortex to negotiate a compromise agreement between Vortex and its creditors, secured and unsecured. Affinity is the only secured creditor, and it has made it clear that it is not prepared to compromise its debts. Affinity cannot be criticized for such a position. Indeed the members of Affinity would have good reason to criticize Affinity management were they to compromise a debt which it has reasonable prospects to fully recover.

h. Affinity's position is that they have lost confidence in and no longer trust Vortex. This position is reasonable given that Vortex has repeatedly over the last two years failed to meet its commitments to make balloon payments or to resume regular payments coupled with the concerns with respect to Vortex's good faith discussed above.

i. While Vortex argues Affinity is not only fully secured, but has a significant cushion of security such that Affinity would suffer no prejudice by permitting Vortex to pursue *CCAA* relief, that argument is but one of many considerations to weigh. It does not weigh heavily given the absence of admissible and credible evidence as to the value of Affinity's security and my common sense conclusion, given the utilization rates and day rates available to Vortex, that the present value of these rigs is a matter of significant uncertainty.

j. Continued operation of the rigs carries with it the consequence that to some greater or lesser extent the value of the rigs will continue to physically depreciate independent from market forces related to the depressed state of the Western Canadian oil industry or that may result from the introduction of new technologies in drilling rigs and practices.

k. If Vortex were granted *CCAA* protection, Affinity would effectively bears the risks and costs associated with that action since, with the exception of the relatively insignificant dollar amount owed to unsecured creditors (some $193,000), Affinity is the only creditor. If Vortex were given *CCAA* protection then, under the usual DIP financing protocols of *CCAA* protection, costs arising from the continuing operation of Vortex that are in excess of its revenue, including the costs of the Monitor and its legal counsel, will effectively be borne by the security Affinity holds. The Pre-Filing Report of the Proposed Monitor contemplates approval of up to $1,000,000 in DIP financing for the proposed 13-week cash flow period which includes $500,000 in professional fees. Such DIP financing would, of course, assume a super priority position over the secured financing of Affinity. Thus the risks associated with *CCAA* protection are effectively borne by Affinity and the unsecured lenders if the security cushion suggested by Vortex turns out not to exist.

38 The contractual agreement between Affinity and Vortex clearly contemplated loans payable on demand, with specified

principal and interest payments before demand. Affinity has provided significant relief from the contractual terms over a two-year period. In a practical sense, Affinity has already effectively provided Vortex with much of the remedial opportunity contemplated by the *CCAA*. Vortex has had the benefit of two years of debt repayment accommodations and forbearance and the opportunity to seek alternate financing. During this period Vortex has failed to honour undertakings it gave in exchange of the deferral relief provided. Affinity is contractually entitled, following its demand, to either seize and sell the rigs or to have a Receiver appointed. Having regard to the relevant factors I outlined in paragraph 19 above, I conclude that it is just and convenient to appoint a Receiver as sought by Affinity.

iv. Other Considerations

39 Affinity argued that there was a concluded agreement in which Vortex had agreed to consent to the appointment of a Receiver. Vortex disputes that such an agreement was concluded and took exception to evidence Affinity wished to rely on as being without prejudice communications. In light of the conclusions I have reached above, I do not find it necessary to address these arguments and the related argument relating to settlement privilege. My decision is made without regard to the evidence and argument submitted surrounding these issues.

Conclusion

40 For the reasons set forth above:

a. I dismiss Vortex's application for relief under the *CCAA*.

b. I order that Deloitte Restructuring Inc. be appointed Receiver of Vortex effective immediately.

c. I contemplate that the form of that order will be substantially in the form of the draft order filed by counsel for Affinity on July 6, 2017. However, at the hearing of the applications counsel for Affinity and Vortex asked that the final form of the order not be settled until after counsel had reviewed my decision and had discussion on the final form of order. I ask counsel to consult promptly. If they are able to agree on the form of order they shall file same for my approval. If they cannot agree on the form of the order, a conference call with me shall be arranged to settle this matter.

c. I approve the actions of the Interim Receiver since the date of appointment as Interim Receiver to the termination of that order.

Plaintiff's application granted; defendant's application dismissed.

End of Document

TAB B

2011 ONSC 1007
Ontario Superior Court of Justice

Bank of Montreal v. Carnival National Leasing Ltd.

2011 CarswellOnt 896, 2011 ONSC 1007, [2011] O.J. No. 671, 198 A.C.W.S. (3d) 79, 74 C.B.R. (5th) 300

Bank of Montreal (Applicant) and Carnival National Leasing Limited and Carnival Automobiles Limited (Respondents)

Newbould J.

Heard: February 11, 2011
Judgment: February 15, 2011
Docket: CV-10-9029-00CL

Counsel: John J. Chapman, Arthi Sambasivan for Applicants
Fred Tayar, Colby Linthwaite for Respondents
Rachelle F. Mancur for Royal Bank of Canada

Subject: Corporate and Commercial; Insolvency

Related Abridgment Classifications

Debtors and creditors
VII Receivers
VII.3 Appointment
VII.3.b Application for appointment
VII.3.b.iii Grounds
VII.3.b.iii.C Conduct of parties

Headnote

Debtors and creditors --- Receivers — Appointment — Application for appointment — Grounds
Debtor was in business of leasing motor vehicles — Debtor was indebted to creditor bank; vehicles guaranteed indebtedness to $1.5 million — Creditor held security over assets of debtor including general security agreement under which it had right to appoint receiver of debtor or to apply to court for appointment of receiver — Under terms of wholesale leasing facility, total advances for used vehicle financing were not to exceed 30 percent of approved lease portfolio credit line — Creditor's account manager was informed that used car lease portfolio was 60 percent of leases financed by creditor, well in excess of 30 percent condition of loan — Creditor delivered demands for payment — Creditor applied for appointment of receiver — Application granted — Debtor relied on decision in which judge was critical of actions of bank in overstating its case and making unsupportable allegations of fraud — In case at bar there was no basis to refuse order sought because of alleged misconduct on part of creditor or its counsel — If anything, shoe was on other foot as factum filed on behalf of debtor was replete with allegations of false assertions on behalf of creditor, none of which were established — Cited case was relied upon in which it was held that where security instrument permits appointment of private receiver, extraordinary nature of remedy sought is less essential to inquiry — It was preferable to have court appointed receiver rather than privately appointed one as debtor stated that if private appointment was made it would litigate its right to do so.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered by *Newbould J.*:

Anderson v. Hunking (2010), 2010 CarswellOnt 5191, 2010 ONSC 4008 (Ont. S.C.J.) — referred to

Bank of Nova Scotia v. D.G. Jewelry Inc. (2002), 2002 CarswellOnt 3443, 38 C.B.R. (4th) 7 (Ont. S.C.J.) — considered

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

Kavcar Investments Ltd. v. Aetna Financial Services Ltd. (1989), 70 O.R. (2d) 225, 77 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1, 35 O.A.C. 305, 62 D.L.R. (4th) 277, 1989 CarswellOnt 191 (Ont. C.A.) — referred to

Royal Bank v. Boussoulas (2010), 2010 ONSC 4650, 2010 CarswellOnt 6332 (Ont. S.C.J.) — considered

Royal Bank v. Chongsim Investments Ltd. (1997), 1997 CarswellOnt 988, 28 O.T.C. 102, 32 O.R. (3d) 565, 46 C.B.R. (3d) 267 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — distinguished

Ryder Truck Rental Canada Ltd. v. 568907 Ontario Ltd. (1987), 1987 CarswellOnt 383, 16 C.P.C. (2d) 130 (Ont. H.C.) — considered

Swiss Bank Corp. (Canada) v. Odyssey Industries Inc. (1995), 30 C.B.R. (3d) 49, 1995 CarswellOnt 39 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) — considered

Toronto Dominion Bank v. Pritchard (1997), 154 D.L.R. (4th) 141, 104 O.A.C. 373, 1997 CarswellOnt 4277 (Ont. Div. Ct.) — considered

1468121 Ontario Ltd. v. 663789 Ontario Ltd. (2008), 2008 CarswellOnt 7601 (Ont. S.C.J.) — not followed

Statutes considered:

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3
s. 243 — referred to

s. 243(1) — considered

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

APPLICATION by creditor for appointment of private receiver of debtor.

***Newbould J.*:**

1 Bank of Montreal (”BMO”) applies for the appointment of PriceWaterhouse Coopers Inc. as national receiver of the respondents Carnival National Leasing Limited (”Carnival”) and Carnival Automobiles Limited (”Automobiles”) under sections 243 (1) of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* and 101 of the *Courts of Justice Act*.

2 Carnival is in the business of leasing new and used passenger cars, trucks, vans and equipment vehicles. It has approximately 1300 vehicles in its fleet. Carnival is indebted to BMO for approximately $17 million pursuant to demand loan facilities. Automobiles guaranteed the indebtedness of Carnival to BMO limited to $1.5 million. David Hirsh is the president and sole director of Carnival and has guaranteed its indebtedness to BMO limited to $700,000. BMO holds security over the assets of Carnival and Automobiles, including a general security agreement under which it has the right to appoint a receiver of the debtors or to apply to court for the appointment of a receiver. On November 30, 2010 BMO delivered demands for payment to Carnival, Automobiles and Mr. Hirsh.

3 The respondents contend that no receiver should be appointed. In my view BMO is entitled to appoint PWC as a receiver of the respondents and it is so ordered for the reasons that follow.

Events leading to demand for payment

4 The respondents quarrel with the actions of BMO leading to the demands for payment and assert that as a result a receiver should not be appointed.

5 BMO has been Carnival's banker for 21 years. Loans were made annually on terms contained in a term sheet. Each year BMO did an annual review of the account, after which a new term sheet for the following year was signed. The last term sheet was signed on January 29, 2010 and was for the 2010 calendar year. The last annual review, completed on October 27, 2010, recommended a renewal of the credits with various changes being proposed, including a risk rating upgrade from 45 to 40 and a reduction in the demand wholesale leasing facility from $21.9 million to $20 million That review, however, was not sent to senior management for approval and no agreement was made extending the credit facilities to Carnival for the 2011 calendar year.

6 The 2010 term sheet provided for two major lines of credit. The larger facility was a demand wholesale leasing facility with a limit of $21.9 million, under which Carnival submitted vehicle leases to BMO. If a lease was approved BMO advanced up to 100% of the cost of the vehicle and in return received security over the vehicle. The second facility was a general overdraft facility described as a demand operating loan with a limit of $1.15 million. The term sheet provided that all lines of credit were made on a demand loan basis and that BMO reserved the right to cancel the lines of credit "at any time at its sole discretion".

7 Under the terms of the wholesale leasing facility, total advances for used vehicle financing were not to exceed 30% of the approved lease portfolio credit line. That apparently had been a term of the facility for many years. The annual review of October 27, 2010 stated that for the past year, the concentration of used leases was 27.8%. In the previous annual review in 2009, the figure for used lease concentration was 11.6%. Mr. Findlay of the BMO special accounts management unit (SAMU) said on cross-examination that while he could not say as a fact where those percentages came from, the routine for annual reviews was for the person preparing the annual review to obtain such figures from the support staff of the bank's automotive centre.

8 Shortly after the 2010 annual review had been completed, and before it was sent to higher levels of the bank for approval, Mr. Lavery, the account manager at BMO for Carnival, received information from someone at BMO, the identity of whom I do not believe is in the record, informing him that the used car lease portfolio was approximately 60% of the leases financed by BMO, well in excess of the 30% condition of the loan. That led Mr. Lavery to call Mr. Findlay of SAMU. On November 17, 2010 BMO engaged PWC to review the operations of Carnival. On November 26, 2010 BMO's solicitors delivered to Carnival a letter which stated, amongst other things, that BMO would not finance any future leases until PWC's review engagement was completed, that BMO would no longer allow any overdraft on Carnival's operating line and that the bank reserved its right to demand payment of any indebtedness at any time in the future.

9 On November 29, 2010 PWC provided its initial report to BMO. It contained a number of matters of concern to BMO, including itemizing a number of breaches of the lending agreements that Carnival had with BMO. On November 30, 2010 BMO's solicitors delivered to Carnival a letter itemizing a number of breaches of the loan agreements, one of which was that advances for used vehicle financing were in excess of 30% of the approved lease portfolio credit line. Demand for payment under the lines of credit totalling $17,736,838.45 was made. Following the demand, PWC continued its engagement and discovered a number of irregularities in the Carnival business, some of which are contained in the affidavit of Mr. Findlay.

10 It turns out that the 30% limit for used vehicle leases had not been met for some time. Carnival provided to BMO's automotive centre copies of the individual leases and bills of sale which showed the model year of the car to to be financed and this information was in the BMO automotive centre computer records. Reports on BMO's website as at December 31, 2008 demonstrated 45% of Carnival's BMO financed leases were for used vehicles. At December 31, 2009 it was 73% and as at October 31, 2001 it was 60%. The evidence of Mr. Findlay on cross-examination was that while that information was on the computer system, it was not known by the account management responsible for the Carnival credits. He acknowledged that if the account management went to the computer system they would have seen that information but if they did not they

would not have known of it. There is no evidence that Mr. Lavery or others in the account management of BMO responsible for the Carnival credit were aware before late October, 2010 of the true percentage of the used car lease portfolio.

11 Mr. Hirsh said on cross-examination that he assumed somebody in control at the bank knew the percentage of used vehicle leases. Although the loan terms he signed each year contained the 30% condition, he never suggested that the percentage should be changed to a higher figure. One can argue that Mr. Hirsh should have told his account manager at BMO that the condition he was agreeing to was not being met. Of course if he had done so he could well have faced a likely loss of credit needed to run his business. The loan terms included a requirement that Carnival provide an annual detailed analysis of the entire lease portfolio, including a breakdown of the lease concentrations. Had those been provided, it would appear that the percentage of used vehicle leases would have been reported by Carnival. While the record does not indicate whether such reports were provided, I think it can be assumed that if they had been, Mr. Hirsh would have provided that information in his affidavit.

12 Since November 26, 2010, BMO has not financed any further vehicles under the demand wholesale line of credit. Pending the application to appoint a receiver, BMO has continued to extend the $1.15 million operating facility, in spite of its demand. Under the terms of the demand wholesale line of credit, Carnival is obliged after selling vehicles financed by BMO to pay down the wholesale leasing line within 30 days by transferring the money received from its operating line account to the wholesale leasing line. It has not always done so and PWC estimates the amount involved to be $814,000. The operating facility is now in overdraft as a result of the demand for payment.

Issues

(a) Right to enforce payment

13 On a demand loan, a debtor must be allowed a reasonable time to raise the necessary funds to satisfy the demand. Reasonable time will generally be of a short duration, not more than a few days and not encompassing anything approaching 30 days. See *Kavcar Investments Ltd. v. Aetna Financial Services Ltd.* (1989), 70 O.R. (2d) 225 (Ont. C.A.) per McKinley J.A. See also *Toronto Dominion Bank v. Pritchard*, [1997] O.J. No. 4622 (Ont. Div. Ct.) per Farley J.:

> 5. It is clear therefore that the reasonable time to repay after demand is a very finite time measured in days, not weeks, and it is not "open ended" beyond this by the difficulties that a borrower may have in seeking replacement financing, be it bridge or permanent.

14 Under the loan agreements, the credits were on demand and as well BMO had the right to cancel the credits at any time at its sole discretion. It is now over 70 days since demand for payment was made.

15 I do not see the issue of BMO management not being aware of the percentage of used car leases as affecting BMO's rights under its loan agreements, even assuming it was all BMO's fault, which I am not at all sure is the case. There is no evidence that BMO in any way intentionally waived its 30% loan condition, nor is it the case that it was only a breach of the 30% condition that led to the demand for payment being delivered to Carnival. There were a number of other concerns that BMO had. In any event, there was no requirement before demand or termination of the credits that BMO had to have justification to demand payment. To the contrary, the agreement provided that BMO had the right to terminate the credits at any time at its sole discretion.

16 In argument, Mr. Tayar said that Carnival needs just a little more time to obtain financing to pay out the BMO loans. From a legal point of view Carnival has been provided more time than is required. From a practical point of view, it is very unlikely that Carnival will be able in any reasonably foreseeable period of time to pay out BMO.

17 The car leasing business for businesses such as Carnival has been very difficult for a number of years, as acknowledged by Mr. Hirsh. Competitors such as Ford, GM and Chrysler began offering very low interest rates for new vehicles that Carnival could not provide. The economy led to more customers missing payments. There were lower sales generally. Carnival's leased assets fell from $49 million in 2006 to $35 million in 2009. Carnival had a profit of $1.2 million in 2006 but in the years 2007 through 2009 had a cumulative net loss of $244,000. While its business was shrinking,

Carnival's accounts receivable grew significantly, from $1.5 million in 2006 to $2.8 million in 2009, indicating, as Mr. Hirsh acknowledged on cross-examination, that customers owed more than in the past for lease payments because of difficult economic times.

18 Carnival also borrowed from RBC to finance its lease portfolio. Some leases were financed with BMO and some with RBC. In the mid-2000s, the size of Carnival's loan facility with BMO and RBC was about even. In 2008 RBC stopped lending to Carnival on new leases and since then Carnival has been paying down its RBC loans. Today Carnival owes RBC approximately $5.6 million. Thus Carnival owes the two banks approximately $22.6 million.

19 In an affidavit sworn February 8, 2011, Mr. Hirsh disclosed that he has had discussions with TD Bank and has an indication of a loan of approximately $11.5 million. A deal sheet has yet to be provided to TD's credit department for approval, but is expected to be considered by the end of February. If approved, it is contemplated that funds could be advanced sometime in April. Mr. Hirsh states that the TD guidelines allow TD to advance (i) on new vehicles $6.5 million on leases currently financed by BMO and $1.9 million on leases currently financed by RBC and (ii) on used vehicles, $2 million on leases currently financed by BMO and $392,000 on leases currently financed by RBC. A further $2 million would be available on non-bank financed leases. Thus if a TD loan were granted, at most the amount that would be available to pay down BMO would be $10.5 million and it might be less if, as is likely, there are not $6.5 million worth of new car leases currently being financed by BMO.

20 Mr. Hirsh further states in his affidavit that he believes he will be able to pay off the balance of BMO loans through a combination of TD financing new Carnival leases and the payout of existing leases and/or sales of Carnival vehicles. No time estimate is given for this and one can only conclude that it would not be soon.

21 In these circumstances, assuming that it is permissible to consider the chances of refinancing in considering what a reasonable time would be to permit enforcement of security after a demand for payment, I do not consider the chances of refinancing in this case to prevent BMO from acting on its security.

22 BMO had the right under its loan agreements to stop financing new vehicle leases and to demand payment of the outstanding loans. No new term sheet was signed for 2011. Since the demand for payment, it has provided far more time than required in order to enforce its security. In my view, BMO is entitled to payment of the outstanding loans and to enforce its security including, if it wished to do so, to privately appoint a receiver of the assets of Carnival and Automobile or serve notices to the large number of lessees of the assignment of the leases and require payment directly to BMO.

(b) Court appointed receiver

23 Under section 243 of the *BIA* and section 101 of the *Courts of Justice Act*, a court may appoint a receiver if it is "just and convenient" to do so.

24 In *Bank of Nova Scotia v. Freure Village on Clair Creek* (1996), 40 C.B.R. (3d) 274 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]), Blair J. (as he then was) dealt with a similar situation in which the bank held security that permitted the appointment of a private receiver or an application to court to have a court appointed receiver. He summarized the legal principles involved as follows:

> 10 The Court has the power to appoint a receiver or receiver and manager where it is "just or convenient" to do so: the Courts of Justice Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. 43, s. 101. In deciding whether or not to do so, it must have regard to all of the circumstances but in particular the nature of the property and the rights and interests of all parties in relation thereto. The fact that the moving party has a right under its security to appoint a receiver is an important factor to be considered but so, in such circumstances, is the question of whether or not an appointment by the Court is necessary to enable the receiver-manager to carry out its work and duties more efficiently; see generally *Third Generation Realty Ltd. v. Twigg* (1991) 6 C.P.C. (3d) 366 at pages 372-374; *Confederation Trust Co. v. Dentbram Developments Ltd.* (1992), 9 C.P.C. (3d) 399; *Royal Trust Corp. of Canada v. D.Q. Plaza Holdings Ltd.* (1984), 54 C.B.R. (N.S.) 18 at page 21. It is not essential that the moving party, a secured creditor, establish that it will suffer irreparable harm if a receiver-manager is not appointed: *Swiss Bank Corp. (Canada) v. Odyssey Industries Inc.* (1995), 30 C.B.R. (3d) 49.

25 It is argued on behalf of Carnival that the appointment of a receiver is an extraordinary remedy to be granted sparingly and that as it amounts to execution before judgment, there must be strong evidence that the plaintiff's right to judgment must be exercised sparingly. The cases that support this proposition, however, are not applicable as they do not deal with a secured creditor with the right to enforce its security.

26 *Ryder Truck Rental Canada Ltd. v. 568907 Ontario Ltd.* (1987), 16 C.P.C. (2d) 130 (Ont. H.C.) is relied on by Carnival as supporting its position. That case however dealt with a disputed claim to payments said to be owing and a claim for damages. The plaintiff had no security that permitted the appointment of a receiver and requested a court appointed receiver until trial. Salhany L.J.S.C. likened the situation to a plaintiff seeking execution before judgment and considered that the test to support the appointment of a receiver was no less stringent than the test to support a Mareva injunction. With respect, that is not the law of Ontario so far as enforcing security is concerned. The same situation pertained in *Anderson v. Hunking*, 2010 ONSC 4008 (Ont. S.C.J.) cited by Mr. Tayar. I have serious doubts whether *1468121 Ontario Ltd. v. 663789 Ontario Ltd.*, 2008 CarswellOnt 7601 (Ont. S.C.J.) cited by Mr. Tayar was correctly decided and would not follow it.

27 In *Bank of Nova Scotia v. Freure Village on Clair Creek*, Blair J. dealt with an argument similar to the one advanced by Carnival and stated that the extraordinary nature of the remedy sought was less essential where the security provided for a private or court appointed receiver and the issue was essentially whether it was preferable to have a court appointed receiver rather than a private appointment. He stated:

> 11. The Defendants and the opposing creditor argue that the Bank can perfectly effectively exercise its private remedies and that the Court should not intervene by giving the extraordinary remedy of appointing a receiver when it has not yet done so and there is no evidence its interest will not be well protected if it did. They also argue that a Court appointed receiver will be more costly than a privately appointed one, eroding their interests in the property.
>
> 12. While I accept the general notion that the appointment of a receiver is an extraordinary remedy, it seems to me that where the security instrument permits the appointment of a private receiver - and even contemplates, as this one does, the secured creditor seeking a court appointed receiver - and where the circumstances of default justify the appointment of a private receiver, the "extraordinary" nature of the remedy sought is less essential to the inquiry. Rather, the "just or convenient" question becomes one of the Court determining, in the exercise of its discretion, whether it is more in the interests of all concerned to have the receiver appointed by the Court or not. This, of course, involves an examination of all the circumstances which I have outlined earlier in this endorsement, including the potential costs, the relationship between the debtor and the creditors, the likelihood of maximizing the return on and preserving the subject property and the best way of facilitating the work and duties of the receiver-manager

28 In *Swiss Bank Corp. (Canada) v. Odyssey Industries Inc.* (1995), 30 C.B.R. (3d) 49 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]), in which the bank held security that permitted the appointment of a private or court ordered receiver, Ground J. made similar observations:

> 28. The first submission of counsel for Odyssey and Weston is that there is no risk of irreparable harm to Swiss Bank if a receiver is not appointed as certificates of pending litigation have been filed against the real estate properties involved, and there is an existing order restraining the disposition of other assets. I know of no authority for the proposition that a creditor must establish irreparable harm if the appointment of a receiver is not granted by the court. In fact, the authorities seem to support the proposition that irreparable harm need not be demonstrated. (see *Bank of Montreal v. Appcon* (1981), 33 O.R. (2d) 97).

29 See also *Bank of Nova Scotia v. D.G. Jewelry Inc.* (2002), 38 C.B.R. (4th) 7 (Ont. S.C.J.) in which Ground J. rejected the notion that it is necessary where there is security that permits the appointment of a private or court ordered receiver to establish that the property is threatened with danger, and said that the test was whether a court ordered receiver could more effectively carry out its duties than it could if privately appointed. He stated:

> I do not think that, in order to appoint an Interim Receiver pursuant to Section 47 of the BIA, I must be satisfied that there is an actual and immediate danger of a dissipation of assets. The decision of Nova Scotia Registrar Smith in *Royal*

> *Bank v. Zutphen Brothers*, [1993] N.S.J. No. 640, is not, in my view, the law of Ontario.
>
> . . .
>
> On the main issue of the test to be applied by the court in determining whether to appoint a Receiver, I do not think the Ontario courts have followed the Saskatchewan authorities cited by Mr. Tayar which require a finding that the legal remedies available to the party seeking the appointment are defective or that the appointment is necessary to preserve the property from some danger which threatens it, neither of which could be established in the case before this court. The test, which I think this court should apply, is whether the appointment of a court - appointed Receiver will enable that Receiver to more effectively and efficiently carry out its duties and obligations than it could do if privately appointed.

30 This is not a case like *Royal Bank v. Chongsim Investments Ltd.* (1997), 32 O.R. (3d) 565 (Ont. Gen. Div.) in which Epstein J. (as she then was) dismissed a motion to appoint a receiver. While the loan was a demand loan and the bank's security permitted the appointment of a receiver, the parties had agreed that the loan would not be demanded absent default, and Epstein J. held that the bank, acting in bad faith, had set out to do whatever was necessary to create a default. Thus she held it was not equitable to grant the relief sought. That case is not applicable to the facts of this case.

31 Carnival relies on a decision in *Royal Bank v. Boussoulas*, [2010] O.J. No. 3611 (Ont. S.C.J.), in which Stinson J. was highly critical of the actions of the bank and its counsel in overstating its case and making unsupportable allegations of fraud in its motion affidavit material and facta filed before him and previously before Cumming J. He thus declined to continue a Mareva injunction earlier ordered by Cumming J. or appoint an interim receiver over the defendant's assets. There is no question but that a court can decline to order equitable relief in the face of misconduct on the part of a party seeking equitable relief.

32 In my view, there is no basis to refuse the order sought because of alleged misconduct on the part of BMO or its counsel. To the contrary, if anything, the shoe is on the other foot. The factum filed on behalf of Carnival is replete with allegations of false assertions on behalf of BMO, none of which have been established.

33 Carnival says the first affidavit of Mr. Findlay was false when it said that the bank first discovered the high concentration of used cars in late October, 2010, because it says the concentration was on the bank's website. This ignores the fact that the account management personnel responsible for the Carnival account did not know of the high concentration of used car leases in excess of the 30% limit, as testified to by Mr. Findlay and evident from the loan reviews for the past two years prepared by account management which stated that the used car concentration was 27.8 and 11.6 %. Although the BMO internal auditors had conducted quarterly audits, the unchallenged evidence of Mr. Findlay is that the purpose of each audit was to review whether each individual lease has been properly papered and handled. The audit did not look at the Carnival portfolio as a whole or to see what percentage of leases were for new or used vehicles.

34 It is argued that BMO has tried to mislead the Court by suggesting that payments received by Carnival after a leased vehicle was sold were to be held in trust for BMO. There is nothing in this allegation. Mr. Findlay referred in his affidavit to the term "sold out of trust", or SOT, a term apparently widely used in the automobile industry, to refer to the situation in which a borrower such as Carnival fails to remit to its lender the proceeds of sale of a financed vehicle. Mr. Findlay did not say that there was any type of legal trust, nor did he imply it. He identified what he said were SOTs, as did PWC in its report, and while he said on cross-examination that he understood that all proceeds from sales of vehicles were paid into Carnival's account at BMO, Carnival had not paid down its loans with these proceeds as it was required to do under the loan terms, but rather had kept the money in its operating account available for its operating purposes. The fact that some of Mr. Findlay's calculations of amounts involved differ from the calculations of PWC after it was sent in to investigate the situation hardly makes the case that BMO set out to mislead the Court by a fabrication and by use of falsified numbers, as was alleged in Mr. Tayar's factum.

35 In his first affidavit Mr. Findlay referred to a concern of BMO as set out in the initial report that Mr. Hirsh was using the Carnival operating line to pay personal mortgages on his home. On cross-examination he said he understood that the money from the mortgages was put into the Carnival account as an injection of capital and he agreed that the payment of interest on the mortgages from Carnival's account was not an improper use of its resources. This is somewhat different from

the statement of concern in his affidavit, but I do not see it as terribly important and as Mr. Findlay was in special account management and not managing the account, it is quite possible that the difference was due to learning more and changing his mind. I do not conclude that he set out to mislead the Court.

36 In my view, it would be preferable to have a court appointed receiver rather than a privately appointed one. Mr. Tayar said that if a private appointment were made, Carnival would litigate its right to do so. This would not at all be helpful when it is recognized that there are some 1300 vehicles under lease and any dispute as to whom lease payments were to be paid could quickly dry up or lessen the payments made. There are already a number of leases in default, and people might opportunistically decide not to pay if there were a dispute as to who was in control. The prospect of more litigation was a consideration that led Blair J. to ordering the appointment of a receiver in *Bank of Nova Scotia v. Freure Village on Clair Creek*.

37 While there may be increased costs over a private receivership, it would appear that this may well be at the expense of BMO and RBC, the other secured creditor. RBC supports the appointment of a receiver by the Court. Carnival has accounts receivable of some $4.4 million. As at November 25, approximately $3 million was more than 120 days old. The book value of the leases of $30 million is therefore questionable, and the repayment of $22.6 owing to BMO and RBC is not assured. Further, a court appointed receiver would have borrowing powers, which might be required as Cardinal has not so far been able to obtain new operating credit lines.

38 In the circumstances the order sought by BMO is granted in the form contained in tab 3 of the application record.

Application granted.