COURT FILE NUMBER	1903 23164
COURT	COURT OF KING'S BENCH OF ALBERTA
JUDICIAL CENTRE	EDMONTON
PLAINTIFF	ATB FINANCIAL
DEFENDANTS	1847845 ALBERTA LTD., 1814905 ALBERTA LTD., 1816665 ALBERTA LTD. 1847034 ALBERTA LTD., HEOLEE ENTERPRISES INC., JAI HOON IN, MYEONG SU CHONG, KWANG RAE KIM, HAE SUK LEE, JINHEE CHUNG also known as JIN HEE CHUNG;, WOOYOUNG HEO also known as WOO YOUNG HEO, KYOUNGOK LEE also known as KYUNGOK LEE, SANGKYUN CHOI also known as SANG KYUN CHOI
DOCUMENT	**BENCH BRIEF**

Clerk's Stamp

JUDICIAL CENTRE OF EDMONTON
FILED DIGITALLY
1903 23164
Jul 12, 2024
10:42 AM
CLERK OF THE COURT

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE AND CONTACT INFORMATION OF PARTY FILING THIS DOCUMENT

MILLER THOMSON LLP
Barristers and Solicitors
2700, Commerce Place
10155-102 Street
Edmonton, AB, Canada T5J 4G8
Phone: 780.429.1751 Fax: 780.424.5866

Lawyer's Name: Terrence M. Warner

Lawyer's Email: twarner@millerthomson.com

File No.: 238199.8

SUPPLEMENTAL BENCH BRIEF OF THE APPLICANT, ATB FINANCIAL
DATE OF HEARING: July 15 2024 at 2:00 p.m.

Miles Davison LLP
Barristers and Solicitors
900, 517 - 10th Avenue SW
Calgary, Alberta T2R 0A8
Tel: 403.298.0390
Fax: 403.263.6840
Attention: Ward Mather
email: wmather@milesdavison.com

Department of Justice Canada / Government of Canada Prairie Regional Office
300, 10423 – 101st
Edmonton, Alberta, T5H 0E7
Telephone 780.495.7443 / 587.335.9341
Facsimile 780.495.3319
Attention: Daniel G. Segal
email: Daniel.Segal@justice.gc.ca

COURT FILE NUMBER	1903 23164
COURT	COURT OF KING'S BENCH OF ALBERTA
JUDICIAL CENTRE	EDMONTON
PLAINTIFF	ATB FINANCIAL
DEFENDANTS	1847845 ALBERTA LTD., 1814905 ALBERTA LTD., 1816665 ALBERTA LTD. 1847034 ALBERTA LTD., HEOLEE ENTERPRISES INC., JAI HOON IN, MYEONG SU CHONG, KWANG RAE KIM, HAE SUK LEE, JINHEE CHUNG also known as JIN HEE CHUNG;, WOOYOUNG HEO also known as WOO YOUNG HEO, KYOUNGOK LEE also known as KYUNGOK LEE, SANGKYUN CHOI also known as SANG KYUN CHOI
DOCUMENT	**BENCH BRIEF**

Clerk's Stamp

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE AND CONTACT INFORMATION OF PARTY FILING THIS DOCUMENT

MILLER THOMSON LLP
Barristers and Solicitors
2700, Commerce Place
10155-102 Street
Edmonton, AB, Canada T5J 4G8
Phone: 780.429.1751 Fax: 780.424.5866

Lawyer's Name: Terrence M. Warner

Lawyer's Email: twarner@millerthomson.com

File No.: 238199.8

SUPPLEMENTAL BENCH BRIEF OF THE APPLICANT, ATB FINANCIAL
DATE OF HEARING: July 15 2024 at 2:00 p.m.

Miles Davison LLP
Barristers and Solicitors
900, 517 - 10th Avenue SW
Calgary, Alberta T2R 0A8
Tel: 403.298.0390
Fax: 403.263.6840
Attention: Ward Mather
email: wmather@milesdavison.com

Department of Justice Canada / Government of Canada Prairie Regional Office
300, 10423 – 101st
Edmonton, Alberta, T5H 0E7
Telephone 780.495.7443 / 587.335.9341
Facsimile 780.495.3319
Attention: Daniel G. Segal
email: Daniel.Segal@justice.gc.ca

INDEX

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This brief is supplemental to the original Bench Brief submitted on behalf of ATB Financial ("**ATB**") in November of 2019 in support of its application to appoint a receiver or receiver-manager over the undertakings, real and personal property, and assets of 1847845 Alberta Ltd. ("**1847845**" or the "**Debtor**").

2. For ease of reference, the original Bench Brief is attached under Tab 1, and it remains valid with some additional facts set out in the Affidavit of Ashton Boiselle, filed July 3, 2024 (the "**Boiselle Affidavit**") and summarized below.

3. This matter involves loans issued to the Debtor to finance the acquisition and operation of a hotel located in Rocky Mountain House.

4. ATB is the primary secured creditor, with a mortgage registered in first position on title to the hotel, and Agriculture Financial Services Corporation ("AFSC") is the second mortgagee.

5. As set out in the Boiselle Affidavit, the Original application in this matter was scheduled for November 20, 2019, but the application was adjourned on the application of ATB as the result of the retainer by the Defendants of Daniel Song as their Counsel which resulted in an agreement in December of 2019 (the "**December 2019 Agreement**").[1]

6. An Adjournment Order was issued by the Honourable Justice Lema ("**Justice Lema**") in this matter on December 3, 2019.

7. Since that time, ATB has been trying to work with the Defendants to enable the Defendants to repay the indebtedness, but ATB has not seen any progress in that regard over the intervening years and the Defendants remain in default of the various credit facilities, and ATB has lost confidence in the Defendants. [2]

8. On January 28, 2021, on the application of ATB, Judgment was granted against all of the Defendants except the Debtor by Justice Lema in the amount of $3,412,411.01. The application for Judgment as against 1847845 was adjourned, without prejudice to the Plaintiff's right to proceed against 1847845 at a later date, and without prejudice to the

---

[1] Boiselle Affidavit, para 6.

[2] Boiselle Affidavit, para 40.

Plaintiff's right to take any enforcement steps in regard to any security held by the Plaintiff, including without limiting the foregoing, enforcement of the Plaintiff's mortgage security.

9. ATB submits that it was and remains just and equitable in these circumstances to grant ATB's application and to appoint a receiver over the undertakings, assets, and personal property of the Debtor.

II. BRIEF SUMMARY OF FACTS

10. As indicated above, the agreement of ATB to adjourn the original application for the appointment of the receiver was predicated on the December 2019 Agreement. The email outlining the December 2019 Agreement is attached as Exhibit "A" to the Boiselle Affidavit.

11. Key aspects of the December 2019 Agreement were not adhered to, including the provision that a refinancing proposal acceptable to ATB be provided to ATB by December 30, 2019.[3]

12. Another key element of the December 2019 Agreement was the engagement of Kevin Meyler, then of Hardie & Kelly Inc., to conduct a business review of 1847845, but the record indicates that there was little cooperation on the part of the Defendants in completing the business review, primarily in regard to receiving financial statements and other fulsome responses to information requests to evaluate the hotel and future operations.[4]

13. Since the December 2019 Agreement, there were various sporadic attempts on the part of the Defendants to sell the hotel, none of which came to fruition. Ultimately no progress was made in finalizing an offer to purchase, and no proposals were received from the Defendants to address the outstanding debt of 1847845 to ATB.[5]

14. David Horen of ATB instructed counsel for ATB to prepare a forbearance agreement in late August, 2020, with the intention of providing some additional time to list and sell the hotel while protecting ATB's interests. The forbearance agreement was prepared and submitted to the Defendants, but it was never fully executed.[6]

---

[3] Boiselle Affidavit, para 8.

[4] Boiselle Affidavit, para 10.

[5] Boiselle Affidavit, para 13.

[6] Boiselle Affidavit, para 16.

15. On January 18, 2024, ATB received a copy of what appeared to be a form of Offer to Purchase, but the name of the offeror was partially blanked out.[7]

16. The price listed in the alleged offer to purchase was $3,500,000, but the Defendants were unwilling to proceed without ATB and AFSC agreeing to release the guarantors from the shortfall between the purchase price and the amounts outstanding.[8]

17. Given the concealment of the identity of the alleged purchaser, ATB was not persuaded that the offer was real and was not prepared to provide any assurances of a release of the guarantors.[9]

18. Similarly, AFSC was not convinced the alleged offer was real and would not agree to accept a shortfall without full disclosure on the part of the Defendants.[10]

19. On May 1, 2024, ATB received an email from the Defendants advising that they had received another offer for the hotel for $3.1 million but the name of the offeror was not disclosed to ATB and was only identified as "Mario" (the "**Mario Offer**").[11]

20. On June 12, 2024, ATB received a further email from the Defendants stating that the seller and the buyer had agreed to an amendment to the Mario Offer whereunder it was proposed that the shares of 1847845 would be acquired by "Mario", for $4.0 million which would be paid by the "take over of the existing debts of the Vendor to a maximum of $4,000,000". ATB was not prepared to consider a takeover or assumption of its credit facilities without going through a full credit application process.[12]

ISSUE

21. The sole issue was and remains whether it is just and convenient to appoint a Receiver or Receiver/Manager over the Debtor in these circumstances.

---

[7] Boiselle Affidavit, para 23.

[8] Boiselle Affidavit, para 24.

[9] Boiselle Affidavit, para 25.

[10] Boiselle Affidavit, para 26.

[11] Boiselle Affidavit, para 34, 35.

[12] Boiselle Affidavit, para 37, 38.

LAW

22. The law on this issue is addressed in the original Bench Brief, and remains valid despite the passage in time.

III. ARGUMENT

23. ATB respectfully submits that this Honourable Court ought to exercise its discretion to appoint a Receiver by reason of it being just, convenient and otherwise appropriate that a Receiver of the undertakings, property and assets of the Debtor be appointed.

24. Having regard to the factors listed by Justice Romaine in *Paragon Capital Corp. v Merchants & Traders Assurance Co.*, which is at Tab 3 of the original Bench Brief, ATB notes:

(a) ATB is the first-ranking secured creditor of the Debtors and holds a first-ranking mortgage over the hotel and a first-ranking security interest in all the present and after-acquired property of the Debtor;

(b) Given the extended period of time in which the Debtor has failed to make payment to ATB, and the consistent lack of cooperation on the part of the Defendants, it is a reasonable conclusion that ATB's security is in jeopardy;

(c) The balance of convenience is clearly in favour of ATB. ATB has given the Debtor a considerable period of time to pay out the indebtedness, but the Debtor has not shown that its serious in finding a solution to repay the ATB indebtedness;

(d) Instead of marketing the hotel through a qualified realtor at a reasonable price, the Defendants have come forward with a series of questionable offers in which the alleged offeror was not disclosed, and all so-called offers were predicated on the secured lenders taking less than what is owed and providing a release of the guarantors;

(e) A court appointment is necessary to enable the Receiver to list and sell the hotel for the best possible price;

(f) ATB has given the Defendants more than ample opportunity to address the indebtedness and throughout the nearly five years of time since the initial

application, has met with a lack of sincerity and little cooperation on the part of the Defendants;

(g) ATB was and is acting in good faith throughout these proceedings;

(h) It is commercially reasonable to appoint a Receiver under the present circumstances.

IV. SUMMARY AND RELIEF REQUESTED

25. ATB respectfully submits that it is just and convenient to grant ATB's Receivership Application and appoint BDO Canada Limited ("**BDO**") as Receiver of the Debtors.

26. ATB is entitled to such remedy in its Securities, and, on a balance of convenience, the facts favour ATB's Receivership Application.

27. The appointment of the Receiver is likely to maximize the value of the property and assets of the Debtors.

28. ATB respectfully seeks an Order appointing BDO as Receiver over the property and undertakings of Debtors.

ALL OF WHICH IS RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED THIS 12th DAY of July, 2024

MILLER THOMSON LLP

Per: _____

Terrence M. Warner
Counsel for ATB Financial

TAB 1



	Clerk's stamp:
COURT FILE NUMBER	1903 23164
COURT	COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH OF ALBERTA
JUDICIAL CENTRE	EDMONTON
PLAINTIFF	ATB FINANCIAL
DEFENDANTS	1847845 ALBERTA LTD., 1814905 ALBERTA LTD., 1816665 ALBERTA LTD. 1847034 ALBERTA LTD., HEOLEE ENTERPRISES INC., JAI HOON IN, MYEONG SU CHONG, KWANG RAE KIM, HAE SUK LEE, JINHEE CHUNG also known as JIN HEE CHUNG;, WOOYOUNG HEO also known as WOO YOUNG HEO, KYOUNGOK LEE also known as KYUNGOK LEE, SANGKYUN CHOI also known as SANG KYUN CHOI
DOCUMENT	**BENCH BRIEF**
ADDRESS FOR SERVICE AND CONTACT INFORMATION OF PARTY FILING THIS DOCUMENT	MILLER THOMSON LLP Barristers and Solicitors 2700 Commerce Place 10155 - 102 Street Edmonton, AB, Canada T5J 4G8 Phone: 780.429.1751 Fax: 780.424.5866 Lawyer's Name: Stephanie A. Wanke Spencer Norris Lawyer's Email: swanke@milerthomson.com snorris@millerthomson.com File No.: 238199.8

BENCH BRIEF OF THE APPLICANT, ATB FINANCIAL

DATE OF HEARING: November 20, 2019 at 10:00 a.m.

INDEX

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This brief is submitted on behalf of ATB Financial (**"ATB"**) in support of its application to appoint a receiver or receiver-manager over the undertakings, real and personal property, and assets of 1847845 Alberta Ltd. (the "**Debtor**").

2. ATB submits that it is just and equitable in these circumstances to grant ATB's application and to appoint a receiver-manager or, in the alternative, interim receiver over the undertakings, assets, and personal property of the Debtor.

II. BRIEF SUMMARY OF FACTS

3. The Debtor is a corporation incorporated pursuant to the laws of Alberta, carrying on a hotel business under the name Tamarack Inn in Rocky Mountain House, Alberta (the "**Hotel**").

4. The Defendants, Sangkyun Choi, Jinhee Chung, and Kwang Rae Kim, with Jongmin Lee are the directors of the Debtor.

5. The Defendants, 1814905 Alberta Ltd., 1816665 Alberta Ltd., 1847034 Alberta Ltd., and Hoelee Enterprises Inc., with 1858740 Alberta Ltd. are shareholders of the Debtor.

6. In addition to the Hotel, the Debtor also operates a restaurant and leases a liquor store.

7. The Hotel and the Debtor's business operations are located on lands owned by the Debtor and legally described as:

   PLAN 0121120
   BLOCK 33
   LOT 7
   EXCEPTING THEROUT ALL MINES AND MINERALS
   AREA: 0.753 HECTARES (1.86 ACRES) MORE OR LESS

   (the "**Lands**")

8. On the application of the Defendants, ATB extended credit to the Debtor.

9. The Debtor is intended to ATB as follows (the "**Credit Facilities**"):

   (a) $3,287,844.83 with respect to a non-revolving, reducing demand loan (the "**Term Loan**") as at November 8, 2019;

(b) $49,642.28 with respect to an Alberta BusinessCard MasterCard credit facility (the "**MasterCard Facility**") as at October 25, 2019;

(c) $12,640.91 with respect to a costs account (the "**Costs Account**") as at November 8, 2019;

all plus further amounts owed in respect of costs and expenses incurred by ATB, including legal costs on a solicitor and own client full indemnity basis, plus further accruing interest (collectively, the "**Indebtedness**").

10. The following parties have guaranteed the Indebtedness as follows:

(a) 1814905 Alberta Ltd. has guaranteed payment and performance of the obligations and liabilities of the Debtor to ATB, to the maximum amount of $3,850,000.00 plus interest from the date of demand, plus costs;

(b) 1816665 Alberta Ltd. has guaranteed payment and performance of the obligations and liabilities of the Debtor to ATB, to the maximum amount of $3,850,000.00 plus interest from the date of demand, plus costs;

(c) 1847034 Alberta Ltd. has guaranteed payment and performance of the obligations and liabilities of the Debtor to ATB, to the maximum amount of $3,850,000.00 plus interest from the date of demand, plus costs;

(d) Heolee Enterprises Inc. has guaranteed payment and performance of the obligations and liabilities of the Debtor to ATB, to the maximum amount of $3,850,000.00 plus interest from the date of demand, plus costs;

(e) Jai Hoon In has guaranteed payment and performance of the obligations and liabilities of the Debtor to ATB, to the maximum amount of $962,500.00 plus interest from the date of demand, plus costs;

(f) Myeong Su Chong has guaranteed payment and performance of the obligations and liabilities of the Debtor to ATB, to the maximum amount of $962,500.00 plus interest from the date of demand, plus costs;

(g) Kwang Rae Kim has guaranteed payment and performance of the obligations and liabilities of the Debtor to ATB, to the maximum amount of $962,500.00 plus interest from the date of demand, plus costs;

(h) Hae Suk Lee has guaranteed payment and performance of the obligations and liabilities of the Debtor to ATB, to the maximum amount of $962,500.00 plus interest from the date of demand, plus costs;

(i) Jinhee Chung has guaranteed payment and performance of the obligations and liabilities of the Debtor to ATB, to the maximum amount of $962,500.00 plus interest from the date of demand, plus costs;

(j) Wooyoung Heo has guaranteed payment and performance of the obligations and liabilities of the Debtor to ATB, to the maximum amount of $962,500.00 plus interest from the date of demand, plus costs;

(k) Kyoungok Lee has guaranteed payment and performance of the obligations and liabilities of the Debtor to ATB, to the maximum amount of $962,500.00 plus interest from the date of demand, plus costs;

(l) Sangkyun Choi has guaranteed payment and performance of the obligations and liabilities of the Debtor to ATB, to the maximum amount of $962,500.00 plus interest from the date of demand, plus costs.

11. For security for the payment of the Indebtedness, the Debtor granted to ATB:

(a) By way of a General Security Agreement executed October 30, 2014 (the "**18478 GSA**"), a security interest in all of the Debtor's present and after-acquired property, assets and undertaking, including without limitation all present and after-acquired personal property, and all present and after-acquired real, immoveable and leasehold property;

(b) By way of a Collateral Mortgage executed October 22, 2014 (the "**Collateral Mortgage**), a mortgage over the Lands registered at the Alberta Land Titles Office as Instrument 142 363 600 on October 29, 2014"); and

(c) By way of a General Assignment of Leases and Rents dated October 22, 2014 (the "**Assignment of Rents**"), an assignment of all leases, licenses, tenancy agreements or rights of use or occupation of every kind in respect of the Lands and all rents and other payments due thereunder, registered at the Alberta Land Titles Office as Instrument 142 363 601 on October 29, 2014;

as more thoroughly described in the Affidavit of David Horen sworn November 12, 2019 (the "**Securities**").

12. The Debtor is in serious, continuing default of its obligations to ATB.

13. As set out in more detail in the Affidavit of David Horen, sworn on November 12, 2019, the Debtor failed to pay the Term Loan upon its maturity on March 31, 2019 and ceased making payments to the Term Loan in August 2019.

14. In an attempt to work with the Debtor, ATB engaged the Debtor and representatives of the guarantors to come to terms on extending the Term Loan.

15. The Debtor and the guarantors could not agree on the terms of the extension to the Term Loan and, as a result, the Term Loan was not extended beyond March 31, 2019.

16. In response, on July 11, 2019, ATB issued a demand for payment of the Credit Facilities to the Debtor with a Notice of Intention to Enforce Security pursuant to Section 244 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency* Act (the "**Section 244 Notice**").

17. On July 11 and 25, 2019, Demands were sent to those who had guaranteed payment and performance of the Debtor's obligations and liabilities to ATB, with a copy of the demand sent to the Debtor and the Section 244 Notice.

18. Following the issuance of demands, ATB continued to negotiate with the Debtor and representatives of the guarantors in an attempt to come to mutually agreeable terms with respect to the Credit Facilities.

19. In early October 2019, however, despite ATB's efforts, the Debtor and the guarantors became unresponsive to ATB's efforts to come to terms on the Credit Facilities.

20. The Term Loan, which comprises the largest portion of the Debtor's debt to ATB, has matured and is payable on demand. By failing to pay the Term Loan upon maturity and upon demand, the Debtor is in default of the Credit Facilities and the Securities.

21. The 18478 GSA granted by the Debtor provides that, on default, ATB is entitled to appoint a receiver or a receiver manager over all of the property of the Debtor.

22. Given the long standing and serious defaults of the Debtor, its unwillingness to work with ATB to come to mutually agreeable terms, and unresponsiveness to ATB's attempts to

resolve the Credit Facilities, ATB is now seeking the immediate appointment of a Receiver over the Debtor.

III. ISSUES

23. Is it just or convenient to appoint a Receiver or Receiver/Manager over the Debtor in these circumstances.

IV. LAW

24. Each of section 243 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, RSC 1985, c. B-3, as amended, section 13(2) of the *Judicature Act*, RSA 2000 c. J-2, section 65(7) of the *Personal Property Security Act*, RSA 2000, c.P-7 and section 99 of the *Business Corporations Act*, RSA 2000, c B-9 vest in this Honourable Court, authority to appoint a Receiver where it is just and convenient to do so.

25. The test to appoint a receiver is whether it is just or convenient to do so. In considering this test the Honourable Madame Justice Romaine noted the following in *MTM Commercial Trust v Statesman and Riverside Quays Ltd*:

> 11 Determining whether it is "just and convenient" to grant a receivership requires the court to consider and attempt to balance the rights of both the applicant and the respondent, with the onus on the applicant to establish that such an order is required: *BG International* at para. 17. The factors set out to be considered in a receivership application are focused on the same ultimate question that the court must determine in considering an application for an interlocutory injunction: what are the relative risks to the parties of granting or withholding the remedy?

2010 ABQB 647 at para 11 [**TAB 1**]

26. A receivership is appropriate when required to protect the interests of a secured lender and when just or convenient having considered and balanced the interest of the parties.

Kasten Energy Inc. v Shamrock Oil & Gas Ltd.,
2013 ABQB 63, at para 21 [**TAB 2**]

27. Justice Romaine in *Paragon Capital Corp. v Merchants & Traders Assurance Co.* adopted the non-exhaustive list of considerations provided by Frank Bennett in *Bennett on Receiverships*; the list includes:

(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 rights of the parties thereto;

(e) the apprehended or actual waste of the debtor's assets;

(f) the preservation and protection of the property pending judicial resolution;

(g) the balance of convenience to the parties;

(h) the fact that the creditor has the right to appoint a receiver under the documentation provided for the loan;

(i) the enforcement of rights under a security instrument where the security-holder encounters or expects to encounter difficulty with the debtor and others;

(j) the principle that the appointment of a receiver is extraordinary relief which should be granted cautiously and sparingly;

(k) the consideration of whether a court appointment is necessary to enable the receiver to carry out its' duties more efficiently;

(l) the effect of the order upon the parties;

(m) the conduct of the parties;

(n) the length of time that a receiver may be in place;

(o) the cost to the parties;

(p) the likelihood of maximizing return to the parties;

(q) the goal of facilitating the duties of the receiver; and

(r) the secured creditor's good faith, commercial reasonableness of the proposed appointment and any questions of equity.

[*Paragon*] 2002 ABQB 430 at para 27 [TAB 3]

28. Justice Romaine goes on to further note that where the security documents provide for the appointment of a receiver, the extraordinary nature of the remedy being sought is less essential to the Court's inquiry.

***Paragon*, at para 28**

V. ARGUMENT

29. ATB respectfully submits that this Honourable Court ought to exercise its discretion to appoint a Receiver by reason of it being just, convenient and otherwise appropriate that a Receiver of the undertakings, property and assets of the Debtor be appointed.

30. Having regard to the factors listed by Justice Romaine in *Paragon*, ATB notes:

(a) ATB is the first-ranking secured creditor of the Debtor and hold a first-ranking security interest in all the present and after-acquired property of the Debtor and the Lands;

(b) Given the extended period of time in which the Debtor has failed to pay the matured Term Loan, the Debtor and the guarantors has failed to enter into terms to resolve the Credit Facilities, and now the Debtor's lack of response to ATB's attempts to resolve the Credit Facilities, ATB reasonably believes that its security is in jeopardy;

(c) the continuous operation of the Hotel is vital to maximizing the realization on the Debtor's assets; as it is expected that the Debtor's assets and the Lands will be sold *en bloc*;

(d) it will take time to market the Lands and Debtor's assets and find an appropriate purchaser, and during that time it is appropriate to have a receiver oversee operation of the Hotel;

(e) An organized sale by a receiver is likely to maximize recovery for all stakeholders in the Debtor;

(f) the balance of convenience is clearly in favour of ATB. The Debtor have ceased communication with ATB and has ceased payments to the Term Loan. Further the entire amount of the Term Loan came due and owing on March 31, 2019, which the Debtor has failed to pay for 7 months.

(g) the Securities granted by the Debtor authorize ATB to appoint a Receiver over the Debtor upon default;

(h) a court appointment is necessary to enable the Receiver to carry out its duties more effectively and efficiently;

(i) a Receivership Order would place all creditors and stakeholders of the Debtor on a level and transparent playing field under the administration of this Honourable Court to ensure the consistent and lawful treatment of all stakeholders;

(j) while there is a cost of appointing a Receiver, all indications to date indicate that the appointment of a Receiver will be the most cost effective means of dealing with the estates of the Debtor;

(k) it is likely that the value of the property of the Debtor will be maximized by establishing a level and transparent process administered by this Honourable Court; and

(l) ATB is acting in good faith and in a commercially reasonable manner in respect of the appointment of the Receiver.

VI. SUMMARY AND RELIEF REQUESTED

31. ATB respectfully submits that it is just and convenient to grant ATB's Receivership Application and appoint Hardie & Kelly Inc. as Receiver-Manager of the Debtor.

32. ATB is entitled to such remedy in its Securities, and, on a balance of convenience, the facts favour ATB's Receivership Application.

33. The appointment of the Receiver-Manager is likely to maximize the value of the property and assets of the Debtor.

34. ATB respectfully seeks an Order appointing Hardie & Kelly Inc. as Receiver / Receiver-Manager over the property and undertakings of Debtor.

ALL OF WHICH IS RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED THIS 12th DAY of November, 2019

MILLER THOMSON LLP

Per: 

Stephanie A. Wanke
Spencer Norris
Counsel for ATB Financial

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

TAB

1. *MTM Commercial Trust v Statesman and Riverside Quays Ltd.*, 2010 CasrwellAlta 2041, 2010 ABQB 647.

2. *Kasten Energy Inc. v Shamrock Oil & Gas Ltd.*, 2013 ABQB 63, 2013 CasrwellAlta 153, 2013 ABQB 63.

3. *Paragon Capital Corp. v Merchants & Traders Assurance Co.*, 2002 CarswellAlta 1531, 2002 ABQB 430.

2010 ABQB 647
Alberta Court of Queen's Bench

MTM Commercial Trust v. Statesman Riverside Quays Ltd.

2010 CarswellAlta 2041, 2010 ABQB 647, [2010] A.J. No. 1189, [2011] A.W.L.D. 35, [2011] A.W.L.D. 37, [2011] A.W.L.D. 5, [2011] A.W.L.D. 66, [2011] A.W.L.D. 8, 193 A.C.W.S. (3d) 1284, 70 C.B.R. (5th) 233, 98 C.L.R. (3d) 198

MTM Commercial Trust and Matco Investments Ltd. (Applicants) and Statesman Riverside Quays Ltd., Riverside Quays Limited Partnership and Statesman Master Builders Inc. (Respondents)

B.E. Romaine J.

Judgment: October 12, 2010
Docket: Calgary 1001-09828

Counsel: Blair C. Yorke-Slader, Q.C., Kelsey J. Drozdowski for Applicants
Robert W. Calvert, Q.C., Larry B. Robinson, Q.C., Sharilyn C. Nagina for Respondents

Subject: Corporate and Commercial; Insolvency
Related Abridgment Classifications
Alternative dispute resolution
III Relation of arbitration to court proceedings
III.3 Stay of court proceedings
III.3.a General principles
Business associations
II Creation and organization of business associations
II.2 Partnerships
II.2.b Relationship between partners
II.2.b.ii Membership
II.2.b.ii.A Introduction and expulsion
Contracts
VII Construction and interpretation
VII.11 Miscellaneous
Contracts
XIV Remedies for breach
XIV.6 Injunction
Debtors and creditors
VII Receivers
VII.3 Appointment
VII.3.a General principles
Headnote
Alternative dispute resolution --- Relation of arbitration to court proceedings — Stay of court proceedings — General principles
Debtors and creditors --- Receivers — Appointment — General principles
M Trust and M Ltd. (collectively applicants) and S Ltd. and S Inc. (collectively respondents) entered into series of agreements regarding residential development project — Partnership was created — Applicants alleged respondents breached various agreements, were guilty of misconduct that amounted to fraud and dishonesty, and commenced phase

2 of construction on project without proper approvals — Applicants applied for, inter alia, appointment of receiver manager of Partnership and S Ltd. — Respondents cross-applied for various declarations — Respondents voluntarily halted construction on project and undertook not to recommence construction without court order — Application granted in part on other grounds; cross-application dismissed — Applicants' concession that receiver was not necessary as long as construction on project did not recommence was consistent with principle that court considering appointment of receiver must carefully explore remedies short of receivership that could protect interests of applicant — Applicants acknowledged that cessation of construction due to voluntary undertaking served same purpose and was adequate remedy — Question became less whether receiver should be appointed and more whether voluntary undertaking to cease construction should be replaced by court-imposed injunction restraining respondents from further construction on project pending resolution of matters between parties.

Contracts --- Remedies for breach — Injunction

M Trust and M Ltd. (collectively applicants) and S Ltd. and S Inc. (collectively respondents) entered into series of agreements regarding residential development project — Partnership was created — Applicants alleged respondents breached various agreements, were guilty of misconduct that amounted to fraud and dishonesty, and commenced phase 2 of construction on project without proper approvals — M brought application for appointment of receiver manager of partnership and other relief; respondents cross-applied for various declarations — Application granted in part; cross-applications dismissed on other grounds — Respondents enjoined from continuing construction on project until issues of alleged breach of contract and other misconduct could be resolved on merits or until parties agreed otherwise — Applicants established strong prima facie case of breach of contract on question whether respondents proceeded with construction of phase 2 of project without necessary approvals of applicants as required under various agreements — Breaches amounted to breach of negative obligation, which was in substance obligation not to proceed to next phase of construction without obtaining Management Committee approval or approval of all S Ltd. directors under Unanimous Shareholders Agreement — If project were to fall into financial distress as result of untimely or imprudent commitments to proceed, it would be very difficult to quantify loss suffered — Applicants established that, on balance, failure to enjoin further contractual breaches would give rise to irreparable harm — Balance of convenience favoured applicants, as failure to grant injunction would nullify its contractual right to be part of decision to proceed — If remedy was withheld, that right would be so impaired by time issues could be ultimately determined on their merits by unilateral action by respondents that it would be too late to afford applicants complete relief.

Contracts --- Construction and interpretation — Miscellaneous

M Trust and M Ltd. (collectively applicants) and S Ltd. and S Inc. (collectively respondents) entered into series of agreements regarding residential development project — Partnership was created — Under Development Management Agreement (DMA), S Inc. was appointed as Manager of intended development — DMA provided that it shall terminate if Manager "misappropriates any monies or defrauds Partnership in any manner whatsoever" — Applicants alleged respondents breached various agreements — Applicants alleged that S Inc. misappropriated partnership funds and commenced phase 2 of construction on project without proper approvals — Applicants brought application for, inter alia, order confirming termination of S Inc. as Manager of Project; respondents brought cross-application for, inter alia, declaration that S Inc. remained Manager — Application granted in part on other grounds; cross-application dismissed — While applicants established strong prima facie case of contractual breach, issue of whether alleged breach was misappropriation was not entirely without doubt — It would also not be clear until issue of whether S Ltd. remained General Partner of Partnership who had authority to act for Partnership in order to instigate termination of DMA — Issue of removal and replacement of General Partner remained to be determined on its merits — No final determination made with respect to this issue.

Business associations --- Creation and organization of business associations — Partnerships — Relationship between partners — Membership — Introduction and expulsion

M Trust and M Ltd. (collectively applicants) and S Ltd. and its affiliate S Inc. (collectively respondents) entered into series of agreements regarding residential development project — Partnership was created — By terms of Limited Partnership Agreement, S Ltd. was appointed General Partner — Applicants alleged that S Ltd.'s actions in starting over $2 million of phase 2 construction and committing partnership to over $12.5 million of phase 2 construction contracts without approval of directors of S Ltd. as required by agreement and without meeting bank's requirements for funding of

phase 2 credit facility, S Ltd.'s involvement in alleged "dummy trades" scheme and use of S Ltd. as co-signatory on promissory note unrelated to project all justified removal of S Ltd. as General Partner of partnership — Applicants brought application for, inter alia, order confirming removal of S Ltd. as General Partner; respondents cross-applied for various declarations, including declaration confirming S Ltd. as General Partner — Application granted in part on other grounds; cross-application dismissed — Interlocutory injunction granted in present application achieved purpose of enjoining further alleged breaches while preserving respondents' rights to fully present evidence and argument on issues of contractual authority — While applicants established strong prima facie case, there were ambiguities in agreements and submissions made with respect to contractual interpretation that did not make matter entirely without doubt — At present stage of proceedings, removal of S Ltd. as General Partner not confirmed — Confirmation of appointment and confirmation of new General Partner was premature — S Ltd. not confirmed as General Partner.

APPLICATION for appointment of receiver manager of Partnership and General Partner and other relief; CROSS-APPLICATION by respondents for various declarations.

B.E. Romaine J.:

Introduction

1 By Originating Notice filed July 8, 2010, the Applicants MTM Commercial Trust and Matco Investments Ltd. (collectively, "Matco") applied for:

> (a) the appointment of a receiver and manager of Riverside Quays Limited Partnership (the "Partnership") and of its initial General Partner Statesman Riverside Quays Ltd. ("SRQL");
>
> (b) an order confirming the termination of Statesman Master Builders Inc. ("SMBI") as Manager of the Riverside Quays multi-family residential construction project (the "Project") pursuant to the terms of the Development Management Agreement (the "DMA");
>
> (c) an order confirming the removal of SRQL as the General Partner of the Partnership, and of its replacement by 1358846 Alberta Ltd. ("1358846"), an affiliate of the Applicant Matco Investment Ltd., pursuant to the terms of the Shareholders' Agreement (the "USA") and the Limited Partnership Agreement;
>
> (d) an order confirming, if regarded as necessary, the authority of 1358846 to appoint Pivotal Projects Inc. ("Pivotal") as the new construction manager for the Project on appropriate terms.

2 By Notice of Motion filed July 15, 2010, SMBI and, by implication, its affiliate The Statesman Group of Companies Ltd. ("Statesman Group") (collectively, "Statesman") cross-applied for:

> (a) a declaration confirming that SRQL remains the General Partner of the Partnership, with Garth Mann having a casting vote in the event of deadlock in construction matters; and
>
> (b) a declaration confirming that SMBI remains the Manager of the Project.

Statesman purported to make such applications on behalf of SRQL. Matco submits that Statesman lacked the proper authority to do so.

3 The receivership motion was initially argued in part on July 15 and 19, 2010. On July 19, Statesman announced that construction of the Project had been voluntarily halted and undertook that it would not recommence construction without court order. The motions and cross-motions were further adjourned to August 18, 2010 pending the filing of additional affidavits by Statesman and cross-examinations on those and prior affidavits.

4 By further Notice of Motion filed August 6, 2010, SMBI applied to stay the action as it relates to matters dealing with the DMA and to appoint an arbitrator to determine such matters.

5 After hearing submissions on August 18, 2010, I advised the parties that I was not satisfied that there were not remedies short of a receivership that could protect the interests of the Applicants, and directed them to participate in a Judicial Dispute Resolution before a Justice of this Court. The Judicial Dispute Resolution was held on September 8, 2010 by Macleod, J. but did not resolve matters between the parties.

Analysis

A. Should a Receiver be Appointed?

6 Counsel for Matco conceded both on July 19, 2010 and on August 18, 2010 that Statesman's undertaking not to recommence construction without court order rendered the appointment of a receiver and manager unnecessary in the short term. Matco continues to take the position that, as long as construction does not resume while the issues between the parties are determined and as long as transitional matters that arise from these determinations can be effected cooperatively, a receiver and manager is not necessary.

7 Statesman, however, does not agree that it should continue to be bound by its undertaking not to recommence construction in the long term and submits that the application for a receiver should be dismissed and the Court should authorize Statesman to carry on with the financing and development of the Project as soon as possible.

8 Matco applied for the appointment of a receiver pursuant to certain provisions of the *Alberta Rules of Court*, certain provisions of the *Business Corporations Act*, R.S.A. 2000, c. B-9 and Section 13(2) of the *Judicature Act*, R.S.A. 2000, c.J-2.

9 Given the acknowledgement by Matco that a receiver is not necessary as long as construction on the project does not recommence, it is not necessary to analyze the law with respect to the appointment of a receiver, except to recognize that Matco's concession in that regard is consistent with the principle that a court considering the appointment of a receiver must carefully explore whether there are other remedies short of a receivership that could serve to protect the interests of the applicant. The potentially devastating effects of granting the receivership order must always be considered, and, if possible, a remedy short of receivership should be used: *BG International Ltd. v. Canadian Superior Energy Inc.*, 2009 CarswellAlta 469 (Alta. C.A.) at paras. 16 & 17; *BG International Ltd. v Canadian Superior Energy Inc.*, [unreported, February 9, 2009] (Alta. Q.B.).

10 While the conduct of a debtor's business rests in the receiver upon appointment and thus the Applicants would be protected from further alleged breaches if a receivership order was granted, they acknowledge that the cessation of construction that occurred as a result of the voluntary undertaking served the same purpose and is an adequate remedy in their view. The question, therefore, becomes less whether a receiver should be appointed and more whether the voluntary undertaking to cease construction should be replaced by a court-imposed injunction restraining Statesman from further construction on the Project pending the resolution of matters between the parties.

11 As has been noted in *Anderson v. Hunking*, [2010] O.J. No. 3042 (Ont. S.C.J.) at para. 15, the test for the appointment of a receiver is comparable to the test for injunctive relief. Determining whether it is "just and convenient" to grant a receivership requires the court to consider and attempt to balance the rights of both the applicant and the respondent, with the onus on the applicant to establish that such an order is required: *BG International* at para. 17. The factors set out to be considered in a receivership application are focused on the same ultimate question that the court must determine in considering an application for an interlocutory injunction: what are the relative risks to the parties of granting or withholding the remedy?

B. Injunctive Relief

12 The test for interlocutory injunctive relief is set out by the Supreme Court in *RJR-MacDonald Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General)*, [1994] 1 S.C.R. 311 (S.C.C.) at paras. 47-48, 62-64, (1994), 111 D.L.R. (4th) 385 (S.C.C.), as follows:

(i) a preliminary assessment must be made of the merits of the case to ensure that there is a serious issue to be tried;

(ii) it must be determined that the moving party would suffer "irreparable harm" if the motion is refused and;

(iii) an assessment must be made to determine which of the parties would suffer greater harm from the granting or refusal of the remedy pending a decision on the merits - that is, the "balance of convenience."

(i) Strength of the Applicant's Case

Breach of Agreements

13 Matco and Statesman set up a structure and entered into a series of agreements in order to develop the Project, which is to be a residential project in the Inglewood area of Calgary. In total, the Project is to include 615 apartments and 71 townhouses in six phases. Matco owned the land and Statesman was to provide the development services.

14 The Partnership was created, the units of which are held by a trust. Other investors invested in the trust, but Matco and Statesman hold the largest interests through corporate, individual, family and employee investments. The General Partner is SRQL, a corporation that Matco and Statesman own equally.

15 The USA provides that Matco and Statesman have equal representation on the board of directors of the General Partner and that all major decisions require unanimous directors' approval. Such decisions include approving related party transactions, executing any contract more than $100,000 and requiring capital contributions. The USA also provides that, to the extent development financing is available on reasonable market terms, it would be obtained rather than utilizing shareholders' equity. Matco submits that the result is that, while Statesman has day-to-day control of the General Partner's operations, Matco retains the ability to restrain the pace of development, to fund it through borrowing rather than equity and to oversee Statesman's management of the Project.

16 Under the DMA, an affiliate of Statesman, SMBI, was appointed as Manager of the intended development. The Manager is given full signing authority and wide powers, but is specifically required to submit for Management Committee approval all construction contracts (although there is some dispute about this between the parties), budgets for each phase of the development, any budget variances exceeding 3%, any transaction with a person not at arm's length with the Manager, and the scheduling of any material component of the development. The amounts of commissions payable to the Manager on the sales of residential units and third party referral fees relating to such sales are specifically set. The Manager acknowledged in the DMA that it is a fiduciary to the Partnership, and agreed that the DMA would automatically terminate if it misappropriated any amounts or if it defrauded the Partnership in any manner.

17 Under the Limited Partnership Agreement, SRQL as General Partner agrees to discharge its duties honestly, in good faith, and in the best interests of the Partnership. If the General Partner breaches its obligations in such a way as would have a materially adverse effect on the business, assets or financial condition of the Partnership, the Limited Partner (being the trust) is entitled to remove and replace the General Partner by resolution.

18 While there is some confusion over terminology, it is clear that development of the Project was planned in phases. Subject to conditions for each phase, bank financing was obtained for land acquisition and infrastructure, and for construction of the first two phases of residential units (the Bank of Montreal Credit Agreement dated April 21, 2008).

19 Land acquisition and infrastructure (including a parkade for Phases 1 and 2) were funded by the Bank and are complete. Phase 1 of the residential unit construction was also funded and is essentially complete. Phase 1 is comprised of 124 residential condominium units and an amenities centre.

20 Phase 2 is to consist of a second building of 122 residential condominium units, plus two townhouses.

21 Only nine units in Phase 1 remained unsold as of July 20, 2010, although 14 sales were pending. As of that date, 57 units in Phase 2 had been pre-sold. The Credit Agreement was revised on June 9, 2010 to provide that, as a condition precedent to the Bank providing financing for Phase 2, there must be satisfactory evidence of not less than 166 eligible purchase agreements under Phase 1 and Phase 2. Statesman submits that sales agreements for 169 units have been submitted to the Bank for review.

22 Matco submits that Statesman has begun to disregard its obligations under the agreements. It asserts breaches of various agreements, some of which it submits amount to misappropriation and misapplication of funds. It alleges that, without seeking the necessary directors' or Management Committee approval, Statesman or one of its affiliates executed more than $12.5 million worth of construction contracts in excess of $100,000 each, and commenced Phase 2 of the development. Matco also alleges that Statesman instructed trades to carry out more than $2 million of Phase 2 construction work without first having met the Bank's funding requirements.

23 Matco submits that Statesman misapplied partnership funds to pay unauthorized commissions and referral fees to its own staff in contravention of the contractual terms. It submits that, after having been repeatedly told not to do so, Statesman assigned its president's son to work on the development.

24 Initially, Statesman submitted that the construction that was the subject of Matco's complaints was part of Phase 1 and that there had been no improper commencement of Phase 2 construction. It was now clear, from evidence from the architects, the City, the banking documents, the Statesman Project Manager, tradespeople, the Statesman Chief Financial Officer and even cross-examination of the President of Statesman, that Phase 2 construction has commenced and that more than $12.5 million of contracts that relate to Phase 2 have been executed by Statesman.

25 Specifically, Matco submits that SMBI as Manager under the DMA launched into Phase 2 construction without seeking or obtaining Management Committee approval for a revised Phase 2 budget, and that it awarded at least 19 Phase 2 contracts and instructed the commencement of work under them without seeking or obtaining Management Committee approval.

26 Statesman does not deny that it did this. It submits, however, that, since the construction of Phase 2 of the Project is not an event outside the ordinary business of the General Partner or the Partnership, consent of all the directors of SRQL to the commencement of construction on Phase 2 is not required under the USA.

27 Statesman argues that under the USA, the development of the Project as a whole has been approved and that there is therefore no need to obtain approval of each phase. These submissions do not deal with the alleged breaches of specific terms of the DMA and the USA.

28 Statesman submits that, at any rate, Matco's failure to give consent is not commercially reasonable. That is not within the province of this court to decide: Matco is not under any contractual obligation to act in a commercially reasonable manner in giving or withholding its consent, and Matco's motives or judgments in respect of its decision are not properly at issue before me, except to the extent that they may relate to considerations of irreparable harm or balance of convenience.

29 Statesman submits that, pursuant to the by-laws of SRQL's board of directors, the President of Statesman, Garth Mann, has a casting vote as Chairman of the board, and therefore effectively a determining vote with respect to construction matters.

30 However, Section 3.5 of the USA provides that each shareholder shall use its best efforts to cause its nominees to the SRQL board to act in such a way to ensure that the provisions of the USA shall govern the affairs of the corporation, and provides that if there is any conflict between the provisions of the USA and the articles or by-laws of SRQL, the articles or by-laws will be amended. The nature of a USA does not allow its provisions to be trumped by a procedural

by-law, and the provisions of the USA that require approval by all directors of certain major decisions cannot in effect be vitiated by such a by-law.

31 Statesman also submits that Matco has no entitlement to halt construction until shareholders' loans are repaid (which it submits is the reason for Matco's reluctance to agree to the next stage of construction), citing section 8.1(d) of the USA which provides for equity injections by shareholders in certain circumstances. Matco rightly points out that additional capital contributions to the Partnership require the unanimous consent of the directors of SRQL.

32 Statesman submits that Matco was aware that construction had commenced on Phase 2. It appears from the evidence that Matco had begun to suspect that construction on Phase 2 had commenced in May of 2010, although there may have been general discussion of Phase 2 requirements in the months leading up to May. It also appears that Matco became aware of what it asserts are other breaches and misconduct of Statesman at about the same time. The Originating Notice was filed on July 8, 2010. Matco therefore acted with reasonable dispatch once it became suspicious that breaches had occurred.

33 Matco also submits that Statesman has beached the DMA in other ways. By the terms of the DMA, the Manager is a fiduciary to the Partnership, and the DMA "shall terminate upon any of" certain events. One such event is said to occur when the "Manager misappropriates any amounts or defrauds the Partnership in any manner whatsoever".

34 The DMA contemplates payment of only three amounts to the Manager - Sales Fees, Management Fees and Strategic Management Fees. Matco thus submits that if the Manager converts Partnership funds for any other purpose, *prima facie* that would be fraud. If the Manager used Partnership funds to pay its staff fees of an authorized description, but deliberately and repeatedly took too much, that might be merely misappropriation.

35 Matco submits that, in breach of the express terms of Clause 5.06 of the DMA, SMBI misapplied Partnership funds to pay unauthorized sales commissions, salaries and fees to its staff. The amounts improperly taken appear to total about $51,328 not including an additional $6,000 of what Matco asserts are improper referral fees.

36 Statesman does not deny that SMBI paid such amounts to its sales staff, nor does it assert that it had Matco's approval or consent, but it claims that its actions represented good and necessary business decisions. Statesman also submits that the amounts paid are reasonable out-of-pocket costs and expenses under Clause 5.09 of the DMA and thus do not require Matco's consent.

37 Statesman says that these payments have been disclosed to Matco or its representatives in the Construction Superintendent Reports, and that, in any event, these issues should be dealt with by arbitration. Statesman submits that if the amounts paid are not permitted under the DMA, it will reimburse the Partnership.

38 The June 9, 2010 Management Committee Meeting minutes state the following with respect to this issue:

> Mr. Mathison queried commission payments apparently made contrary to the agreed formula and in excess of budget. Mr. Mann acknowledged that higher commission payments had been made to Statesman salespeople. He stated that MLS Resale Listing fees were forgiven to stimulate sales where a purchaser had a product to sell, therefore, offset the higher commission payments with a zero net result. Mr. Mathison repeated that this decision was again made unilaterally without notice or the approval of Matco.

39 It therefore appears that Matco did not agree to this alleged breach, by silence or otherwise.

40 Matco also submits that Statesman breached the provision of the USA that requires approval by the SRQL directors of the execution of any contract involving more that $100,000.

41 Statesman submits that the DMA gives the Manager the responsibility of awarding construction contracts. That responsibility, however, is subject to the specific terms of the DMA agreement, which includes the provision that the Manager shall submit construction contracts to the Management Committee for approval, provided that in any

disagreement Statesman has the determining vote. There is no evidence that these contracts were submitted to the Management Committee for approval. Statesman points out, however, that Phase 1 construction contracts were not all submitted to the Management Committee.

42 There is a certain amount of ambiguity in the agreements with respect to the concept of a Management Committee. The DMA does not define the structure of the Management Committee, but merely states it shall be "as constituted and subject to the Partnership Agreement" (Section 1.03). The Limited Partnership Agreement does not reference a Management Committee. The recitals to the DMA provide that the Partnership wishes to engage the Manager and Matco as to certain strategic management decisions and Section 1.15 of the DMA engages Matco as a "strategic manager" for the Project. However, the DMA clearly requires Management Committee oversight and approval of numerous matters, and the parties have operated with a Management Committee with equal representation from Matco and Statesman. Whether the Management Committee is a committee of the directors of SRQL or of SRQL as Manager and Matco as "strategic manager" is not entirely clear.

43 While this ambiguity exists, the issue is less the conduct of Statesman in entering into individual contracts, and more the complaint that it commenced construction on Phase 2 without Management Committee approval.

44 Section 4.4(f) of the USA provides that all directors of SRQL must approve "related party transactions and major decisions with regard to those transactions".

45 There appears to be no dispute that Mr. Mann's son, Jeff Mann, has been acting project manager of the Project from time to time, and Matco says this was done without the necessary approval. Statesman says that Jeff Mann acted as an interim project manager for approximately 75 days in June, 2009 when the previous construction manager left without notice and that Matco was aware of this. It says that Jeff Mann assumed the role of interim project manager again in mid-January, 2010 until a replacement for the then construction superintendent could be found. Statesman also maintains that Jeff Mann was not paid by the Partnership for these services. Statesman submits that it relied on Herbert Meiner, who it says was an independent contractor through a corporate entity hired by Statesman, to inform Mr. Mathison of these kinds of details. It also argues that this was not a "related party transaction" since Jeff Mann was never intended to fill a permanent role. There appears to be conflicting evidence with respect to whether Matco knew of Jeff Mann's employment. Mr. Mathison's evidence, however, is that he never consented to this, and objected when it was brought to his attention.

Other Alleged Breaches

46 Matco also submits that Statesman is guilty of misconduct that amounts to fraud and dishonesty, apart from alleged breaches that simply relate to breach of contractual provisions.

47 Matco submits that Mr. Mann committed the Partnership to a US $732,600 promissory note to pay an unrelated debt of an American affiliate of Statesman. It also submits that Statesman signed up a number of tradespeople to agreements to purchase residential units on the understanding that they would not be required to close such purchases.

48 There is conflicting affidavit and cross-examination on affidavit evidence with respect to these serious allegations. With respect to the allegation that Mr. Mann on behalf of Statesman used SRQL to guarantee a settlement obligation of a Statesman affiliate that had nothing to do with the Project, Matco alleges Statesman did not just commit SRQL as a co-promissary on a promissory note that had nothing to do with the Project, but attempted to block the Applicants from obtaining information about this.

49 Statesman asserts that this was an innocent and inadvertent clerical error that was remedied within a few days, but at any rate by June 16, 2010. There are serious issues of credibility that arise from the documentation and the evidence of Mr. Mann and others on this issue. Given the serious nature of the allegation and the conflicting evidence, this issue requires *viva voce* evidence before a determination can be made.

50 With respect to the allegation that Statesman entered into "dummy" purchase contracts with various tradespeople for units in Phase 2 of the Project, pre-sales agreements that were not intended to close in an attempt to inflate sales numbers in order to satisfy the Bank's condition with respect to numbers of sales of units, while it is now clear that at least twelve of these so-called "investor sales" were entered into, Statesman submits that these were done by Mr. Meiner acting without authority, that Mr. Mann was not aware of them and that when he became aware of them, full disclosure was made to the Bank and to Matco. Again there is conflicting evidence with respect to this issue, including what senior Statesman management knew about this scheme and when they knew it, and no final determination can be made on the basis of affidavit evidence and cross-examination on affidavit.

51 Matco complains of a number of other breaches and irregularities in the management of the Project. Given the conclusion I have reached on the alleged breaches described, it is not necessary to review all of these allegations.

52 While the first factor of the test set out in *RJR-MacDonald* only requires a serious issue to be tried, the strength of the applicant's case is an important consideration in a determination of whether to grant an injunction prior to trial. I am satisfied that in this case Matco has established a strong *prima facie* case of breach of contract with respect to the question of whether Statesman proceeded with the construction of Phase 2 of the Project without the necessary approvals of Matco as required under the various agreements.

53 I am also satisfied that these breaches amount to a breach of a negative obligation, which is in substance the obligation not to proceed to the next phase of construction without obtaining Management Committee approval or the approval of all of directors of SRQL under the USA.

54 The determination of these issues depends primarily on an interpretation of the various agreements, rather than issues of credibility. A determination of the relative strength of Matco's case for the purpose of the first factor is therefore a more predictable matter than a determination of the other issues between the parties which are the subject of conflicting evidence and questions of credibility. That is not to say that Matco has failed to establish a serious issue to be tried with respect to the other alleged breaches, but it is because they raise questions of credibility that a more determinative assessment of merit cannot be made.

55 The contractual interpretations that Statesman submits would lead to the conclusion that approval of construction of Phase 2 of the Project is not necessary or that Mr. Mann has a casting vote that would allow Statesman to make the decision to proceed in the face of Matco's opposition do not address the structure of the development agreements as a whole, and ignore or fail to give effect to specific provisions to the contrary.

(ii) Irreparable Harm

56 While there are authorities that suggest that it is unnecessary to establish irreparable harm or that less emphasis will be placed on this factor in the context of an injunction application involving a negative context (see John D. McCamus, *The Law of Contracts*, Irwin Law Inc., 2005 at page 995, note 197), I have considered the application with reference to this factor. To show that it would suffer irreparable harm, Matco must establish either that failure to enjoin Statesman's continued breach of contract would give rise to harm that either cannot be quantified in monetary terms or that cannot be subsequently cured.

57 Matco submits that allowing Statesman to continue to construct Phase 2 without its consent gives rise to grave risks, given the current economy, of the Project falling into financial distress. It submits that Statesman's actions in launching into commitments for approximately $12.5 million of Phase 2 contracts without the approval of its development partner and without confirmation of Bank funding are reckless and irresponsible and put the interests of Matco and other Project investors at risk. If the Project were to fall into financial distress as a result of untimely or imprudent commitments to proceed, it would be very difficult to quantify the loss that may be suffered by, not only by Matco, but by other investors. In the context of this situation, I find that Matco has established that, on balance, the failure to enjoin further contractual breaches would give rise to irreparable harm.

58 In the usual case of an application for injunctive relief, the moving party would provide an undertaking in damages in the event it is not ultimately successful. Given the manner in which this application has proceeded, Matco has not had an opportunity to address this requirement. If Matco is unwilling to supply the usual undertaking as to damages, it has leave to apply to be relieved from such an obligation. Such an undertaking should be supplied or an application to relieve from the undertaking should be made within two weeks, and Statesman will of course be allowed an opportunity to respond to the application.

(iii) Balance of Convenience

59 This factor requires the Court to consider which of the parties would suffer the greater harm from the granting or refusal of an interlocutory injunction.

60 It is clear that failure to enjoin Statesman from continuing to breach the agreements by continuing construction on Phase 2 of the Project would nullify Matco's right to a say in whether construction on the Project should continue at this time. As noted by Matco, Statesman has indicated no commitment to discontinue the alleged breaches: rather, by its response to the application, it asserts its right to proceed without consultation or approval and applies to be relieved of its voluntary undertaking to stop construction and for confirmation of what it says is its right to proceed.

61 The enforcement of the negative obligation not to continue construction on Phase 2 without Matco's consent would not required Court supervision and has in fact already been effected through the voluntary shut-down of the Project. It is possible to readily define what Statesman should be enjoined from doing. There is no issue that permanent injunctive relief may not have been an available remedy to Matco after trial, given the nature of the obligation as a negative obligation.

62 Statesman alleges that it has significant financial exposure in the event that construction on the Project does not continue and that, the longer the Project is delayed, the more likelihood that the loss of momentum will be highly detrimental to the ongoing success of the Project. What Statesman complains of is the loss of immediate opportunity. Matco clearly does not agree with the submission that delay will prejudice the Project. It also does not agree that it has little financial exposure with respect to the Project, pointing out that Matco and related parties have a significant investment as unitholders in the trust in addition to other financial obligations and its share of fees and profits.

63 It is noteworthy that Matco does not propose that the Project be abandoned or that development cease on a permanent basis: what is involved is a difference of opinion between two experienced partners to a development with respect to the timing of development, the structure and availability of financing and the use of funds. Whether Matco or Statesman is correct with respect to these matters is not a question to be decided by this Court. What the Bank may do in the face of a failure to recommence construction on Phase 2, what various tradespeople or purchasers who have entered into pre-sale agreements may do is only speculative at this point, and does not tip the balance of convenience in favour of one party or the other.

64 It is likely that existing owners of Phase 1 units will be unhappy with a delay in construction, and likely that tradespeople that were anticipating immediate employment opportunities on the Project will likewise be disappointed. This does not justify ignoring Matco's contractual right to be part of the decision on timing of the commencement of construction of the next phase of the Project.

65 I find that the balance of convenience favours Matco in this case, as failure to grant the injunction would nullify its contractual right to be part of the decision to proceed. If the remedy was withheld, that right would be so impaired by the time the issues could be ultimately determined on their merits by unilateral action by Statesman that it would be too late to afford Matco complete relief.

C. Should There Be an Order Confirming the Termination of SMBI as Manager of the Project?

66 As previously indicated, the DMA provides that it shall terminate if the Manger "misappropriates any monies or defrauds the Partnership in any manner whatsoever." Matco submits that misappropriation does not require fraud or even dishonesty and that it is sufficient if there is a failure by a fiduciary to meet an obligation, even where the fiduciary believes the reasons for his failure to be valid, citing *Kitnikone, Re* (1999), 13 C.B.R. (4th) 76 (B.C. S.C.) at 77 -78 and *Janco (Huppe) v. Vereecken* (1982), 44 C.B.R. (N.S.) 211 (B.C. C.A.) at 213 -214.

67 Matco submits that the alleged misappropriation by SMBI of partnership funds to pay unauthorized sales commissions to its staff is a misappropriation that has terminated the DMA. Statesman's response to this submission has been set out previously in these reasons. While Matco has established a strong *prima facie* case of contractual breach, the issue of whether this alleged breach is a misappropriation is not entirely without doubt.

68 It will also not be clear until the issue of whether SRQL remains the General Partner of the Partnership who has authority to act for the Partnership in order to instigate termination of the DMA.

69 For these reasons, and since the issue of the removal and replacement of the General Partner remains to be determined on its merits for the reasons set out later in this decision, I make no final determination of this issue at this time.

D. Should There Be an Order Confirming the Removal of SRQL as General Partner?

70 By the terms of the Limited Partnership Agreement, SRQL was appointed as initial General Partner. Statesman has had day to day authority over the operation of SRQL, but the USA provides that all "Major Decisions", including the approval of related party transactions and the execution of any contract involving more than $100,000, require the approval of all directors. SRQL itself specifically committed to act exclusively as General Partner of the Partnership and to comply with these approval requirements. By the Limited Partnership Agreement, SRQL covenanted to discharge its duties honestly, in good faith and in the best interests of the Partnership.

71 The Limited Partnership Agreement provides that "the Limited Partners may remove the General Partner and appoint a successor by Extraordinary Resolution" where the "General Partner has breached its obligations under this Agreement in such a manner as would have a material adverse effect on the Business, assets or financial condition of the Limited Partnership." By Extraordinary Resolution signed by all of the Trustees of the Limited Partner dated June 28, 2010, the Limited Partner removed SRQL as General Partner and appointed 1358846 as its successor. Matco submits that this removal should be summarily confirmed in this application.

72 Matco submits that SRQL's actions in commencing over $2 million of Phase 2 construction and committing the Partnership to over $12.5 million of Phase 2 construction contracts without the approval of the directors of SRQL as required by the USA and without meeting the Bank's requirements for funding of the Phase 2 credit facility, SRQL's involvement in the alleged "dummy trades" scheme and the use of SRQL as a co-signatory on a promissory note unrelated to the Project all justify the removal of SRQL as General Partner of the Partnership.

73 While the Limited Partner of the Partnership, being MTM Commercial Trust, may remove the General Partner and appoint a successor by Extraordinary Resolution, Section 15.1(b) provides that if a breach is capable of being cured, the General Partner can only be removed if such breach continues unremedied for a period of twenty business days after the General Partner has received written notice of such breach from any Limited Partner, which in this case means MTM Commercial Trust.

74 The alleged breaches with respect to the "dummy trades" and the promissory note problem have been addressed by the General Partner, although it may be an issue whether a fiduciary may cure a breach of trust of this kind. As indicated previously, these allegations, however, raise issues of credibility that cannot be determined in an application of this kind. The alleged breach of proceeding with construction of Phase 2 without required approval is less subject to credibility issues, and the question is whether it is appropriate to made a final determination of the issues of whether Statesman

has breached the agreements in this respect, whether such breaches have had a material adverse effect on the business or financial condition of the Partnership, whether such breaches are capable of being cured and it so, whether proper notice has been given and thus whether the Limited Partner was justified in removing the General Partner as part of this summary application.

75 The interlocutory injunction granted in this application achieves the purpose of enjoining further alleged breaches while preserving Statesman's rights to fully present evidence and argument on these issues of contractual authority. While Matco has established a strong *prima facie* case, there are ambiguities in the agreements and submissions made with respect to contractual interpretation that do not make the matter entirely without doubt. I therefore decline to confirm the removal of SRQL as General Partner of the Partnership at this stage of the proceedings. It follows that confirmation of the appointment and confirmation of 1358846 Alberta Ltd. as new General Partner is premature.

76 For the same reasons that I decline to make a final order with respect to SRQL as General Partner and SMBI as Manager of the Project on the motion by the Applicants, I decline to confirm SRQL as General Partner and SMBI as Manager of the Project in accordance with Statesman's counter motions.

E. Should the SMBI Issue Be Stayed and an Arbitrator Appointed Pursuant to the Terms of the DMA?

77 I agree that the parties have gone too far down the litigation trail for some of the inter-related issues to be now referred to arbitration.

78 While the DMA contains an arbitration clause, the other agreements to not. The issues among the parties are affected by three agreements, and involve affiliated entities that are not parties to the DMA. It would be undesirable to have a multiplicity of proceedings where there is clear to be overlapping subject matter. Absent consensual arbitration of all issues, the law is clear in such circumstances that it is the arbitration that should be stayed in favour of the litigation, not the other way around: *New Era Nutrition Inc. v. Balance Bar Co.*, 2004 ABCA 280 (Alta. C.A.) at paras. 39ff; *Hammer Pizza Ltd. v. Domino's Pizza of Canada Ltd.*, [1997] A.J. No. 67 (Alta. Q.B.) at paras. 6-9.

Conclusion

79 Statesman is enjoined from continuing construction on the Project until the issues of alleged breach of contract and other misconduct can be resolved on their merits or until the parties agree otherwise. I will remain seized of the matter as case management judge to hear applications to have the matters in issue proceed to a full hearing on an expedited basis and to hear any other related motions.

80 If the parties are unable to agree on costs of these applications, they may be addressed.

Application granted in part; cross-application dismissed.

2013 ABQB 63
Alberta Court of Queen's Bench

Kasten Energy Inc. v. Shamrock Oil & Gas Ltd.

2013 CarswellAlta 153, 2013 ABQB 63, [2013] A.W.L.D. 1334, [2013] A.W.L.D. 1378, 20 P.P.S.A.C. (3d) 128, 225 A.C.W.S. (3d) 1018, 555 A.R. 305, 76 Alta. L.R. (5th) 407, 99 C.B.R. (5th) 178

Kasten Energy Inc. Applicant and Shamrock Oil & Gas Ltd. Respondent

Donald Lee J.

Heard: November 29, 2012
Judgment: January 24, 2013
Docket: Edmonton 1203-15035

Counsel: Terrence M. Warner for Applicant
Brian W. Summers for Respondent

Subject: Corporate and Commercial; Natural Resources; Property; Insolvency

Related Abridgment Classifications

Debtors and creditors
VII Receivers
VII.3 Appointment
VII.3.a General principles
Natural resources
III Oil and gas
III.5 Oil and gas leases
III.5.h Transfer of title

Headnote

Debtors and creditors --- Receivers — Appointment — General principles

Company K was involved in business of exploring and developing oil and gas — Company S had petroleum and natural gas lease used to develop oil well — K was successor in interest to company P — S entered into contract with P, which required P to construct road to S's well site — Following services provided under contract, S became indebted to P in principal amount of $567,267.76, plus interest at rate of 24 percent per annum — By Debt Assignment Agreement, P assigned S's outstanding debt, along with underlying security, to K — K brought application seeking order for appointment of receiver and manager of S's assets and undertaking — Application granted — Appointment of receiver and manager was just for circumstances of case — S's oil and gas lease was proprietary interest and was transferable and fell within power and authority of court-appointed receiver.

Natural resources --- Oil and gas — Oil and gas leases — Transfer of title

Company K was involved in business of exploring and developing oil and gas — Company S had petroleum and natural gas lease used to develop oil well — K was successor in interest to company P — S entered into contract with P, which required P to construct road to S's well site — Following services provided under contract, S became indebted to P in principal amount of $567,267.76, plus interest at rate of 24 percent per annum — By Debt Assignment Agreement, P assigned S's outstanding debt, along with underlying security, to K — K brought application seeking order for appointment of receiver and manager of S's assets and undertaking — Application granted — Appointment of receiver and manager was just for circumstances of case — S's oil and gas lease was proprietary interest and was transferable and fell within power and authority of court-appointed receiver.

APPLICATION seeking order for appointment of receiver and manager of company's assets and undertaking.

***Donald Lee J.*:**

Introduction

1 This is an application by Kasten Energy Inc. ("Kasten" or "Applicant") against Shamrock Oil & Gas Ltd. ("Shamrock" or "Respondent") seeking an Order of this Court, as a secured creditor, for the appointment of a Receiver and Manager of the Respondent's assets and undertaking.

Facts

2 Kasten is incorporated in Alberta as body corporate involved in the business of exploring and developing oil and gas; and a successor in interest to Premier CAT Service Ltd. ("Premier CAT").

3 Shamrock is incorporated in Alberta and has a petroleum and natural gas lease used to develop an oil well located at 2-02-90-13-W5 in the Sawn Lake region of Red Earth, Alberta ("Sawn Lake Well").

4 The Respondent, Shamrock entered into a contract with Premier CAT on or about June 1, 2010 which required Premier CAT to construct a road to Shamrock's well site. Following services provided under the contract, Shamrock became indebted to Premier CAT in the principal sum of $567,267.76. The debt was payable 60 days from the date of invoice at the interest rate of 24% per annum.

5 On or about July 22, 2010, a General Security Agreement ("GSA") was granted by Shamrock to Premier CAT for a security interest in all present and after acquired personal property of Shamrock as security for repayment of the outstanding debt.

6 By a Debt Assignment Agreement dated January 20, 2011 ("Debt Assignment"), Premier CAT assigned Shamrock's outstanding debt, along with the underlying security, to Kasten. The registration of the GSA at the Personal Property Registry was amended on February 4, 2011 to delete Premier CAT and substitute Kasten as the secured creditor. As a result, Shamrock became indebted to Kasten, the successor in interest to Premier CAT.

7 As of July 30, 2012, the outstanding indebtedness of Shamrock to Kasten was $777,216.26 based on the amount owed to Premier CAT at the date of the Debt Assignment, plus accrued interest at the agreed rate of 24% per annum.

8 On or about October 31, 2011, Shamrock issued a Notice of Intention to Make a Proposal pursuant to the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, RSC 1985, c B-3, s 50.4 [*BIA*]. Later, on November 25, 2011, Shamrock submitted a *BIA*, Part III, Division 1 Proposal addressed to all its secured and unsecured creditors. Under the Proposal, Stout Energy Inc. ("Stout"), a grandparent company to Shamrock would retain BDO Canada Limited as proposal trustee; and Stout would operate the Sawn Lake Well under a joint operating agreement with Shamrock. This agreement contemplated that after recovery of Stout's capital investment, 80% of the net revenue generated from operations would be paid to secured creditors until full payment while unsecured creditors would receive 20% until full payment.

9 At a meeting of Shamrock's creditors convened by the trustee on December 15, 2011, Kasten, a secured creditor voted against the proposal but all the unsecured creditors voted in favour of the proposal. Subsequently, on January 31, 2012, Shamrock made an application to the Court of Queen's Bench for an approval of the Proposal. Kasten opposed the application before Master Breitkreuz, the presiding Registrar. Ultimately, the Proposal was approved by the Court.

10 On February 25, 2012, a Demand for Payment was issued to Shamrock on Kasten's instruction, along with a Notice of Intention to Enforce a Security, pursuant to the *BIA*, s 244. The total amount of indebtedness as at this demand date was $760,059.18. As of October 9, 2012, the indebtedness had climbed to $799,595.06 taking into account the sum of $45,130.58 which was the only cheque that Kasten received from Shamrock since the Court approved the Proposal.

Issue

11 The issue before me is whether a Receiver and Manager of Shamrock's assets and undertaking should be appointed.

Law

12 The test for the grant of an Order of this Court appointing a Receiver is set out in the *Judicature Act*, RSA 2000, c J-2, s 13(2) which provides that:

> An order in the nature of a mandamus or injunction may be granted or a receiver appointed by an interlocutory order of the Court in all cases in which it appears to the Court to be just or convenient that the order should be made, and the order may be made either unconditionally or on any terms and conditions the Court thinks just.

Parties' Positions and Analysis

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.

Kasten's Submissions

14 The Applicant submits that the evidence before this Court is that since the Proposal was approved, the expenses on Shamrock's well production have exceeded revenues by a substantial margin such that it's unlikely that Shamrock would be able to pay the outstanding indebtedness in a timely manner. The revenue accruing from the Sawn Lake Well, which is Shamrock's primary asset, has not been directed at paying the debt owed Kasten.

15 Kasten contends that it has the right to appoint a Receiver under the GSA (at para 8.2. It notes that on the basis of the evidence in this case, Shamrock is insolvent and this situation is not improving. The risk of waste under the joint operating agreement is palpably real as Stout is spending substantial amount of money as expenses for well operations while channelling revenues in a selective manner. Kasten submits that irreparable harm may result if a Receiver is not appointed, pending judicial resolution of this matter, to properly manage and preserve the value of the well and its associated lease, as well as to distribute revenues equitably to all interested parties.

16 Kasten argues that the balance of convenience favours the appointment of a Receiver who would be better positioned to distribute revenues equitably to all interested parties and creditors since Shamrock is unable to comply with the payment schedule. Kasten reiterates that nothing demonstrates its good faith in pursuit of its legitimate interest to get paid the debt owed more than the patience it has displayed towards Shamrock for nearly two years.

17 The Applicant notes that Shamrock's argument on the issue of whether the GSA covers the oil and gas in the ground along with the right to extract the minerals distracts from the main issue of whether this Court should appoint a Receiver in the circumstances of this matter. Kasten argues that there is no doubt that a Crown oil-and-gas lease is a contract that contains a profit à prendre, which is an interest in land: *Amoco Canada Resources Ltd. v. Amax Petroleum of Canada Inc.*, 1992 ABCA 93 (Alta. C.A.); at para 10, [1992] 4 W.W.R. 499 (Alta. C.A.). Nevertheless, leases have a dual nature as both a conveyance and a commercial contract; and as such, are subject to normal commercial principles: *Highway Properties Ltd. v. Kelly, Douglas & Co.*, [1971] S.C.R. 562 (S.C.C.), at 576, (1971), [1972] 2 W.W.R. 28 (S.C.C.). The contract is assignable and subject to seizure.

Shamrock's Submissions

18 The Respondent Shamrock submits that Kasten has not demonstrated that irreparable harm may result if this Court refuses to appoint a Receiver. Instead, Stout has injected huge sums of money to improve the revenue potential of the Sawn Lake Well. Shamrock contends that if a Receiver is appointed, Stout may cease funding operations and oil and gas production will cease. Further, Shamrock says that it had also initiated a sale process and does not perceive any risk to Kasten while waiting for the completion of that process.

19 Shamrock argues that by nature, the property involved in this case calls for a continuous operation by Stout and itself that are better equipped in developing and operating oil well than a Receiver, probably unfamiliar with the oil business. It notes that the Sawn Lake Well cannot be moved from its present location and there is no evidence of waste regarding the well. Shamrock apprehends that Kasten's motivation is "not a good faith pursuit of repayment of debt, but rather an attempt to obtain the Sawn Lake Well."

Should a Receiver be Appointed in this Case?

20 The Alberta Court of Appeal notes in *BG International Ltd. v. Canadian Superior Energy Inc.*, 2009 ABCA 127 (Alta. C.A.) at paras 16-17 that a remedial Order to appoint a Receiver "should not be lightly granted" and the chambers judge should: (i) carefully explore whether there are other remedies, short of a receivership, that could serve to protect

the interests of the applicant; (ii) carefully balance the rights of both the applicant and the respondent; and (iii) consider the effect of granting the receivership order, and if possible use a remedy short of receivership.

21 The security documentation in the present case authorizes the appointment of a Receiver (GSA, para 8.2). Thus, even if I accept the argument that the Applicant Kasten has not been able to demonstrate irreparable harm, that itself would not be determinative of whether or not a Receiver should be appointed in this matter. It is not essential for a creditor to establish irreparable harm if a receiver is not appointed: *Paragon Capital* at para 27. I am also not persuaded by Shamrock's suggestion that it is probable that Stout may cease funding its operations and this development would result in irreparable harm which may be avoided by the Court's refusal to appoint a Receiver. In my view, such a cessation of funding by Stout would likely amount to a breach under the joint operating agreement and Shamrock could accordingly, seek appropriate remedy. This factor or consideration should not stand in the way of an appointment of a Receiver, if it is otherwise just to do so.

22 Shamrock objects to the appointment of a Receiver based on the nature of the property and the probability that a court-appointed Receiver may lack familiarity with oil well development and operation. However, this concern is not insurmountable, given the broad management authority and discretion that a court-appointed Receiver would possess to enable it do everything positively necessary to ensure that the operation of the relevant oil well continues in a productive and efficient manner.

23 In terms of apprehended or actual waste, there is no concrete evidence before this Court one way or the other. However, it is apparent that Shamrock has not made any substantial payments to Kasten from the alleged revenues flowing from the operation and production in the Sawn Lake Well. This situation also ties in to one of the factors that this court should consider, i.e. whether the manner in which Shamrock is making payments to Kasten (as a security-holder) forms a reasonable basis for Kasten to expect that it would encounter difficulty with Shamrock (as the debtor). Kasten contends that it is critical that there is no evidence before this Court to demonstrate the veracity of the claim that the Sawn Lake Well is generating the alleged production; and neither is there any evidence as to where the alleged revenues accruing from the production is being diverted.

24 In my view, the approach which Shamrock has adopted in paying the debts owed to Kasten seems to be a justifiable basis for Kasten's apprehension that it would likely and ultimately encounter difficulties with Shamrock. And based on this ground, it would be inaccurate to characterize Kasten's tenacious pursuit of Shamrock for its indebtedness as an activity motivated by bad faith, as Shamrock alleges.

25 Shamrock states that it had initiated a sale of Sawn Lake Well. At this point however, there is no indication that Shamrock's initiative or endeavour is moving ahead in a positive manner. After the chambers application before me on November 29, 2012, Mr. Nathan Richter (on behalf of Stout) sent a letter dated December 14, 2012 to Kasten (see, attachment to Shamrock's supplemental brief filed Dec. 14, 2012). The letter indicated that four postdated cheques were sent to Kasten as payments of monthly interests until March, 2013 and pending the anticipated sale of Sawn Lake Well in April, 2013. Mr. Richter also confirmed in the letter that no formal bids were received as at the bid deadline date of December 12, 2012.

26 After carefully considering whether there are other remedies, short of a receivership, that could serve to protect the interests of the Applicant in this matter and also carefully balancing the rights and interests of both Kasten and Shamrock, I have come to the conclusion that a remedial Order to appoint a Receiver and Manager is just, convenient and appropriate in the circumstances of the developments and delays in this matter.

Is Shamrock's Oil and Gas Lease Covered by the GSA?

27 Kasten submits that while the GSA is not directly enforceable against the oil and gas under (or in) the ground, once the oil and gas comes out of the ground and captured by Shamrock it becomes subject to the GSA in much the

same manner as the production facilities that are clearly covered by the GSA. It agrees that the oil and gas lease contains a *profit à prendre*, but submits that the right of Shamrock to extract oil and gas as granted by the Crown is transferable.

28 Shamrock agrees that a Receiver could only be appointed over its personal property, which includes the oil when it is produced and removed from the ground. However, it contends that the authority of the Receiver does not extend to the lease or the sale of Sawn Lake Well since Kasten has no security over the PNG lease under the GSA and can only receive revenue from the Well. Shamrock takes the position that the oil and gas lease is a *profit à prendre*, which is an interest in land excluded under Alberta's *PPSA*, s 4(f).

29 I note that the Supreme Court of Canada in *Saulnier (Receiver of) v. Saulnier*, 2008 SCC 58, [2008] 3 S.C.R. 166 (S.C.C.) [Saulnier] discussed the term "property" in the context of a commercial fishing licence under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, RSC 1985, c B-3, s 2 [*BIA*] and *Nova Scotia's Personal Property Security Act*, SNS 1995-96, c 13 [*PPSA*]. The provision of the relevant section of Nova Scotia's *PPSA* is identical to that of *Alberta's Personal Property Security Act*, RSA 2000, c P-7.

30 The Supreme Court in *Saulnier* held that the *BIA* and *PPSA* should be interpreted in a way best suited to enable them accomplish their respective commercial purposes. Binnie, J, writing for the Court, observed that:

> [28] ... [A] fishing licence ... bears some analogy to a common law *profit à prendre* which is undeniably a property right. A *profit à prendre* enables the holder to enter onto the land of another to extract some part of the natural produce, such as crops or game birds ...
>
> [29] Fichaud J.A. in the court below noted numerous cases where it was held that "during the term of a license the license holder has a beneficial interest to the earnings from his license" (para. 37) ... The earnings flow from the catch which is lawfully reduced to possession at the time of the catch, as is the case with a *profit à prendre*.
>
> [30] Some analytical comfort may be drawn in this connection from the observations of R. Megarry and H. W. R. Wade on The Law of Real Property (4th ed. 1975), at p. 779:
>
> A licence may be coupled with some proprietary interest in other property. Thus the right to enter another man's land to hunt and take away the deer killed, or to enter and cut down a tree and take it away, involves two things, namely, a licence to enter the land and the grant of an interest (a profit à prendre) in the deer or tree.
>
> And at p. 822:
>
> A right to "hawk, hunt, fish and fowl" may thus exist as a profit, for this gives the right to take creatures living on the soil which, when killed, are capable of being owned.
>
> [31] The analogy of a commercial fishing licence to the *profit à prendre* has already been noted by the High Court of Australia in ***Harper v. Minister for Sea Fisheries*** (1989), 168 C.L.R. 314 [where] Brennan J. [observed]:
>
> A fee paid to obtain such a privilege is analogous to the price of a profit à prendre; it is a charge for the acquisition of a right akin to property. Such a fee may be distinguished from a fee exacted for a licence merely to do some act which is otherwise prohibited (for example, a fee for a licence to sell liquor) where there is no resource to which a right of access is obtained by payment of the fee. [p. 335]
>
> . . .
>
> [33] In my view these observations are helpful ... there are important points of analogy between the fishing licences issued to the appellant ***Saulnier*** and the form of common law property called a *profit à prendre* ...
>
> [34] My point is simply that the subject matter of the licence (i.e. the right to participate in a fishery that is exclusive to licence holders) coupled with a proprietary interest in the fish caught pursuant to its terms, bears a reasonable

analogy to rights traditionally considered at common law to be proprietary in nature. It is thus reasonably within the contemplation of the definition of "property" [which in] this connection the property in question is the fish harvest.

(emphasis added)

31 In my view, the oil and gas lease in this case which grants a right (or licence) to Shamrock to access, drill for and extract the resource or substance from the ground is analogical and identical to a commercial fishing licence which grants the right to harvesting of fish resource as discussed in *Saulnier*. This is in the sense that during the term of the oil and gas lease/licence, Shamrock, the lease holder has a beneficial interest to the earnings from its oil and gas lease: *Saulnier* at para 29. The right to exclusively extract oil and gas by Shamrock, the lease holder coupled with a proprietary interest in the extracted resource pursuant to the terms of the lease/licence, "bears a reasonable analogy to rights traditionally considered at common law to be proprietary in nature": *Saulnier* at para 34.

32 In the result, I conclude that Shamrock's oil and gas lease is a proprietary interest within the purposive contemplation of Alberta's *Personal Property Security Act*: *Saulnier* at para 34; *Stout & Co. LLP v. Chez Outdoors Ltd.*, 2009 ABQB 444 (Alta. Q.B.) at para 39, (2009), 9 Alta. L.R. (5th) 366 (Alta. Q.B.) [*Chez Outdoors*]. Shamrock's oil and gas lease is covered by the GSA and Alberta's Personal Property Security Act in the category of "intangibles": *Chez Outdoors* at para 15. That right is transferable and falls within the power and authority of a court-appointed Receiver, subject to the terms of the oil and gas lease as agreed with the Crown.

Scope of the Court-Appointed Receiver's Authority

33 This Court has the authority to make an Order either "unconditionally or on any terms and conditions" it thinks just, including a restriction of the powers of a Receiver and Manager if necessary in the circumstances of the case before it: *Judicature Act*, s 13(2).

34 Kasten seeks a court-appointed Receiver who is a court officer owing a fiduciary duty to all parties, including the debtor: *Philip's Manufacturing Ltd., Re* (1992), 92 D.L.R. (4th) 161 (B.C. C.A.) at para 17, [1992] 5 W.W.R. 549 (B.C. C.A.) (WL). It argues that the court-appointed Receiver would take instructions from the Court and not from Kasten. The Receiver would be bound to act in the best interests of all parties. In a *volte-face*, Kasten seeks in its supplemental brief that this Court should appoint it as a Receiver. There was no reason specifically advanced by Kasten for its new position.

35 Shamrock submits that a Consent Receivership Order should be granted and the Receiver should not be conferred with a power of sale. It wants the Order held in abeyance until April 1, 2013 or when Shamrock/Stout fails to make a payment of interest as scheduled, whichever occurs first, in order to allow for the sale of Sawn Lake Well.

36 The Respondent notes that Kasten now seeks to be appointed as the Receiver and Manager instead of the earlier proposed independent body corporate, MNP Ltd. which had given its consent to act as Receiver and Manager of Shamrock, the debtor.

37 In the absence of any clear objection to the appointment of MNP Ltd., an independent and neutral entity in this matter, an Order will issue to name MNP Ltd. as the court-appointed Receiver and Manager of all the current and future assets, undertakings and properties of Shamrock Oil and Gas Ltd. until Kasten and other creditors (secured and unsecured) are paid in full. The Receiver and Manager will have no power of sale, except as approved by an Order of this Court. However its authority is suspended until April 1, 2013 in order to accommodate any potential sale of Sawn Lake Well by Shamrock. To be clear, if Sawn Lake Well is not sold on or before April 1, 2013, the power and authority of the Receiver and Manager is to become effective immediately on that day.

38 If parties are unable to agree on costs, they should arrange to speak to me within 30 days of the issue of this decision.

Application granted.

End of Document

2002 ABQB 430
Alberta Court of Queen's Bench

Paragon Capital Corp. v. Merchants & Traders Assurance Co.

2002 CarswellAlta 1531, 2002 ABQB 430, 316 A.R. 128, 46 C.B.R. (4th) 95

PARAGON CAPITAL CORPORATION LTD. (Plaintiff) and MERCHANTS & TRADERS ASSURANCE COMPANY, INSURCOM FINANCIAL CORPORATION, 782640 ALBERTA LTD., 586335 BRITISH COLUMBIA LTD. AND GARRY TIGHE (Defendants)

Romaine J.

Judgment: April 29, 2002
Docket: Calgary 0101-05444

Counsel: Judy D. Burke for Plaintiff
Robert W. Hladun, Q.C. for Defendants

Subject: Corporate and Commercial; Civil Practice and Procedure; Insolvency
Related Abridgment Classifications
Debtors and creditors
VII Receivers
VII.3 Appointment
VII.3.a General principles
Headnote
Receivers --- Appointment — General
Ex parte order was granted in 2001 appointing receiver and manager of property and assets of two of defendant companies, including certain assets pledged by those companies to plaintiff creditor — Defendants brought application to set aside, vary or stay that order — Application dismissed — Evidence at time of ex parte application provided grounds for believing that delay caused by proceeding by notice of motion might entail serious mischief — Evidence existed that assets that had been pledged to plaintiff as security for loan were at risk of disappearance or dissipation — Plaintiff did not fail to make full and candid disclosure of relevant facts in ex parte application — Security agreement provided for appointment of receiver — Conduct of primary representative of defendants contributed to apprehension that certain assets were of less value than was originally represented to plaintiff or that they did not in fact exist — Balance of convenience favoured plaintiff.
Annotation

This decision canvasses the difficult issue of the appropriateness of granting *ex parte* court orders in an insolvency context. Specifically, the facts of this case revolve around the proper exercise of Romaine J.'s jurisdiction pursuant to Rule 387 of the *Alberta Rules of Court* [1] to grant an *ex parte*, without notice, order appointing a receiver over the assets of two debtor companies. This rule provides that an order can be made on an *ex parte* basis in cases where the evidence indicates "serious mischief". Such jurisdiction is also granted to courts in Ontario [2] and in the context of interim receivership orders under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*. [3] The guiding principles that govern the granting of *ex parte* orders generally were summarized in *B. (M.A.), Re* [4] where it was concluded that the court's discretion to grant such orders should only be exercised in cases where it is found that an emergency exists and where full disclosure has been provided to the court by the applicant. It is generally considered that an emergency is a circumstance where the consequences that the applicant is attempting to avoid are immediate [5] and that such consequences would have irreparable harm. [6]

Insolvency situations are, by their very nature, crisis oriented. Debtors and creditors alike are typically faced with urgent circumstances and must move quickly to preserve value for all stakeholders. The special circumstances encountered in insolvency proceedings have been acknowledged by the Ontario Court of Appeal in *Algoma Steel Inc., Re* [7] where it was recognized that *ex parte* court orders and the lack of adequate notice is often justified in an insolvency context due to the often "urgent, complex and dynamic" nature of the proceedings. However, there is nonetheless a recognition that despite the "real time" nature of insolvency proceedings, the remedy of appointing a receiver is so drastic that doing so without notice to the debtor is to be considered only in extreme cases. In *Royal Bank v. W. Got & Associates Electric Ltd.*, [8] the Alberta Court of Appeal cited the following passage from *Huggins v. Green Top Dairy Farms* [9] with approval:

Appointment of a receiver is a drastic remedy, and while an application for a receiver is addressed in the first instance to the discretion of the court, the appointment ex parte and without notice to take over one's property, or property which is prima facie his, is one of the most drastic actions known to law or equity. It should be exercised with extreme caution and only where emergency or imperative necessity requires it. Except in extreme cases and where the necessity is plainly shown, a court of equity has no power or right to condemn a man unheard, and to dispossess him of property prima facie his and hand the same over to another on an ex parte claim.

The courts in Ontario have also been mindful of this need to be extra vigilant in granting *ex parte* orders in an insolvency context. It is generally recognized that in cases where rights are being displaced or affected, short of urgency, applicants should be given advance notice. In *Royal Oak Mines Inc., Re*, [10] Farley J. stated the following:

I appreciate that everyone is under immense pressure and have concerns in a CCAA application. However, as much advance notice as possible should be given to all interested parties ... At a minimum, absent an emergency, there should be enough time to digest material, consult with one's client and discuss the matter with those allied in interest — and also helpfully with those opposed in interest so as to see if a compromise can be negotiated ... I am not talking of a leisurely process over weeks here; but I am talking of the necessary few days in which the dedicated practitioners in this field have traditionally responded. Frequently those who do not have familiarity with real time litigation have difficulty appreciating that, in order to preserve value for everyone involved, Herculean tasks have to be successfully completed in head spinning short times. All the same everyone is entitled the opportunity to advance their interests. This too is a balancing question.

In light of this balancing of interests, the practice in Ontario has developed to a point that, short of exceptional circumstances, the parties affected by the applicant's proposed order, whether an order pursuant to *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* [11] or receivership orders, are typically given some advance notice of the pending application. This is particularly true in cases where there is a known solicitor of record for the interested party. In the present case, it is difficult to say whether sufficient and adequate evidence was proffered to demonstrate that urgent circumstances and a real risk of dissipation of assets existed. As Romaine J. indicated in her reasons, "...it [was] regrettable that the application did not take place in open chambers so that a record would be available." [12] Accordingly, in such circumstances, deference is accorded to the trier of fact. Romaine J. was in the best position to determine whether the test to grant an *ex parte* receivership order was met. Also, it is not clear from Romaine J.'s reasons why given the existence of a solicitor of record for the debtors that prior notice, of any kind, was not given to the debtors in this case. The granting of a receivership order is a serious remedy and those subject to it should, to the extent possible, have a right to due process.

Marc Lavigne*

APPLICATION by defendants to set aside, vary or stay order appointing receiver.

Romaine J.:

INTRODUCTION

1 On March 20, 2001, I granted an *ex parte* order appointing a receiver and manager of the property and assets of Merchants & Traders Assurance Company ("MTAC") and 586335 British Columbia Ltd. ("586335"), including certain assets pledged by MTAC and 586335 to Paragon Capital Corporation Ltd. MTAC, 586335 and the other defendants in this action brought an application to set aside this *ex parte* order. I declined to set aside, vary or stay the *ex parte* order and these are my written reasons for that decision.

SUMMARY

2 The *ex parte* order should not be set aside on any of the grounds submitted by the Defendants, including an alleged failure to establish emergent circumstances, a lack of candour or any kind of non-disclosure or misleading disclosure by Paragon. Hearing the motion to appoint a receiver and manager *de novo*, I am satisfied that the receivership should continue on the terms originally ordered, and that the Defendants have not established that a stay of that receivership should be granted.

FACTS

3 On March 15, 2000, Paragon loaned MTAC $2.4 million. The loan was for a term of six months with an interest rate of 3% per month, and matured on September 15, 2000. MTAC was to make interest-only payments to Paragon in the amount of $72,000.00 per month.

4 The purpose of the loan was to allow MTAC to acquire 76% of the shares of Georgia Pacific Securities Corporation ("Georgia Pacific"), a Vancouver-based brokerage business. That transaction was completed. As security for the loan, MTAC pledged the following:

a) an assignment of all of the property of MTAC and 586335, including the Georgia Pacific shares;

b) a general hypothecation of the shares of Georgia Pacific owned by MTAC;

c) a power of attorney granted by MTAC to Paragon appointing an agent of Paragon to be the attorney of MTAC with the right to sell and dispose of any shares held by MTAC;

d) an assignment of mortgage-backed debentures;

e) an assignment of a $200,000 US term deposit, which was stated to be held in the trust account of a lawyer by the name of Jamie Patterson;

f) $250,000 to be held in trust by Paragon's counsel; and

g) $986,000 in an Investment Cash Account at Georgia Pacific.

Paragon filed a General Security Agreement executed by MTAC by way of a financing statement at the Personal Property Registry on March 15, 2000. In addition, Paragon obtained personal guarantees of the loan from Garry Tighe, Insurcom Financial Corporation, 586335 and 782640 Alberta Ltd.

5 The loan was not repaid and, pursuant to the terms of the General Security Agreement, Paragon appointed a private receiver in January, 2001.

6 Subsequently, the parties entered into discussions resulting in a written Extension Agreement. The Extension Agreement acknowledged the balance outstanding under the loan on January 9, 2001 of $2,629,129.99 with a then per diem rate of $2,528.28 and acknowledged delivery of numerous demands and a Notice of Intention to Enforce Security pursuant to Section 244 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c.B-3, as amended

7 MTAC agreed pursuant to the Extension Agreement that all monies due and outstanding would be repaid by February 22, 2001. If the funds were not repaid, Paragon would be at liberty to enforce its security and take all steps it deemed necessary to collect the debt. MTAC agreed it would not oppose Paragon's realization of its security, including the appointment of a receiver over its assets, and that it would, if requested, work with Paragon and any person designated by Paragon to attempt to realize on the value of the Georgia Pacific shares in a commercially reasonable manner.

8 Pursuant to the terms of the Extension Agreement, the shares of Georgia Pacific owned by MTAC were delivered to counsel for Paragon.

9 It was also a term of the Extension Agreement that a discontinuance of the pending action would be filed and the appointment of the private receiver would be revoked. Both of these actions were undertaken by Paragon.

10 The loan was not repaid by February 22, 2001. As of June 26, 2001, $2,850,192.62 was outstanding. Paragon issued a new Statement of Claim on March 2, 2001. On March 16, 2001 counsel for MTAC, Insurcom, 782640, 586335, and Tighe filed a Statement of Defence and served it upon Paragon's counsel.

11 On March 20, 2001, Paragon applied for and was granted an *ex parte* order appointing Hudson & Company as receiver and manager of all of the assets and property of MTAC and 586335, including, specifically, the mortgage-backed debentures, $986,000 in a cash account, $200,000 in trust with a lawyer, the $250,000 paid to Paragon's counsel and the Georgia Pacific shares. The application was made in private chambers, and no court reporter was present. However, counsel for Paragon made his application based on affidavit evidence of Mr. Hudson and others and supported by a written "Bench Brief", all of which has been disclosed to the Defendants. All of the above-noted facts and additional information contained in the affidavits and Bench Brief were disclosed to me at the time of the *ex parte* application.

ANALYSIS

Should the ex parte receivership order have been granted?

12 Rule 387 of the *Alberta Rules of Court* provides that the court may make an *ex parte* order if it is satisfied that the delay caused by proceeding by notice of motion might entail serious mischief. The applicant must act in good faith and make full, fair, and candid disclosure of the facts, including those that are adverse to his position: *Hover v. Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.* (1999), 237 A.R. 30 (Alta. C.A.) at paragraph 23, referring to *Royal Bank v. W. Got & Associates Electric Ltd.* (1994), 150 A.R. 93 (Alta. Q.B.), at 102-3; (1997), 196 A.R. 241 (Alta. C.A.); leave to appeal granted (S.C.C.).

13 The Defendants submit that there was no urgency requiring an *ex parte* application. There was, however, affidavit evidence that led me to believe that the assets of MTAC and 586335 that had been pledged as security for the loan to Paragon were at risk, and that mischief could occur if an *ex parte* order was not granted.

14 There was, by way of example, evidence that the mortgage-backed debentures were not what they seemed.

15 There was evidence that Mr. Hudson had been advised by Mr. Tighe that his intention was to pay out the Paragon loan by transactions involving Georgia Pacific. Without elaborating on the status of Georgia Pacific at the time, as it is not a party to this litigation, the evidence with respect to potential activities involving this company was troubling, and justified a concern that the shares that comprised this asset may be at risk.

16 Further, Mr. Hudson deposed that Mr. Tighe was at first agreeable to Mr. Hudson and Paragon's counsel speaking to various parties, including officers of Georgia Pacific and Deloitte & Touche, to gather information. However, he withdrew that consent when Mr. Hudson and Paragon's counsel were actually in Vancouver, intending to speak to those parties.

17 There were also concerns arising over whether or not there actually was $200,000 held in trust by Mr. Patterson, who had ceased practising law and left the country.

18 There was evidence that the shares of Insurcom Financial Corporation, one of the guarantors of the Paragon loan, had been halted in trading and that the $986,000 that was supposed to be held in a Georgia Pacific cash account as security for the Paragon loan was missing.

19 The Defendants also submit that Paragon and its counsel and the proposed receiver failed to be candid and make full disclosure of the facts in the application. However, it is clear from the affidavits filed and from the Bench Brief that the disclosure given at the time of the *ex parte* order was extensive. It included reference to the fact that the proposed receiver, Mr. Hudson, had previously been appointed a private receiver for Paragon under the loan documentation, and that he and Paragon's counsel had been involved in negotiating and finalizing the Extension Agreement. In addition, counsel to Paragon disclosed that a defence to the Statement of Claim had been filed by counsel for the Defendants, and described the nature of the defences. I cannot find that there was any breach by the applicant for the *ex parte* order of its obligation of candour and frankness.

20 In hindsight, it is regrettable that the application did not take place in open chambers so that a record would be available. However, on the basis of the strength of the evidence before me, including evidence of the loan documentation and events that had transpired since the loan was put in place, together with the extensive affidavits and Bench Brief, I was satisfied that there was a reasonable basis on which I could hear the application on an *ex parte* basis. I was satisfied that there was reasonable apprehension of serious mischief and risk of disappearance or dissipation of assets. These concerns included the concern of interference with the activities of a regulated firm in a sensitive industry, where third party rights may well be affected. I therefore chose to exercise my discretion to grant the order *ex parte*, as is "within the prerogative of a judge to do in Alberta under our rules": *Canadian Urban Equities Ltd. v. Direct Action for Life*, [1990] A.J. No. 253 (Alta. Q.B.) at pages 7 and 8.

21 The *ex parte* order contains the usual provision allowing any party to apply on two clear days notice for a further or other order. The Defendants' right to bring their position before the court on very short notice was therefore reasonably protected. The Notices of Motion seeking orders to set aside or stay the *ex parte* order were not filed until May 8, 2001, and the motions were heard on their merits at the earliest time available to counsel to the parties and the court.

Should the receiver and manager appointed under the ex parte order been precluded from acting in this case due to conflict?

22 This issue is moot, given that on June 8, 2001 an order was granted replacing Hudson & Company as receiver and manager with Richter Allen and Taylor Inc. This was done with the consent of all parties other than the Defendants, who objected to the replacement, while continuing to maintain that Hudson & Company had a conflict. The Defendants make the same complaint about counsel to the former receiver and manager, who did not continue as counsel for the new receiver.

23 Despite the complaint of conflict of interest, the Defendants have not raised any evidence that the former receiver and manager or its counsel preferred Paragon to other creditors, or failed in a receiver's duty as a fiduciary or its duty of care, other than to submit that the receiver should not have been granted the power in the *ex parte* order to sell the assets covered by the order. This power of sale was, of course, subject to court approval, and also subject to review at the time the application was heard on its merits. It was not exercised during the time the *ex parte* order was in place, and representations were heard on its propriety for inclusion in the affirmed receivership order. While there may have been a potential for conflict in Hudson & Company's appointment, there is no evidence that Hudson & Company showed any undue preference to Paragon while serving as a receiver, or failed in its duties as receiver in any way.

24 The Defendants also submit that the Bench Brief used by Paragon's counsel in making the application for the *ex parte* order showed that such counsel was not impartial, but acted as an advocate on this application. Paragon's counsel did indeed advocate that a receiver should be appointed by the court, as he was retained to do, and there was nothing improper in him doing so. I have already said that full disclosure was made of the material facts in that application, including the previous involvement of both the proposed receiver and Paragon's counsel in this matter.

25 I therefore find that there was nothing wrong or improper in the appointment of Hudson & Company as receiver or in Paragon's previous counsel acting as receiver's counsel, or in their administration of the receivership. It may be preferable to avoid an appearance of conflict in these situations, but a finding of conflict or improper preference requires more than just the appearance of it. In situations where it is highly possible that the creditors will not be paid out in full, the use of a party already familiar with the facts to act as receiver may be attractive to all creditors. I note that it is not the creditors who raise the issue of conflict in this case, but the debtors.

Should the ex parte order now be set aside?

26 The general rule is that when an application to set aside an *ex parte* order is made, the reviewing court should hear the motion *de novo* as to both the law and the facts involved. Even if the order should not have been granted *ex parte*, which is not the case here, I may refuse to set it aside if from the material I am of the view that the application would have succeeded on notice: *Edmonton Northlands v. Edmonton Oilers Hockey Corp.* (1993), 15 Alta. L.R. (3d) 179 (Alta. Q.B.) (paragraphs 30 and 31).

27 The factors a court may consider in determining whether it is appropriate to appoint a receiver include the following:

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.

Bennett, Frank, *Bennett on Receiverships*, 2nd edition, (1995), Thompson Canada Ltd., page 130 (cited from various cases)

28 In cases where the security documentation provides for the appointment of a receiver, which is the case here with respect to the General Security Agreement and the Extension Agreement, the extraordinary nature of the remedy sought is less essential to the inquiry: *Bank of Nova Scotia v. Freure Village on Clair Creek*, [1996] O.J. No. 5088 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]), paragraph 12.

29 It appears from the evidence before me that the Georgia Pacific shares may be the only asset of real value pledged on this loan. Shares are by their nature vulnerable assets. These shares are in a business that is itself highly sensitive to variations in value. At the time of the application, the business appeared to have been suffering certain financial constraints. The business is situated in British Columbia, and regulated by the Investment Dealers Association of Canada and other entities, giving additional force to the argument of the necessity of a court-appointed receiver. I also note the possibility that there will be a sizeable deficiency in relation to the loan, increasing the risk to Paragon as security holder.

30 The conduct of Mr. Tighe, the primary representative of the Defendants, supports the appointment of a receiver. Although the Defendants submit that the assets that are the subject of the order are secure, there is troubling evidence that the mortgage-backed debentures appear to have questionable value, that the $200,000 that was supposed to be in Mr. Patterson's trust account does not exist, that the Georgia Pacific cash account that was supposed to contain $986,000 is not actually a cash account at all, but rather a trading account. Mr. Tighe's affidavits and cross-examination on affidavits do little to clear-up these matters, and instead add to the apprehension that these assets are of less value than represented to Paragon or that they in fact do not exist.

31 The balance of convenience in these circumstances rests with Paragon, which is owed nearly $3 million. There is no plan to repay any of this indebtedness, and no persuasive evidence that the appointment would cause undue hardship to the Defendants. As stated by Ground, J. in *Swiss Bank Corp. (Canada) v. Odyssey Industries Inc.*, [1995] O.J. No. 144 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) at paragraph 31, the appointment of a receiver always causes some hardship to a debtor who loses control of its assets and risks their sale. Undue hardship that would prevent the appointment of a receiver must be more than this usual unfortunate consequence. Here, any proposed sale of an asset by the receiver must be brought before the court for approval and its propriety and necessity will be fully canvassed on its merits.

32 I am satisfied that the order appointing a receiver and manager should continue to stand on the same terms as the initial order.

Should the order be stayed?

33 To be granted a stay of an order pending appeal, an applicant must establish:

a) that there is a serious issue to be tried on appeal;

b) that the applicant would suffer irreparable harm and no fair or reasonable redress would be available if the stay is not granted; and

c) that the balance of convenience is in favour of granting the stay after taking into consideration all of the relevant factors.

RJR-MacDonald Inc. v Canada (Attorney General) (1994), [1994] S.C.J. No. 17 (S.C.C.); *Schacher v. National Bailiff Services*, [1999] A.J. No. 599 (Alta. Q.B.).

34 On the issue of whether there is a serious issue to be tried, the Defendants have filed a defence to the claim raising several issues, the major one being that the effective rate of interest under the loan exceeds 60% and is therefore usurious. Affidavit evidence purporting to indicate such an illegal rate of interest was filed and served on Paragon the day before

this application was heard. Counsel for Paragon submitted that the evidence is defective on its face, but I was not able to make a determination of that question on the basis of the sworn evidence before me. Another factor affecting this issue is that Paragon has brought an application for summary judgment, which had not been heard at the time of this application. Given my decision on the second and third parts of the test, I have assumed that there is a triable issue relating to the loan and, therefore, to the appointment of a receiver, despite the uncertainty existing at the time of the application.

35 With respect to irreparable harm, the Defendants submit that company assets are being tied up while the order is in force, and that therefore no payments are being made, allowing liabilities to inflate. The main assets that are the subject of this order are assets that were already pledged as security for the loan to Paragon and therefore no irreparable harm can be said to arise from this factor. The Defendants also submit that irreparable harm has been, and continues to be done to, Georgia Pacific's assets as a result of the order. The order affects only the Defendants' shares in George Pacific, and counsel for the Defendants does not represent Georgia Pacific. No objection to the order has been taken by Georgia Pacific itself, although management for Georgia Pacific is aware of the receivership. There is no evidence that the order is responsible for any harm to Georgia Pacific, aside from harm that may have arisen from the Defendants' precarious financial situation and the current status of this regulated business with the IDA.

36 The balance of convenience in this case favours Paragon. The only asset that appears to have any real value at this stage in the proceedings is the shares in Georgia Pacific, an asset that is vulnerable by its nature, in a highly regulated business carried on in another jurisdiction. The order serves to maintain the status quo of that asset and prevent mischief caused by the possibility of illegal or imprudent manipulation or interference with the affairs of Georgia Pacific.

37 Finally, the Defendants submit that, if a stay is not granted, the order be varied to maintain the status quo of the three major assets. By requiring court approval of a sale of any of the assets, the right of the Defendants to argue their position on a sale at an appropriate time is reasonably protected.

38 I therefore decline to grant a stay, or to vary the order as granted.

39 If the parties are unable to agree on the matter of costs, they may be spoken to.

Application dismissed.

Footnotes

1 Alta. Reg. 390/68.

2 See rule 37.07(3) of the *Rules of Civil Procedure*, R.R.O. 1990, Reg. 194.

3 R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3. See rule 77 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Rules*, C.R.C. 1978, c. 368.

4 (1992), 126 A.R. 276 (Alta. Prov. Ct.) at 286.

5 *John Doe v. Canadian Broadcasting Corp.*, [1993] B.C.J. No. 1875 (B.C. S.C.).

6 *Imperial Broadloom Co., Re* (1978), 22 O.R. (2d) 129 (Ont. Bktcy.).

7 (2001), 25 C.B.R. (4th) 194 (Ont. C.A.) at 196.

8 (1997), [1997] A.J. No. 373 (Alta. C.A.) at para. 21.

9 (1954), 273 P.2d 399 (Id. S.C.) at 404.

10 [1999] O.J. No. 864 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]) at para. 6.

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

12 Para. 20.

* Associate in the Insolvency and Restructuring Group of Torys LLP. The author wishes to thank Sean Keating, student-at-law, for his invaluable research assistance in the preparation of this annotation.