ONTARIO SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE COMMERCIAL LIST

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT WITH RESPECT TO JTI-MACDONALD CORP.

SUPPLEMENTAL TO THE FOURTH REPORT OF THE MONITOR JUNE 25, 2019

INTRODUCTION

- This report (the "Supplemental Report") is supplemental to the Fourth Report of Deloitte Restructuring Inc. in its capacity as Court-appointed monitor (the "Monitor") of JTI-Macdonald Corp. ("JTIM" or the "Applicant") dated June 21, 2019 (the "Fourth Report"). Capitalized terms not otherwise defined herein shall have the meaning ascribed to them in the Fourth Report.
- 2. The Fourth Report, among other things, was filed in support of JTIM's motion seeking to extend the Stay Period to December 16, 2019 and to advise the Court on activities of the Monitor and the Applicant since the issuance of the First Report. The Monitor has since reviewed the Responding Motion Record and Factum of the QCAPs served on June 21, 2019 (collectively, the "QCAPs Motion Materials"), and provides this Supplemental Report in respect thereof for the assistance of the Court.

- 3. In the QCAPs Motion Materials, the QCAPs allege that, as a result of the TM Receiver exercising set-off rights against the Deposit to satisfy unpaid royalty payments, JTIM permitted the TM Receiver to circumvent the March 19 Endorsement. The QCAPs are critical that "the Applicant JTIM and its Monitor did not take any action to prevent this breach." A copy of the March 19 Endorsement and an Unofficial Transcription thereof is attached as Appendix "A".
- 4. The QCAPs seek an order directing the TM Receiver to pay any amounts set off by the TM Receiver against the Deposit to JTIM.

PURPOSE

5. The purpose of this Supplemental Report is to provide the Court with the Monitor's views in connection with the matters raised in the QCAPs Motion Materials.

MONITOR'S VIEWS

6. The Monitor was advised by the TM Receiver that it intended to exercise set-off rights against the Deposit, which the Monitor reported in its Fourth Report. The Monitor did not object to the TM Receiver's intention to exercise set-off rights having considered, in consultation with its independent legal counsel, the following:

- a) The existence of the Deposit, its purpose and the contractual terms governing the TM Receiver's set-off rights (the "Amended License Agreement") were fully disclosed in the application materials of JTIM that commenced the CCAA Proceedings;¹
- b) The Deposit has been held by the TM Receiver since January 2018 and the Monitor was not aware of any basis to compel the return of the Deposit to JTIM, nor had any stakeholder asserted that the Deposit should be repaid to the estate;
- c) The Amended License Agreement provides rights to the TM Receiver to exercise set-off against the Deposit of any outstanding liabilities;
- d) The Monitor understands that CCAA case law in Ontario has concluded that, in light of Section 21 of the CCAA which expressly preserves set-off rights in CCAA proceedings, set-off rights can only be stayed on a "temporal" basis with express language;²
- e) The March 19 Endorsement did not contain any such express language to stay
 the TM Receiver's set-off rights. In fact, the March 19 Endorsement
 noted that the Court was advised that "if pre-filing royalties are not paid they will
 be deducted from a deposit held by TM"; and

¹ Affidavit of Robert McMaster sworn March 8, 2019 at para 29 and Exhibit C.

² See *Re Air Canada*, 2003 CarswellOnt 4016 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List] and *Tucker v. Aero Inventory (UK) Ltd.* 2009 CarswellOnt 7007 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]).

f) The Deposit held by the TM Receiver were not funds to which JTIM had access; as a result, the set-off if exercised would not result in prejudice to the estate.

All of which is respectfully submitted this 25th day of June, 2019.

Deloitte Restructuring Inc., Solely in its capacity as Court-appointed Monitor of JTIM and not in its personal capacity

Per:

Paul M. Casey, CPA, CA, FCIRP, LIT

Senior Vice-President

APPENDIX "A"

Court File Number: <u>CV-19-615862-00</u>CL

Superior Court of Justice Commercial List

Le: JTI	Macdenald C	arp
	AND	Plaintiff(s)
		Defendant(s)
Case Management Yes No by Jud	ge: McBwelt	
Counsel	Telephone No:	Facsimile No:
(see affached)		
Order Direction for Registrar (No Above action transferred to the Commer	formal order need be taken ou rcial List at Toronto (No formal	it) order need be taken out)
Adjourned to: Time Table approved (as follows):	<u>-</u>	
The Quebec	Class Action	Plaintiffe
(" The Plaintille") bone Mis	nota
seoline an a	nder suspending	the operation
of phragraphs	8(c) and	8(a) of
he Intallo	oder of Just	red Hairey
dated march	8,2019 (M	Intral
Order" this	prohibiting No	2 Day wester
of principal.	interest ar	d rosaltier
to TII-W	recolonated TM	Carp.
19 March 19		ET
Date		idge's Signature
Additional Pages NTPC		

Court File Number:	
--------------------	--

Judges Endorsment Continued
pending Purther Order of the Court
The Paintiffe also seek an Order
permitting them to appose or seek a
Variation of the Initial order at
the Comeback hearing scheduled for
horil 4 and 5 2019.
The Plaintiffe are supported by
HIVO Yes Chatain
TIT Macdonald Carp (TTIM) appears Who reliab sought. It is supported
We reliat sought. It is suggested
by IT Canada LLC and Pwc as well
as the Monitor.
For the reasons below I am propried
to grant the relief sought reading
the return of the comeback hearing
a Further order made by me as
The Case management judgo.
The plaintiffe traise & mushic
Of argments primary as Follows:
· IT was did not disclose to
Page of Judges Initials

Court File Number:

Judges Endorsment Continued
Justice Hairey the regaline Comments
made by tiestice Prordon against
ITIM and ITI-macdonald TMComp
("TM") will respect to New inter-
company contracts concerning payments
of principal interest and royalties: see
in penticular pares: 1095-97 1101, 1103
Land 2141;
· We allideunt of Robert memaster
tiled in Sugart of the Harlication
time vagre regarding potential adverse
for consequences.
· when JTIM obtained an initial order
From Tustice Farley in Argust 2004
these same payments to TMV were
not requestred nor made;
· subsequet to the order of Tistice
Forley at various times rough
payments and interest were not paid
or in the case of interest the
Page

Court File Number:

Judges Endorsment Continued
interest rates reduced:
· ITIM also did not disclose to
Justice Hairey Comments made by
Justice Schrager who head a motion
to have TIIM and other post Securit:
See in Pentrular paras 42 and 52
Based on the Paregoing the Plaintiffe
submit the Intercompany Rogally and
Interest payments that are scheduled
to take place before the comeback
heaving on hit to be suspended. Then
argue that TIIM had an obligation
to port all of the orbers inharmation
do so- Based on the above the
do so. Based on the above the
Plaintithe Claim that there is nothing
to suggest that ITTM a TM will
be presided of the construction
and that the parmets in an
event are a shain.
Page of Judges Initials

Court File Number:

Judges Endorsment Continued
Last the Plaintiffer submit that it is
infair to allow ITIM to contine
to make the payments in the above
Li make the payments in the orbore Circustance. It is not in keeping with
the purpose of the CCAA and parents
ought to be suspended pending an
gapartunt & adjudicate the
gophtuit & adjudicate the
ITIM vicovous grosses the
relief sought primary submitting as
follows:
· le proper moterals were before Thetre
tane,
· No decision of Tustrie Mangeon in
effect "Cancels out" No comments
made by Tustia Riarda:
· We relief south is desired to
will pain on a second creditor.
· There is no regrest to pay principal
and have will be said absent a
Page 5 of 1 Judges Initials

Court File Number:

Judges Endorsment Continued
Carther Order of Mis court;
he will be deducted from a deposit
the will be deducted from a deposit
parsont to the provisions of 5.11 of the
persuant to the provisions of 511 of the
CCAA:
· with respect to the issue of interest it
is a seemed debt and its suspension could
lead to an enamous debt later as it
will compound- this would adverse affect
plaintitle in all artisis;
· Were is a reparent areament in
place to satisf an judgment with a
properly Capitatized entity - IT International
Holding B.V. with respect to interest (not
rogation);
· The Manter approved TTIME Submissione
and retter ITIM or For that
fact the manter south to minim
Page of

Court File Number:

Judges Endorsment Continued
way mislead the Court or provide wathrest
Information
JTIM : 6 Submits Most it "
prematine to great the order Sought.
I disapree
white I am not proposed to
cast aspersions with resport to the
materials before Tostoro Hire at this
time the arguments rarsed by the
Plaintite persoade me that here
Should be a pouse in the payments
pending the return of the cameback
bearing.
The Comments of Tustous Riondon
and Schrager raise clear concerns
about the legitimacy of the
inter-campa, Constracte. Their doors vons
post-date the decision of Tustice
Mongeon which was released pre-trial.
Further, give the history of
Page of Judges Initials
i Tita Piardais Costani Rinding latere carbold on appe

Court File Number:		
--------------------	--	--

Judges Endorsment Continued
reduced or lack of payments after
The 2004 order of Tralace Forla
I am not satisfied at this
juncture that the adverse consequence
described by Mr McMaster will be
Some out. Further, as noted the
relief Concerning principal interest and
relief Concerning principal interest and togath payments was not south
before Tistier Forley, har ananted
In all of the above chrentones
pendry the complant bearing and
tenther order I were with the
Plaintite that it in partable to
Surped the somety referred to
at Tab DD of Uol 4 of the
Application Record ; vanely the Intercomp
Right and Interest permits (as
well as an principal permenter although
as rated JTM is not making Mase
payments).
Page of Judges Initials

Court File Number:	

Judges Endorsment Continued
There is no real prejudice to
TTIM or TM in abotating Mins
interior suspersion pending the return of
the matter at the comeback bearing.
Bosed on the submissione I believe
that the and relevant property the
that the and relevant property the Plaintiffs seeks & suspend are voted
at Tab DD above If Futher
Clarification is organized I can be
spoken to as I apreciate that paras.
& (c) and 8 (d) of Thetree Haire is
order are somewhat broader in
hatme than the above-voted payments.
Modera
Page of Judges Initials

ONTARIO SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE (COMMERCIAL LIST)

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF JTI-MACDONALD CORP.

UNOFFICIAL TRANSCRIBED ENDORSEMENT OF JUSTICE MCEWEN

March 19, 2019

The Quebec Class Action Plaintiffs (the "Plaintiffs") bring this motion seeking an order suspending the operation of paragraphs 8(c) and 8(d) of the Initial Order of Justice Hainey dated March 8, 2019 (the "Initial Order") thus prohibiting the payments of principal, interest and royalties to JTI-Macdonald TM Corp. pending further Order of the Court.

The Plaintiffs also seek an Order permitting them to oppose or seek a variation of the Initial Order at the comeback hearing scheduled for April 4 and 5, 2019.

The Plaintiffs are supported by HMQ for Ontario.

JTI-Macdonald Corp. ("JTIM") opposes the relief sought. It is supported by JT Canada LLC and PWC, as well as the Monitor.

For the reasons below I am prepared to grant the relief sought pending the return of the comeback hearing or further order made by me as the case management judge.

The Plaintiffs raise a number of arguments primarily as follows:

- JTIM did not disclose to Justice Hainey the negative comments made by Justice Riordan against JTIM and JTI-Macdonald TM Corp. ("TM") with respect to their inter-company contracts concerning payments of principal, interest and royalties: see in particular paras. 1095-97, 1101, 1103 and 2141;
- the affidavit of Robert McMaster filed in support of the Application was vague regarding potential adverse tax consequences;
- when JTIM obtained an initial order from Justice Farley in August 2004 these same payments to TM were not requested nor made;
- subsequent to the order of Justice Farley at various times royalty payments and interest were not paid or in the case of interest the interest rates reduced;

Doc#4426180v1

• JTIM also did not disclose to Justice Hainey comments made by Justice Schrager who heard a motion to have JTIM and others post security: see in particular paras. 42 and 52.

Based on the foregoing the Plaintiffs submit the Intercompany Royalty and Interest payments that are scheduled to take place before the comeback hearing ought to be suspended. They argue that JTIM had an obligation to put all of the above information before Justice Hainey and failed to do so. Based on the above the Plaintiffs claim that there is nothing to suggest that JTIM or TM will be prejudiced if the payments stop and that the payments, in any event, are a sham.

Last, the Plaintiffs submit that it is unfair to allow JTIM to continue to make the payments in the above circumstances. It is not in keeping with the purpose of the CCAA and payments ought to be suspended pending an opportunity to adjudicate the matter at the comeback hearing.

JTIM vigorously opposes the relief sought primarily submitting as follows:

- the proper materials were before Justice Hainey;
- the decision of Justice Mongeon in effect "cancels out" the comments made by Justice Riordan;
- the relief sought is designed to inflict pain on a secured creditor;
- there is no request to pay principal and none will be paid absent a further Order of this court;
- if pre-filing royalties are not paid they will be deducted from a deposit held by TM;
- royalties going forward must be paid pursuant to the provisions of s.11 of the CCAA;
- with respect to the issue of interest, it is a secured debt and its suspension could lead to an enormous debt later as it will compound this would adversely affect plaintiffs in all actions;
- there is a repayment agreement in place to satisfy any judgment with a properly capitalized entity JT International Holding B.V., with respect to interest (not royalties);
- the Monitor approved JTIM's submissions and neither JTIM or for that fact the Monitor sought to, in any way mislead the Court or provide insufficient information.

JTIM therefore submits that it is premature to grant the orders sought.

I disagree.

While I am not prepared to cast aspersions with respect to the materials before Justice Hainey at this time the arguments raised by the Plaintiffs persuade me that there should be a pause in the payments pending the return of the comeback hearing.

The comments of Justice Riordan¹ and Schrager raise clear concerns about the legitimacy of the intercompany contracts. Their decisions post-date the decision of Justice Mongeon which was released pretrial.

 $^{^{\}rm l}$ Justice Riordan's factual findings were upheld on appeal. <code>Doc#4426180v1</code>

Further, given the history of reduced or lack of payments after the 2004 order of Justice Farley I am not satisfied at this juncture that the adverse consequences described by Mr. McMaster will be borne out. Further, as noted, the relief concerning principal, interest and royalty payments was not sought before Justice Farley, nor granted.

In all of the above circumstances, pending the comeback hearing or further order, I agree with the Plaintiffs that it is equitable to suspend the payments referred to at Tab DD of Volume 4 of the Application Record; namely the Intercompany Royalty and interest payments (as well as any principal payments although as noted JTIM is not making these payments).

There is no real prejudice to JTIM or TM in ordering this interim suspension pending the return of the matter at the comeback hearing.

Based on the submissions I believe that the only relevant payments the Plaintiffs seek to suspend are noted at Tab DD above. If further clarification is required I can be spoken to as I appreciate that paras. 8(c) and 8(d) of Justice Hainey's order are somewhat broader in nature than the above-noted payments.

McEwen J.