

This is the 1st Affidavit of Chantelle Wilson-Cole in this case and was made on October 20, 2025

No: S-240493 Vancouver Registry

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

BETWEEN:

FOX ISLAND DEVELOPMENT LTD. and ADVANCED VENTURE HOLDING CO., LTD.

PETITIONERS

AND:

KENSINGTON UNION BAY PROPERTIES NOMINEE LTD. (formerly known as 34083 YUKON INC.), KENSINGTON UNION BAY PROPERTIES LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, KENSINGTON UNION BAY PROPERTIES GP LTD., INTERNATIONAL TRADE CENTER PROPERTIES LTD., SUNWINS ENTERPRISE LTD., MO YEUNG CHING also known as MICHAEL CHING, MO YEUNG PROPERTIES LTD., SFT DIGITAL HOLDINGS 30 LTD., HOTEL VERSANTE LTD., BEEM CREDIT UNION, MORTEQ LENDING CORP., CHUN YU LIU, 1307510 B.C. LTD., JEFFREY RAUCH, HEUNG KEI SUNG, and RCC HOLDINGS LTD.

RESPONDENTS

AFFIDAVIT

- I, Chantelle Wilson-Cole, legal assistant, of 900-900 West Hastings Street, Vancouver, BC, SWEAR THAT:
 - 1. I am a legal assistant for Bridgehouse Law LLP, lawyers for the Respondents, Kensington Union Bay Properties Nominee Ltd. (formerly known as 34083 Yukon Inc.), Kensington Union Bay Properties Limited Partnership, Kensington Union Bay Properties GP Ltd., International Trade Center Properties Ltd., Sunwins Enterprise Ltd., Mo Yeung Ching also known as Michael Ching and SFT Digital Holdings 30 Ltd. Hotel Versante Ltd., and 1212429 B.C. Ltd. in this proceeding and as such I have personal knowledge of the facts and matters hereinafter deposed to save and except where stated to be in on information and relief and where so stated I verily believe them to be true.

- 2. Attached and marked as Exhibit "A" is a true copy of the Proceedings in Chambers on July 15, 2025.
- 3. Attached and marked as Exhibit "B" is a true copy of an email chain between Dentons Canada LLP and Bridgehouse Law LLP dated October 15, 2025.

SWORN BEFORE ME at the City of Vancouver, in the Province of British Columbia, this 20th day of October, 2025.

A Commissioner for taking Affidavits within British Columbia

CHANTELLE WILSON-COLE

BENJAMIN LA BORIE

Barrister & Solicitor
9th Floor, 900 West Hastings Street
Vancouver, British Columbia V6C 1E5

Exhibit "A" referred to in the Affidavit of Chantelle Wilson-Cole sworn before me at Vancouver, British Columbia this 20th day of October 2025.

Commissioner/Notary Public for the Province of British Columbia

No. S240493 Vancouver Registry

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA (BEFORE THE HONOURABLE MADAM JUSTICE FITZPATRICK)

Vancouver, BC July 15, 2025

BETWEEN:

Fox Island Development Ltd. and Advanced Venture Holding Co., Ltd.

Petitioners

AND:

Kensington Union Bay Properties Nominee Ltd. (formerly known as 34083 Yukon Inc.), Kensington Union Bay Properties Limited Partnership, Kensington Union Bay Properties GP Ltd, International Trade Center Properties Ltd., Sunwins Enterprise Ltd., Mo Yeung Ching also known as Michael Ching, Mo Yeung Properties Ltd., SFT Digital Holdings 30 Ltd., Hotel Versante Ltd., Beem Credit Union, Morteq Lending Corp., Chun Yu Liu, 1307510 B.C. Ltd., Jeffrey Rauch, Heung Kei Sung, and RCC Holdings Ltd.

Respondents

PROCEEDINGS IN CHAMBERS

COPY

No. S240493 Vancouver Registry

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA (BEFORE THE HONOURABLE MADAM JUSTICE FITZPATRICK)

Vancouver, BC July 15, 2025

BETWEEN:

Fox Island Development Ltd. and Advanced Venture Holding Co., Ltd.

Petitioners

AND:

Kensington Union Bay Properties Nominee Ltd. (formerly known as 34083 Yukon Inc.), Kensington Union Bay Properties Limited Partnership, Kensington Union Bay Properties GP Ltd, International Trade Center Properties Ltd., Sunwins Enterprise Ltd., Mo Yeung Ching also known as Michael Ching, Mo Yeung Properties Ltd., SFT Digital Holdings 30 Ltd., Hotel Versante Ltd., Beem Credit Union, Morteq Lending Corp., Chun Yu Liu, 1307510 B.C. Ltd., Jeffrey Rauch, Heung Kei Sung, and RCC Holdings Ltd.

Respondents

PROCEEDINGS IN CHAMBERS

Counsel for the Petitioners:

C. Brousson

Counsel for the Respondents
Kensington Union Bay Properties
Nominee Ltd., Kensington Union Bay
Properties Limited Partnership,
Kensington Union Bay Properties GP
Ltd, International Trade Center
Properties Ltd., Sunwins Enterprise
Ltd., Mo Yeung Ching, Mo Yeung
Properties Ltd., SFT Digital Holdings
30 Ltd., Hotel Versante Ltd.
and Attendees Club Versante
Management Ltd. and
1212429 B.C. Ltd.:

B. La Borie

Counsel for the Attendee Deloitte Restructuring Inc.:

J. Sandrelli C. Federico

Counsel for the Attendee Bygenteel Capital Inc.:

P. Reardon

TABLE OF CONTENTS PROCEEDINGS IN CHAMBERS JULY 15, 2025

PROCEEDINGS

Witness	Proceedings	Page		
	Submissions by Cnsl J. Sandrelli	1		
	Submissions by Cnsl B. La Borie	13		
	Submissions by Cnsl C. Brousson	14		
	0rder	15		
	Reporter certification	17		

EXHIBITS

Exhibit	Description	Page

No exhibits marked.

RULINGS, REASONS, ORDERS

Description	•	· ·	·	· ·	Page
0rder					15

```
1
2
3
4
5
                                          July 15, 2025
                                          Vancouver, BC
                  (PROCEEDINGS COMMENCED) ([3:01:00 PM])
 6
        THE CLERK:
                    Calling the matter of Fox Island
 7
             Developments Limited versus Kensington Union Bay
 8
             Properties Nominee Limited, Justice.
 9
        THE COURT:
                    Yes.
                          Thank you.
10
        CNSL J. SANDRELLI:
                            Good afternoon, Justice.
11
       THE COURT:
                    Mr. Sandrelli.
12
       CNSL J. SANDRELLI:
                            John Sandrelli, and with me is
13
             Federico, F-e-d-e-r-i-c-o, initial C., she/her,
14
             and we appear for the receiver, Deloitte
15
             Restructuring Inc.
16
       THE COURT:
                    Okay.
                           Thank you.
                                       Mr. La Borie.
17
       CNSL B. LA BORIE:
                           Good afternoon, Justice. Benjamin
18
             La Borie, I appear for a number of parties. And I
19
             apologize for the long list, but it's Club
20
             Versante Management Ltd., Kensington Union Bay
21
             Properties Nominee Ltd., Kensington Union Bay
22
             Properties Limited Partnership, Kensington Union
23
             Bay Properties GP Ltd, International Trade Center
24
             Properties Ltd., SFT Digital Holdings 30 Ltd.,
25
             Hotel Versante Ltd., Sunwins Enterprise Ltd.,
26
            Mo Yeung Ching, also known as Michael Ching, and
27
            Mo Yeung Properties Ltd., and finally 1212429
28
            B.C. Ltd. Some of those were not parties, and my
29
             friend will tell you why I appear on their behalf.
30
       THE COURT:
                   It might be more efficient just to refer to
31
            who you don't represent --
32
       CNSL B. LA BORIE: I was going to say that but --
33
       THE COURT:
                   -- in the respondents, but -- all right.
34
            Thank you, Mr. La Borie.
35
       CNSL P. REARDON:
                         Justice, P. Reardon, I appear for
36
            unknown parties, so I'm not on the list.
37
            Bygenteel -- B-y-g-e-n-t-e-e-l -- Capital Inc.
38
       THE COURT:
                   Okay.
                          Thank you. Mr. Brousson.
39
       CNSL C. BROUSSON: Last name is Brousson,
40
            B-r-o-u-s-s-o-n, initial C.
                                          I appear on behalf of
41
            the petitioners.
42
       THE COURT: Okay.
                          All right.
                                       Mr. Sandrelli, I believe
43
            this is your application.
44
45
       SUBMISSIONS BY CNSL J. SANDRELLI:
46
47
       CNSL J. SANDRELLI: Yes, thank you. And I can say that
```

the application is consensual. It relates to a settlement that had been reached by a number of the parties in regard to the parking rights at Hotel Versante.

And so that's a positive development, but let me take you through the background again and the receiver's report and update you in terms of where matters are and walk you through why this settlement arrangement is very helpful to the sale process underway and commend the parties and counsel for getting to this point.

So, again, Deloitte Restructuring Inc. was appointed by an order made March 4th, 2025. The receivership involves an operating hotel and related assets in Richmond. It's on Bridgeport Road in Richmond, close to the airport. It's a hundred room sort of boutique hotel. Construction completed in about 2022. It's part of -- it's not a standalone in the sense that it's part of a three building development that International Trade Center Properties Ltd. had developed. There's a couple of office towers in addition to the hotel property.

One unique thing is that they all share a common parkade, which sits on the remainder parcel, which is owned by International Trade Center Properties Ltd. And we call the main secured creditors or the petitioning creditors as Fox Island Development Ltd. and Advanced Venture Holding Company Ltd.

The receivership arises out of a foreclosure proceeding. That's the style of cause here. An order nisi had been obtained in early 2024, and ultimately there was a listing -- unsuccessful process -- and a decision was ultimately made that a receiver was required to take control of the operations of the hotel and the real property and also market the hotel as a going concern for sale.

And so since the receivership order, the receiver has been looking at that process, and I'll take you sort of through the activities in a moment, but it did investigate the various agreements impacting ownership of the hotel. And you may -- you probably don't recall, but early on in the proceeding that had been covered, there was another entity called RCC Holdings that might have had an interest. We came back and had the

receivership extended to that party to the extent it had been interest in the hotel.

One of the other things we uncovered -- it's not nefarious or suggesting it's nefarious, but we uncovered there's various agreements that impact not only the ownership of the hotel but also the parking and how that was structured.

And the receiver had concerns about, really, the ambiguity around the various parties' rights and the parking stalls and how such could impact the saleability of the hotel and engaged with the various stakeholders through counsel and ultimately reached a resolution that should resolve those concerns that a potential purchaser might have — in other words, be able to deliver to a purchaser the unrestricted use of 85 stalls.

And I'll walk you through sort of how that works, but we'll leave for another day the rights of the various parties, in terms of arguing what aspect of a purchase price should be allocated to the value of those parking stalls and ultimately what should happen in terms of any distribution associated therewith.

But the positive thing is we would be able to — to deliver to a purchaser, you know, those rights it should have, that a hotel owner should have in relation to the parkade, and all the stalls that are allocated to the hotel are all on — what's — P5, the fifth level of the parkade. And then there's easements and registered rights associated with access, ingress and egress, associated with the parkade.

So with that overview, then, if you go to tab 4 of the record, which is the receiver's report, and I'll go to paragraph 20- -- so paragraph 22, it's been busy in terms of the actions of the receiver following the first report. And, again, we're not here seeking the approval of activities or fees right now, but we thought it would be helpful to set out in detail everything that's been going on since the first report, which was really in early March.

So, you know, working with management to monitor and stabilize the operations -- regular communication with management hotel employees and overseeing day-to-day matters. There's a -- there's an arrangement with Fortis Alternative

 Energy Services with relation to the heating and cooling unit that Fortis owns but sits on the building. There's been various issues because they weren't paid for some time, so we've been sorting out that situation, obviously, receipts and disbursements, the normal stuff, monthly bank account, reconciliations, and the like, filing returns, and reviewing insurance, various agreements.

There's also been a need for hiring some additional employees and operational needs, renewal of services agreements. There were a number of -- some of the airlines have arrangements with the hotel in terms of rooms and the like, and so dealing with that, and also on the sale side.

In the spring, I think it's fair to say things were slower in terms of revenue and occupation, but the receiver notes it's picked up quite considerably, and it's actually having a pretty decent summer at this point. So the receipts and disbursements have improved significantly.

Daily meetings -- and there's about, by recollection now, 30 to 40 employees of the hotel. There's town hall meetings. A lot of work associated with -- with the parking stalls, both our firm and the receiver in terms of dealing with that, rolling cash flows and the like -- so quite a bit of activity in addition to, of course, launching the sale process.

And so in terms of that update, they did ask for RFPs from a few brokers -- also engaged Colliers on April 4th. They kicked off a formal listing agreement, engaged April 9th. And there is a data room set up, asset -- draft asset purchase agreement. CIM was prepared, profiled. They launched on May 5th or so, and there's detail in terms of the usual things you would expect in terms of website, profile, their global mailing, and the rest.

At paragraph 30, new private hotel investors, hotel owners, hotel operators, investment companies, high net worth individuals, et cetera. They're running advertisements. They're doing all the usual things you would expect, and there isn't a formal court ordered SISP in this case, just

merely the -- the listing with Colliers and then moving forward with that process. Positively, as of July 3rd, 2025, at paragraph 32, there's over 65 parties that executed CAs, a number of completed scheduled site tours at the hotel.

We did disclose here — there was — an interested party approached the receiver who had actually looked at the hotel back in the early days, and they were quite — quite interested, spent a bunch of time, and we did go down a path of potentially entering into a stalking horse bid term sheet, which would then turn into a stalking horse purchase agreement. We did explore that possibility, in terms of running a process.

Ultimately, given all the circumstances and information available, include feedback from the petitioning creditors, the receiver decided, exercising its business judgment, not to process the stalking horse bid process, went back to Colliers. The recommendation advice from Colliers to set a bid deadline to communicate to the purchaser community, investment community, et cetera. That's been set as July 29th, 2025. So that's been communicated.

And as I say, there's a detailed form of asset purchase agreement that's available that does incorporate this parking resolution concept that we've been able to manage. Another blast, and that sort of process is ongoing, and we're going to see sort of the results of that towards the end of this month now. So that's where we are.

I would expect, you know, we're not going to be rushing into court in early August. I would expect we'll get bids and mark-ups of APAs, and there'll be variety of discussions, perhaps through the first few weeks of August. So realistically, if all goes well, it's probably a September timeline.

Over to paragraph 39 -- so -- so here's where we are now in terms of the parking and what we've -- first of all, what exists and what we've been able to achieve by way of resolution. So paragraph 39 then -- so there is sort of a parking head lease. And so that's -- you know, I mentioned that International Trade Center Properties as landlord is the underlining owner of

```
the real estate and the entirety of the parkade --
 234
             leased to a numbered company, which is the 121
             company that Mr. La Borie now acts for as well, as
             tenant -- and let me say that 121, put into a
 5
6
7
8
             corporate search, the sole director and officer of
             that is Michael Ching. We've been advised that
             there's different owners of 121, but Mr. Ching is
             the sole director and officer.
 9
                   So it enters into this parking head lease for
10
             all of the parking stalls located in the entire
11
             sort of 5-storey parkade, and --
12
        THE COURT:
                     Correct -- for how long? What's the term?
13
        CNSL J. SANDRELLI: For 99 years --
14
        THE COURT:
                     Oh.
                          Oh, I see.
15
        CNSL J. SANDRELLI:
                             -- for a nominal consideration, so
             it's just for $10. And let me say, again -- according to our real estate team, that's not
16
17
18
             hugely unusual in the sense that usually for a
19
             parking garage with multiple users, you'd have
20
             some parties or some entity that would have the
21
             rights to it, and it would piece off those rights
22
             partially to all the different strata owners.
             as I just mentioned, there's not just three owners and three tenants. There's the hotel, and then
23
24
25
             there's office buildings with a whole bunch of
26
             strata owners within those things. And all of
27
             those strata owners ultimately need access to the
28
             parking and rights to parking stalls.
29
                  So 121, then, enters into the various parking
30
             stall arrangements with -- with all of these
31
             parties. Why they did it through 121 and not
32
             directly through ITCP, I'm not sure, but that's
33
             what they did.
34
       THE COURT: Mimm-hmm.
35
       CNSL J. SANDRELLI: And so there's this head lease.
36
             And then a short time in 2019 -- and, again, this
37
             is pre-completion, right, so this is during the
38
             development phase -- 121 assigns to Bygenteel,
39
             Mr. Reardon's client, a partial assignment of the
40
             parking head lease in respect of the P5 parking
41
                     So it -- it assigns the rights over to
             stalls.
42
             the P5, to Bygenteel. Again, why Bygenteel,
43
             nominal consideration --
44
       THE COURT:
                    For 99 years.
45
                            -- for 99 years, not sure.
       CNSL J. SANDRELLI:
46
                    And who's Bygenteel in the piece?
       THE COURT:
47
       CNSL J. SANDRELLI: So Bygenteel -- the director and
```

officer of Bygenteel is Mr. Ching's daughter. 2 Again, the ultimate owners -- I can't recall off 3 the top of my head, but we were advised -- it was 4 disclosed -- the ultimate owners are -- they're 5 not Mr. Ching or his daughter. Again, why that 6 was done, not exactly sure. But, again, that's 7 what was done. 8 So you have now, then, the parking stalls 9 that really are needed for the hotel, the rights 10 are in -- ultimately in Bygenteel at that period of time. Then Bygenteel, taking those rights, then, subleases those off to Club Versante, and 11 12 13 Club Versante, again, represented by Mr. La Borie. 14 That one is a shorter period of time. 15 five-year term with an extension of five years, 16 but, again, at nominal consideration. And so Bygenteel has the 99-year rights, but 17 it pieced off for ten years to Club Versante, and 18 19 that's pursuant to the Club Versante lease. And 20 Club Versante is a strata owner in one of the 21 other buildings. 22 THE COURT: Oh, I see. 23 CNSL J. SANDRELLI: It's -- it is -- it has reason, I 24 suppose, to have some rights to parking stalls. 25 Whether or not it should have rights to 85 stalls 26 is an open question. Then lastly --27 What's the relationship, again, between THE COURT: 28 Hotel Versante Ltd. and Club Versante? 29 CNSL J. SANDRELLI: They appear to be affiliates. 30 THE COURT: The hotel -- the hotel --31 CNSL J. SANDRELLI: The hotel discloses that Hotel 32 Versante --33 THE COURT: Hotel Versante runs the hotel; right? 34 CNSL J. SANDRELLI: Hotel Versante is the operating 35 entity of the hotel. 36 THE COURT: Right. 37 CNSL J. SANDRELLI: Club Versante is an -- Mr. La Borie 38 can probably explain it better than me, but 39 vis-a-vis the hotel, it operates a food and 40 beverage at the hotel. 41 THE COURT: Oh, I see. Okay. 42 CNSL J. SANDRELLI: But it has other businesses, like 43 other club businesses. I think there are a couple 44 of other restaurant or coffee shop or something 45 unrelated to the hotel. But there is a services 46 agreement with Club Versante for providing certain 47 food and beverage services for the hotel. And it

```
actually -- actually has the rights to the liquor
 2
             licence, which is also something that is sorted
 3
             out in terms of the sale of the hotel.
  4
        THE COURT: M'mm-hmm.
 5
        CNSL J. SANDRELLI:
                           And then finally, there is this
  6
             agreement that we've disclosed. We're not seeking
 7
             to do anything with it right now, but on
             August 15th, 2021, Bygenteel, then, as vendor,
 8
 9
             having these ultimate rights, agreed to transfer
10
             and assign back to ITCP all of the rights in the
11
             parking for a purchase price of $6 million. So
12
             that's --
13
        THE COURT:
                    This is the 99-year --
14
        CNSL J. SANDRELLI:
                            This is Bygenteel's rights, having
15
             taken those rights --
16
        THE COURT:
                    From 121 -
17
       CNSL J. SANDRELLI:
                           -- from 121, who took them from
18
             ITCP, to send them back full circle to ITCP for
19
             $6 million. Now, I understand that never closed
20
             in terms of a transaction, but it's a document
             that exists, and I would expect, ultimately, when
21
22
            we're talking about allocations of value and
23
             distribution, somebody on behalf of somebody was
24
             going to be arguing that the value of the parking
25
             is worth $6 million.
26
       THE COURT:
                    I see.
27
       CNSL J. SANDRELLI:
                            That would be my expectation.
28
            several parties have potential rights. As you can
29
            expect after the point I made at the beginning, a
30
            purchaser would be a bit troubled by, okay, what
31
            do I do with this and who do I take rights from?
32
                  And so the resolution which we came to and
33
            which is essentially to say let's have -- like,
34
            121 has the whole parkade, and it's entered into
35
            all these other arrangements with all these other
36
            strata owners. Let's not upset that structure.
37
            Let's get 121 to give the hotel rights for
38
            99 years to the purchaser. So that's -- I'll
39
            describe it and then I'll go into detail.
            that's essentially what that part is.
40
41
                 Then we need to terminate these agreements
            between Bygenteel and 121 and Bygenteel and
42
43
            Club Versante so that we can then deliver to a
44
            purchaser not only the parking, but we can confirm
45
            that these agreements have all been terminated.
46
            So the concept is that all that would be signed
47
            now, assuming you've granted the order approving
```

the settlement. Those documents have been prepared. They're attached to the order that I'll take you through. It'll all be executed, delivered to the receiver to be held in escrow, to be delivered to a purchaser on closing, all without prejudice or preserving the rights of the various parties to argue what value should be allocated to that at the end of the day, what proceeds should be held back, and who should get some value associated with that parking arrangement.

So at paragraph 42, that's the detail of the settlement. So 121 enters into an assignment agreement to assign the rights to stall to a purchaser, delivered -- assuming the order is made, delivered after the order, held by the receiver in escrow. 121 is, then, as I said, keeps the overriding sort of parking head lease. We don't alter that. We don't impact all the rights involving all the other parties that might have parking rights associated with the parkade. Receiver holds that in escrow, then Bygenteel and 121 execute the termination agreement of the assignment agreement. Bygenteel and Club Versante execute the termination agreement, terminating the Club Versante lease as well, and then the receiver holds those termination agreements in escrow and delivers those to a purchaser on closing, assuming

And then importantly, g, h, and i, the rights of the lenders -- that's a defined term, being the petitioners -- Bygenteel, 121, and Club Versante shall be preserved in respect of claims they may have to the allocation of net proceeds arising from a court approved sale as to the value of the P5 parking stalls. And then on application, such orders shall include a term requiring that the parking stall net proceeds be held and retained in trust, pending further agreement of court orders.

we get to a court approved sale.

So what we envision is not to have a massive dust-up at the court approval hearing, but rather the only issue at the court approval hearing should be how much should be held back as net parking proceeds for the parties to fight over later, and such, then, wouldn't preclude a distribution order being sought at that time or shortly thereafter for the balance of the

proceeds. 234567 And so hopefully, it's a fairly straightforward how much should be held back. substantive fight would come later in terms of should any money -- you know, should the lenders be -- the lenders argue they should be entitled to 100 percent of the total proceeds, including the 8 net parking proceeds, and other parties will argue 9 for some entitlement to those proceeds. But that 10 It makes it easy for a purchaser. gets us there. 11 It makes it clean for the court, as well -- as 12 clean as we can make it at that time, and that is 13 the nature of the order we're seeking in terms of 14 the settlement and the resolution that's been 15 reached. 16 THE COURT: What happens with the P5 stalls purchase 17 agreement? 18 CNSL J. SANDRELLI: So that exists in -- so just to be 19 So that would be -- I mean, ITCP, again, it's -- it's -- I just -- I think it's a bit of a 20 red herring. Let me explain why. First of all, 21 22 it never closed. Second of all, it's not binding 23 of ITCP in terms of actually being required to pay 24 the purchase price, as we read the agreement. 25 it's more in the nature of -- we'll call it an 26 option, I guess, to acquire the P5 stalls. 27 we've left it alone for now. And don't think it's 28 problematic on the face of it, but it's going to 29 be something that, you know, the parties will 30 argue as indicative of value in terms of what 31 should be allocated in terms of these parking 32 stalls. It will be "vested away" in terms of a 33 vesting order at the end of the day, so I think 34 that's what terminates the effect of it, 35 essentially. But we did contemplate trying to 36 terminate that as well. 37 What I think in terms of, again, the 38 arguments that the parties want to make in terms 39 of entitlement to proceeds, it's there before you 40 and, no doubt, some of the parties will argue it's 41 indicative of value. THE COURT: Are you going to be asking the purchaser to 42

CNSL J. SANDRELLI: So that is not the intention, and

let me tell you why. So from the receiver's

perspective, frankly, we'd like to probably stay

out of the fray to the extent we can. And if --

make an allocation?

43

44

45

46

47

> you know, if we asked purchasers to make an allocation to the parking, it would inevitably lead to the receiver having to negotiate, presumably, that allocation because you could have some purchaser -- like, let's take an extreme of that -- some purchaser that might be aligned with Mr. Ching allocates \$30 million to the parking in that purchase agreement. And so the receiver confronted with that extreme example would have to do something about that.

Similarly, maybe there's a purchaser aligned with the petitioners that allocate zero to the parking. Again, the receiver would have to weigh So we thought that's -- we don't need one -from a transactional perspective, you don't need one. There's no tax implications in the sense there's going to have to be property transfer tax on the real estate. It doesn't matter whether it's parking or -- or hotel, so the answer is no.

THE COURT: M'mm-hmm.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

CNSL J. SANDRELLI: I think we can kind of stay out of the fray a little bit -- THE COURT: M'mm-hmm.

CNSL J. SANDRELLI: -- in that way. And I suppose we can't stop people from doing that if they do that voluntarily. And if they do, we may have to disclose that to the court that this is what some purchasers did, for what that's worth.

Then finally, in some of the questions about all that, there is an updated R&D statement of receipts and disbursements that we've put forward. And as of June 30th, 2025, the gross receipts have been 3.6 million, about 3.1 million in hotel operating receipts. They've also drawn 550,000 under the borrowing facility from petitioners. There are significant expenses, obviously, with running the operations, and that's -- that's outlined.

Right now, again, given the performance -and there's a bit of lag on professional fees, I might say. There's monies owing to the receiver in trust in terms of professional fees, but that's not because there's a lack of funds right now. It's just a timing issue. And the receiver believes it will have sufficient funds as a result of the performance through the summer to continue to carry on the receivership through conclusion,

```
assuming we can get to a transaction, you know, in
 2
             the fall, without having to borrow further funds
 3
             under the borrowing facility.
  4
                  And subject to your questions, I would
 5
             conclude my submissions, and I can take you
  6
             through the detail of the draft order at the
 7
             appropriate time.
 8
        THE COURT:
                   Could you hand that up now, please --
 9
        CNSL J. SANDRELLI:
                            Yes.
10
        THE COURT:
                   -- Mr. Sandrelli?
11
        CNSL J. SANDRELLI:
                            Here's the vetted copy, and here's
12
             the copy for the clerk.
13
        THE COURT:
                    Thank you.
14
        CNSL J. SANDRELLI:
                            So the terms of settlement are
15
             actually set out in an email exchange.
16
             detailed -- ultimately the parties were
17
             comfortable with that, frankly.
                                               It didn't want to
18
             try to lead to all that in a separate document
19
             because we were -- made a lot of effort to get
             everybody to confirm agreement. So that's what the order attaches in terms of the settlement
20
21
             arrangements. But, of course, the order itself --
22
23
             so the order approves the settlement as reflected
             in the email exchange, but then goes out to give
24
             effect to that settlement by the various documents
25
26
             and agreements that are attached to the order and
27
             directing the various parties execute those and
28
             deliver those to the receiver in escrow.
29
       THE COURT: M'mm-hmm.
30
       CNSL J. SANDRELLI: So paragraph 1 is the approval of
31
             the settlement. Paragraph 2, as I say, is the
32
             execution of the assignment agreement, which is to
33
            assign the rights of the parking to a purchaser.
34
            Paragraph 3 is that other than the rights that are
35
            assigned to the purchaser, 121 retains the rights
36
            and obligations under the head lease. That's the
37
            point I made earlier.
                                    It still has obligations
38
            under the head lease and various contracts for
39
            various strata owners with respect to the parking
40
            stall arrangements, so it continues to have that.
            Receiver holds that assignment in escrow.
41
42
                 Then we have the Bygenteel termination
43
            agreement at paragraph 5. Then we have the
44
            Club Versante termination agreement at paragraph
45
            6, and, again, receiver holding those in escrow in
46
            paragraph 7. And then the reservation of rights
47
            really flows in paragraphs 8, 9, and 10. And,
```

13 Submissions by Cnsl B. La Borie

again, at paragraph 11, again, confirming that the hold back of the parking stall net proceeds doesn't prohibit the distribution of the balance of the funds.

Our real estate team worked with us in terms of the underlying land title, the easements and reciprocal rights agreements on titles, and these various agreements. And, again, I sort of ask them to focus it. If you're asking for a purchaser, what would you need? What would make you comfortable from a due diligence perspective? And that's how we got these various documents in terms of, like, what you could expect, and we're confident that they should satisfy a purchaser.

THE COURT: M'mm-hmm. Okay. Thank you.

CNSL J. SANDRELLI: Thank you. THE COURT: Mr. La Borie.

17 18 19

20 21

22 23

24

25

26 27

28

29 30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41 42

43

44

45

46

47

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

SUBMISSIONS BY CNSL B. LA BORIE:

CNSL B. LA BORIE: Justice, I don't have much to say where it's by consent. I do -- receiver's counsel has stated the history here. And this is not an application for approval of receiver's activities or sales process. The parking situation, as you can clearly tell, is convoluted. And this property has been for sale in one fashion since 2024. Our clients just want to get on with it.

And so the -- the agreement that's been reached does that, we say. It -- the -- it puts aside this issue until later so that a purchaser can come forward, and the sale process can be concluded, at least, and funds can be generated. The fight will be later, obviously. The only point I wanted to mention is I think the receiver's report says that there are interested parties. Obviously, the petitioner is an interested party, and I'm not sure if that was communicated. I'm sure Fox Island would say --CNSL J. SANDRELLI: Interested party in --CNSL B. LA BORIE: No. In the receiver's report, it says who has an interest in the funds, and I think the only point I noticed there was that Fox Island is obviously an interested party, and their rights are preserved in the order. THE COURT: Yep. Okay.

CNSL B. LA BORIE: But I don't have anything further

Submissions by Cnsl C. Brousson

than that.

29 .

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Mr. Reardon? CNSL P. REARDON: I have nothing further to add,

Justice.
THE COURT: Mr. Brousson.

SUBMISSIONS BY CNSL C. BROUSSON:

CNSL C. BROUSSON: Yeah. We stand in support as well. Obviously, we were a big part of the settlement. I have a couple of things, a couple comments. My friend mentioned the realistically September timeline for the sale approval, which I don't disagree with. I think that's probably appropriate, given the July 29th deadline, it's probably roughly around that time. And my friend also said we're not going to have the big fight, but we're going to have this allocation fight.

I do have some concern that that -- and you'll see in the order it talks about having that take place on the distribution order, right. So the timing -- you'd make your approval. You'd make your distribution order. We're going to have a fight about how much is going to be held back. And obviously, we'd be arguing that there would be less money, and others might be arguing that there's more.

I am concerned that there are evidentiary aspects of that leading up to September. I get that it's still a month and a bit away, but I am a little concerned that we get into a place where we're last minute on the evidence. And I'm not sure exactly what evidence is going to be put forward by my friend, so I just wanted to raise it here in court. I'm not asking you to make an order on it or directions on it. I wanted to raise it here in court that, you know, we should all be preparing for that eventuality.

And I disagree with the comment my friend said that somehow the P5 stalls purchase agreement is indicative of any value, whatsoever, the \$6 million. I'm not sure why that would be indicative of any value. That, again, has all the same parties, related parties on both sides of it.

And then the last point I'll make, I think you -- you know, Justice, you hit on all the questions that are relevant here, and one of them

Order

29.

was about sort of receiver's involvement as purchasers about allocation. I don't disagree. I -- it shouldn't be imposed upon if it's not necessary for the tax purposes. But I do wonder -- and I wasn't expecting that submission that they would stay out of the fray. submission, there would be no better party, probably, in these circumstances, to enter the fray if they are the party that is selling and is the party that is most connected to Colliers, who is the party that's hearing from all the purchasers. I agreed with my friend when he said some purchasers may be connected to Michael Ching. That's been a concern all along. Maybe my client will be connected to him. I don't know.

But everyone is going to have a position on the other side. Mr. Reardon's client, I guess -although I don't know who Mr. Reardon's client is, to be frank. But the receiver wouldn't. And Colliers would be able to gather that information, and I think it would be valuable.

So I stand to say that I'm not sure staying entirely out of the fray, while it may be preferable from the receiver's perspective, would necessarily be the best for this court in the circumstances. It may be something that they do come in and say, "Based upon all the information that we've gathered about the parking stalls, et cetera, this is what we think." So I just stand to say that.

Those are my submissions, and I support the order.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you. Well, I am going to grant the order, Mr. Sandrelli. It seems to me, as I say, it's without opposition. And it really just kicks the can down the road a little, in terms of having the fight or big fight or both at the later point in time. But it does get a purchaser to the table with the certainty that it provides. So the order as sought is approved, and I signed the order.

And Madam Clerk, just for your edification, the endorsement of the order, other than Mr. Sandrelli, is dispensed with.

All right. I'll give you back your binders, Mr. Sandrelli.

CNSL J. SANDRELLI: Thank you.

Order

```
THE COURT: Okay. I'm not sure what my schedule is
 2
             like in September, except I think --
        CNSL J. SANDRELLI: Yeah. IIC is in there at some
 3
 4
             point, but --
 5
6
7
        THE COURT: I think I'm around on the 3rd. I think I'm around on the 3rd, if that's of any assistance. I
             think I'm in Toronto from the 5th to the 8th, and
 8
             then many of you will be aware I'm in Halifax for
 9
             the IIC conference --
10
        CNSL J. SANDRELLI: Right.
11
        THE COURT: -- too. So other than that, I'm fairly
12
             open.
13
        CNSL J. SANDRELLI: Okay.
14
        THE COURT: As I'm sure you're all aware, I'm
15
             supernumerary now, so my schedule is rather blank
16
             for the time being.
17
       CNSL J. SANDRELLI: Much better than it used to be.
18
       THE COURT:
                   Yes, exactly. Okay.
                                            Thank you.
19
       CNSL J. SANDRELLI: Thank you.
       THE CLERK:
20
                    Order in chambers. Chambers is adjourned.
21
22
23
                   (PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED) ([3:37:47 PM])
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
```

17 Reporter certification

REPORTER CERTIFICATION

I certify that proceedings from timestamp 3:01:00 PM to timestamp 3:37:47 PM, inclusive, are a true and accurate transcript of these proceedings, recorded on a sound recording apparatus, transcribed to the best of my skill and ability in accordance with applicable standards.

Cordia Wong

Authorized Reporter

Conda Wong

	T		1	T
l s	550,000 (1) - 11:34	agreement (20) - 4:35,	12:22, 12:40	bit (6) - 4:30, 8:30,
	5th (2) - 4:38, 16:7	4:37, 5:13, 5:26,	aside [1] - 13:31	10:20, 11:22, 11:40,
\$10[1] - 6:16		7:46, 8:6, 9:14, 9:23,	aspect [1] - 3:20	14:30
\$30[1] - 11:7	6	9:24, 9:25, 9:39,	aspects [1] - 14:29	blank [1] - 16:15
		10:17, 10:24, 11:8,	asset(3) - 4:36, 5:26	blast[1] - 5:28
1 1	6 [5] - 8:11, 8:19, 8:25,	12:20, 12:32, 12:43,	assets [1] - 2:15	Borie [7] - 1:16, 1:18,
	12:45, 14:42	12:44, 13:29, 14:40	assign [3] - 8:10, 9:14,	1:34, 6:3, 7:13, 7:37,
1 [1] - 12:30	65 (1) - 5:4	agreements (10) -	12:33	13:17
10 [1] - 12:47		2:43, 3:5, 4:9, 4:12,	assigned [1] - 12:35	BORIE (6) - 1:17, 1:32,
100[1] - 10:7	7	8:41, 8:45, 9:27,	assignment [5] - 6:39,	13:19, 13:21, 13:41,
11 [1] - 13:1	T	12:26, 13:7, 13:8	9:13, 9:24, 12:32,	13:47
121 [16] - 6:2, 6:4, 6:7,	7 (1) - 12:46	airlines [1] - 4:13	12:41	borrow[1] - 12:2
6:29, 6:31, 6:38,		airport (1) - 2:16	assigns (2) - 6:38,	borrowing (2) - 11:35,
8:16, 8:17, 8:34,	8	aligned [2] - 11:6,	6:41	12:3
8:37, 8:42, 9:13,	8 [1] - 12:47	11:11	assistance [1] - 16:6	boutique (1) - 2:17
9:17, 9:23, 9:32,	85 _[2] - 3:16, 7:25	allocate [1] - 11:12	associated (8) - 3:23,	Bridgeport [1] - 2:15
12:35	8th [1] - 16:7	allocated [4] - 3:20,	3:31, 3:32, 4:27,	brokers [1] - 4:33
1212429[1] - 1:27		3:28, 9:8, 10:31	9:10, 9:21	Brousson [3] - 1:38,
15[1] - 1:1	9	allocates [1] - 11:7	assuming [4] - 8:47,	1:39, 14:5
15th [1] - 8:8	-	allocation (6) - 9:34,	9:15, 9:28, 12:1	BROUSSON (4) -
	9(1) - 12:47	10:43, 11:2, 11:4,	attached [2] - 9:2,	1:39, 1:40, 14:7,
2	99 (4) - 6:13, 6:44,	14:18, 15:2	12:26	14:9
2(1) - 12:31	6:45, 8:38	allocations [1] - 8:22	attaches [1] - 12:21	building [2] - 2:20, 4:3
20m - 3:35	99-year [2] - 7:17, 8:13	alone [1] - 10:27	August [3] - 5:34,	buildings (2) - 6:25,
2019[1] - 6:36	9th [1] - 4:35	alter(1) - 9:19	5:37, 8:8	7:21
2021 [1] - 8:8		Alternative(1) - 3:47	Authorized [1] - 17:17	bunch [2] - 5:10, 6:25
2022[1] - 2:18	l A	ambiguity [1] - 3:9	available (2) - 5:16,	business (1) - 5:18
2024[2] - 2:33, 13:28		answer (1) - 11:19	5:26	businesses (2) - 7:42,
2025 [5] - 1:1, 2:13,	ability [1] - 17:8	APAs [1] - 5:35	aware [2] - 16:8, 16:14	7:43
5:3, 5:23, 11:32	able (5) - 3:15, 3:24,	apologize [1] - 1:19		busy (1) - 3:36
22[1] - 3:36	5:28, 5:43, 15:20	apparatus [1] - 17:7	В	BY [3] - 1:45, 13:19,
29th [2] - 5:23, 14:15	access [2] - 3:31, 6:27	appear(6) - 1:14, 1:18, 1:29, 1:35,	B.C[1] - 1:28	14:7
	accordance[1] - 17:8	1:40, 7:29, 1:35,	background (1) - 2:6	Bygenteel [17] - 1:37,
3	according (1) - 6:17	applicable (1) - 17:8	baiance [2] - 9:47.	6:38, 6:42, 6:46,
	account (1) - 4:7	application [4] - 1:43,	13:3	6:47, 7:1, 7:10, 7:11,
3(1) - 12:34	accurate[1] - 17:5	2:1, 9:36, 13:24	bank (1) - 4:6	7:17, 8:8, 8:42, 9:22,
3.1 [1] - 11:33	achieve [1] - 5:43	appointed [1] - 2:13	Based [1] - 15:27	9:24, 9:32, 12:42 BYGENTEEL[1] -
3.6 [1] - 11:33	acquire (1) - 10:26	approached (1) - 5:7	Bay[4] - 1:7, 1:20,	1:37
30 [3] - 1:24, 4:25,	actions [1] - 3:37	appropriate [2] - 12:7,	1:21, 1:23	Bygenteel's [1] - 8:14
4:42	activities [3] - 2:41;	14:15	BC (1) - 1:2	-180mma 111 - 0' 14
30th [1] - 11:32	3:39, 13:24	approval [7] - 3:39,	beginning (1) - 8:29	С
32[1] - 5:3	activity [1] - 4:30	9:41, 9:42, 12:30,	behalf [3] - 1:29, 1:40.	
39 [2] - 5:40, 5:44	acts (1) - 6:3	13:24, 14:13, 14:22	8:23	Capital [1] - 1:37
3:01:00[1] - 17:4	add [1] - 14:3 addition [2] - 2:22,	approved [3] - 9:29,	belleves [1] - 11:45	carry[1] - 11:47
3:37:47 [1] - 17:4	4:30	9:35, 15:40	benjamin [1] - 1:17	CAs [1] - 5:4
3rd [3] - 5:3, 16:5,	4:30 additional (1) - 4:11	approves[1] - 12:23	best[2] - 15:25, 17:7	case[1] - 4:47
16:6	adjourned [1] - 4:11	approving [1] - 8:47	better(3) - 7:38, 15:7,	cash [1] - 4:29
	ADJOURNED)([3:37:	April [2] - 4:34, 4:35	16:17	Center(4) - 1:23, 2:21,
4	47 (1) - 16:22	argue (5) - 9:7, 10:6,	between [2] - 7:27,	2:27, 5:46
4[1] - 3:34	Advanced [1] - 2:29	10:8, 10:30, 10:40	8:42	certain [1] - 7:46
40 [1] - 4:25	advertisements(1) -	arguing (4) - 3:19,	beverage [2] - 7:40,	certainty (1) - 15:39
42[1] - 9:12	4:45	8:24, 14:25, 14:26	7:47	CERTIFICATION(1) -
4th [2] - 2:13, 4:34	advice[1] - 5:20	arguments (1) - 10:38	bld [3] - 5:11, 5:19,	17:1
	advised [2] - 6:6, 7:3	arises (1) - 2:31	5:21	certify [1] - 17:3
5	affiliates [1] - 7:29	arising [1] - 9:34	bids (1) - 5:35	cetera [3] - 4:44, 5:23,
	afternoon [2] - 1:10,	arrangement(3) - 2:9,	big [3] - 14:10, 14:17,	15:29
5[1] - 12:43	1:17	3:47, 9:11	15:37	chambers [2] - 16:20
5-storey [1] - 6:11	agreed [2] - 8:9, 15:12	arrangements[5] -	binders (1) - 15:45	Ching (6) - 1:26, 6:6,
	J .,,	4:14, 6:30, 8:35,	binding (1) - 10:22	7:5, 11:7, 15:13

ching [1] - 6:7 Ching's [1] - 7:1 CIM [1] - 4:37 circie (1) - 8:18 circumstances pi -5:15, 15:8, 15:26 claims (1) - 9:33 clean [2] - 10:11, 10:12 clear(1) - 10:19 clearly (1) - 13:26 CLERK[2] - 1:6, 16:20 Clerk [1] - 15:42 clerk [1] - 12:12 client [4] - 6:39, 15:14, 15:17, 15:18 clients (1) - 13:28 close [1] - 2:16 closed [2] - 8:19, 10:22 closing [2] - 9:5, 9:28 club [1] - 7:43 Club [14] - 1:19, 7:12, 7:13, 7:18, 7:19, 7:20, 7:28, 7:37, 7:46, 8:43, 9:24, 9:26, 9:32, 12:44 CNSL [46] - 1:10, 1:12, 1:17, 1:32, 1:35, 1:39, 1:45, 1:47, 6:13, 6:15, 6:35, 6:45, 6:47, 7:23, 7:29, 7:31, 7:34, 7:37, 7:42, 8:5, 8:14, 8:17, 8:27, 10:18, 10:44, 11:21, 11:24, 12:9, 12:11, 12:14, 12:30, 13:16, 13:19, 13:21, 13:40, 13:41, 13:47, 14:3, 14:7, 14:9, 15:47, 16:3, 16:10, 16:13, 16:17, 16:19 coffee [1] - 7:44 Colliers (6) - 4:34, 5:1, 5:20, 15:10, 15:20 comfortable [2] -12:17, 13:11 COMMENCED)([3:01 :00 (1) - 1:4 commend [1] - 2:10 comment[1] - 14:39 comments [1] - 14:11 common [1] - 2:25 communicate[s] -5:21 communicated [2] -5:24, 13:39 communication [1] -3:45

community [2] - 5:22 companies [1] - 4:44 company [2] - 6:2, 6:3 Company [1] - 2:30 completed [2] - 2:18, completion [1] - 6:37 concept [2] - 5:27, 8:46 concern [3] - 2:38, 14:19, 15:14 concerned [2] - 14:28, 14:31 concerns [2] - 3:8, 3:14 conclude (1) - 12:5 concluded [1] - 13:33 conclusion [1] - 11:47 conference [1] - 16:9 confident [1] - 13:14 confirm [2] - 8:44, 12:20 confirming [1] - 13:1 confronted [1] - 11:9 connected [3] - 15:10. 15:13, 15:15 consensual [1] - 2:1 consent_[1] - 13:22 considerably [1] -4:20 consideration [3] -6:15, 6:43, 7:16 construction [1] contemplate[1] -10:35 continue [1] - 11:46 continues [1] - 12:40 contracts m - 12:38 control [1] - 2:36. convoluted (1) - 13:26 cooling [1] - 4:2 copy [2] - 12:11, 12:12 Cordia (1) - 17:16 corporate [1] - 6:5 correct(1) - 6:12 counsel [3] - 2:11. 3:12, 13:22 couple [4] - 2:22, 7:43, 14:11 course (2) - 4:30, 12:22 COURT[41] - 1:9, 1:11, 1:16, 1:30, 1:33, 1:38, 1:42, 6:12, 6:14, 6:34, 6:44, 6:46, 7:22, 7:27, 7:30, 7:33, 7:36, 7:41, 8:4, 8:13,

8:16, 8:26, 10:16,

10:42, 11:20, 11:23, 12:8, 12:10, 12:13, 12:29, 13:15, 13:17, 13:46, 14:2, 14:5, 15:33, 16:1, 16:5, 16:11, 16:14, 16:18 court | 12 - 4:47, 5:34, 9:29, 9:35, 9:39, 9:41, 9:42, 10:11, 11:27, 14:35, 14:37, 15:25 covered | 11 - 2:45 creditors | 31 - 2:28, 5:17

D

daily [1] - 4:24

data [1] - 4:36 daughter(2) - 7:1, 7:5 day-to-day [1] - 3:46 davs (1) - 5:9 deadline gg - 5:21. 14:15 dealing [2] - 4:15, 4:28 decent[1] - 4:21 decided [1] - 5:17 decision [1] - 2:35 defined [1] - 9:31 deliver[4] - 3:15. 3:25, 8:43, 12:28 delivered [4] - 9:4, 9:5, 9:15, 9:16 delivers (1) - 9:28 Deloitte [2] - 1:14, 2:12 describe (1) - 8:39 detail [5] - 3:40, 4:38, 8:39, 9:12, 12:8 dėtalied (2) - 5:25, 12:16 developed [1] - 2:21 development(3) - 2:5, 2:20, 6:38 Development[1] -2:29 Developments (1) -1:7 different [2] - 6:7, 6:22 Digital (1) - 1:24 dlligence [1] - 13:11 directing [1] - 12:27 directions [1] - 14:36 directly [1] - 6:32 director [3] - 6:5, 6:8, 6:47 disagree [3] - 14:14, 14:39, 15:2 disbursements [3] -

4:6, 4:22, 11:31 disclose [2] - 5:6, 11:27 disclosed [2] - 7:4, 8:6 discloses (1) - 7:31 discussions (1) - 5:36 dispensed [1] - 15:44 distribution (8) - 3:22, 8:23, 9:46, 13:3, 14:21, 14:23 document [2] - 8:20. 12:18 documents (3) - 9:1. 12:25, 13:12 done [2] - 7:6, 7:7 doubt (1) - 10:40 down [2] - 5:10, 15:36 draft [2] - 4:36, 12:6 drawn [1] - 11:34 due (1) - 13:11 during (1) - 6:37 dust [1] - 9:41 dust-up [1] - 9:41

Ε

early (5) - 2:33, 2:44,

3:42, 5:8, 5:34

oasements [2] - 3:30, 13:6 easy [1] - 10:10 edification (1) - 15:42 offect [2] - 10:34, 12:25 officlent (1) - 1:30 offcrt[1] - 12:19 egress [1] - 3:32 email (2) - 12:15. 12:24 employees [3] - 3:45, 4:11, 4:25 end [3] - 5:31, 9:8, 10:33 endorsement (1) -15:43 Energy (1) - 4:1 engaged [3] - 3:11, 4:33, 4:35 enter[1] - 15:8 entered [1] - 8:34 entering (1) - 5:11 Enterprise [1] - 1:25 enters [3] - 6:9, 6:29, 9:13 entire [1] - 6:10 entirely (1) - 15:23 entirety [1] - 6:1 entitled [1] - 10:6 entitlement [2] - 10:9,

10:39 entity [3] - 2:46, 6:20, 7:35 envision [1] - 9:40 escrow(7) - 9:4, 9:17, 9:22, 9:27, 12:28, 12:41, 12:45 essentially [3] - 8:33, 8:40, 10:35 estate [4] - 6:1, 6:17, 11:18, 13:5 et [3] - 4:44, 5:23. 15:29 eventuality (1) - 14:38 evidence[2] - 14:32, 14:33 evidentiary [1] - 14:28 exactly [3] - 7:6, 14:33, 16:18 example[1] - 11:9 except[1] - 16:2 exchange [2] - 12:15, 12:24 execute (3) - 9:23. 9:25, 12:27 executed [2] - 5:4, 9:3 execution (1) - 12:32 exercising [1] - 5:18 exists [3] - 5:42, 8:21, 10:18 expect [7] - 4:39, 4:46, 5:33, 5:35, 8:21, 8:29, 13:13 expectation [1] - 8:27 expecting [1] - 15:5 expenses [1] - 11:36 explain [2] - 7:38, 10:21 explore [1] - 5:13 extended (1) - 3:1 extension [1] - 7:15 extent(2) - 3:1, 10:47 extreme(2) - 11:5, 11:9

F

face [1] - 10:28 facility [2] - 11:35, 12:3 fair [1] - 4:17 fairiy [2] - 10:2, 16:11 fail [1] - 12:2 fashion [1] - 13:27 Federico [1] - 1:13 FEDERICO [1] - 1:13 feedback [1] - 5:16 fees [3] - 3:39, 11:40, 11:42 few [2] - 4:33, 5:37

fifth [1] - 3:29 fight [8] - 9:44, 10:4, 13:34, 14:17, 14:18, 14:24, 15:37 filing [1] - 4:7 finally [3] - 1:27, 8:5, 11:29 firm [1] - 4:28 first (5) - 3:37, 3:41, 5:37, 5:42, 10:21 five [2] - 7:15 five-year(1) - 7:15 flows [2] - 4:29, 12:47 focus [1] - 13:9 following [1] - 3:37 food [2] - 7:39, 7:47 foreclosure [1] - 2:31 form [1] - 5:25 formal [2] - 4:34, 4:47 Fortis [2] - 3:47, 4:2 forward [4] - 5:2, 11:31, 13:32, 14:34 Fox [4] - 1:6, 2:29, 13:39, 13:43 frank (1) - 15:19 frankly [2] - 10:46, 12:17 fray [5] - 10:47, 11:22, 15:6, 15:9, 15:23 friend (e) - 1:29, 14:12, 14:16, 14:34, 14:39, 15:12 full (1) - 8:18 funds [8] - 11:43, 11:45, 12:2, 13:4, 13:33, 13:42

G

garage [1] - 6:19 gather [1] - 15:20 gathered [1] - 15:28 generated [1] - 13:33 given [3] - 5:15, 11:39, 14:15 global [1] - 4:40 GP [1] - 1:23 grant [1] - 15:34 granted [1] - 8:47 gross [1] - 11:32 guess [2] - 10:26, 15:17

Н

Halifax[1] - 16:8 hall [1] - 4:26 hand [1] - 12:8 head [6] - 5:45, 6:9, 6:35, 6:40, 7:3, 9:18,

hearing [3] - 9:41, 9:42, 15:11 heating [1] - 4:1 held [7] - 9:4, 9:9, 9:16, 9:38, 9:43, 10:3, 14:24 helpful pj - 2:9, 3:40 herring [1] - 10:21 high (1) - 4:44 hiring [1] - 4:10 history [1] - 13:23 hit[1] - 14:46 hmm [6] - 6:34, 8:4, 11:20, 11:23, 12:29, 13:15 hold (1) - 13:2 Holding (1) - 2:30 holding [1] - 12:45 Holdings (2) - 1:24, 2:46 holds (3) - 9:22, 9:27, 12:41 hopefully [1] - 10:2 horse [3] - 5:11, 5:13, 5:19 hotel (34) - 2:14, 2:17, 2:23, 2:37, 2:38, 2:43, 3:2, 3:6, 3:11, 3:26, 3:28, 3:45, 4:14, 4:25, 4:42, 4:43, 5:5, 5:8, 6:24, 7:9, 7:30, 7:31, 7:33, 7:35, 7:39, 7:40, 7:45, 7:47, 8:3, 8:37, 11:19, 11:33 Hotel [8] - 1:25, 2:4, 7:28, 7:31, 7:33,

12:36, 12:38

1

7:34

9:19

hugely [1] - 6:18

hundred [1] - 2:17

IIC [2] - 16:3, 16:9

impact [3] - 3:5, 3:10,

impacting [1] - 2:43 implications [1] -11:16 importantly [1] - 9:30 imposed [1] - 15:3 improved [1] - 4:22 inc [3] - 1:15, 1:37, 2:12 include [2] - 5:16, 9:37 including [1] - 10:7 inclusive [1] - 17:4 incorporate [1] - 5:27

indicative [4] - 10:30. 10:41, 14:41, 14:43 individuals [1] - 4:44 inevitably [1] - 11:2 information pj - 5:16, 15:20, 15:27 ingress [1] - 3:31 initial [2] - 1:13, 1:40 insurance [1] - 4:8 intention (1) - 10:44 interest [3] - 2:47, 3:2, 13:42 interested (8) - 5:7. 5:9, 13:36, 13:38, 13:40, 13:44 International [4] -1:23, 2:20, 2:26, 5:46 investigate [1] - 2:42 investment [2] - 4:43, 5:22 investors [1] - 4:42 involvement(1) - 15:1 involves [1] - 2:14 involving [1] - 9:20 Island [4] - 1:6, 2:29, 13:39, 13:43 issue [3] - 9:42, 11:44, 13:31 Issues [1] - 4:3 It'll [1] - 9:3 ITCP (8) - 6:32, 8:10, 8:18, 10:19, 10:23 itself(1) - 12:22

J

john [1] - 1:12

judgment[1] - 5:18

July [4] - 1:1, 5:3, 5:23, 14:15 June [1] - 11:32 Justice [2] - 1:35, 13:21 Justice [5] - 1:8, 1:10, 1:17, 14:4, 14:46

K

keeps [1] - 9:18 Kensington [4] - 1:7, 1:20, 1:21, 1:22 kicked [1] - 4:34 kicks [1] - 15:36 kind [1] - 11:21 known [1] - 1:26

L LA(6) - 1:17, 1:32,

13:19, 13:21, 13:41, 13:47 lack[1] - 11:43 lag (1) - 11:40 land [1] - 13:6 landlord [1] - 5:47 last(3) - 1:39, 14:32. 14:45 lastly [1] - 7:26 launched [1] - 4:38 launching (1) - 4:31 lead [2] - 11:3, 12:18 leading [1] - 14:29 lease (6) - 5:45, 6:9, 6:35, 6:40, 7:19, 9:18, 9:26, 12:36, 12:38 leased (1) - 6:2 teast | 11 - 13:33 leave [1] - 3:18 left[1] - 10:27 lenders [3] - 9:31, 10:5, 10:6 less [1] - 14:26 level [1] - 3:29 llcence (1) - 8:2 Limited [3] - 1:7, 1:8, 1:22 liquor [1] - 8:1 list(z) - 1:19, 1:36 listing [3] - 2:34, 4:35, 5:1 located [1] - 6:10 locked [1] - 5:8 looking [1] - 2:40 Ltd [14] - 1:20, 1:21, 1:23, 1:24, 1:25, 1:27, 1:28, 2:21, 2:27, 2:29, 2:30, 7:28

M

m'mm (8) - 6:34, 8:4, 11:20, 11:23, 12:29, 13:15 m'mm-hmm (6) - 6:34. 8:4, 11:20, 11:23, 12:29, 13:15 Madam [1] - 15:42 mailing (1) - 4:40 main [1] - 2:27 manage [1] - 5:28 Management[t] -1:20 management [2] -3:43, 3:45 March [2] - 2:13, 3:42 mark[1] - 5:35 mark-ups (1) - 5:35

market[1] - 2:38 massive[1] - 9:40 matterpj - 1:6, 11:18 matters [2] - 2:8, 3:46 mean (1) - 10:19 meetings |2| - 4:24, 4.26 mention (1) - 13:35 mentioned is - 5:46. 6:23, 14:12 merely (1) - 5:1 Michael [3] - 1:26, 6:6, 15:13 might[7] - 1:30, 2:46, 3:15, 9:20, 11:6, 11:41, 14:26 million [7] - 8:11, 8:19, 8:25, 11:7, 11:33, 14:42 minute (1) - 14:32 Mo [2] - 1:26, 1:27 moment[1] - 2:42 money (2) - 10:5, 14:26 monies (1) - 11:41 monitor[1] - 3:44 month [2] - 5:31, 14:30 monthly [1] - 4:6 most [1] - 15:10 moving(1) - 5:2 multiple (1) - 6:19

N

name [1] - 1:39 nature (2) - 10:13, 10:25 necessarily (1) - 15:25 necessary[1] - 15:4 need [8] - 4:10, 6:27, 8:41, 11:14, 11:15. 13:10 needed [1] - 7:9 needs [1] - 4:11 nefarious [2] - 3:4 negotiate [1] - 11:3 net [6] - 4:44, 9:34, 9:38, 9:43, 10:8, 13:2 never(2) - 8:19, 10:22 new [1] - 4:42 nisi (1) - 2:33 nominal [3] - 6:15. 6:43, 7:18 Nominee [2] - 1:8, 1:21 normal [1] - 4:6 notes [1] - 4:19 nothing [1] - 14:3

noticed [1] - 13:43 number [4] - 1:18, 2:2, 4:13, 5:4 numbered (1) - 6:2

0

obligations 121 -12:36, 12:37 obtained [1] - 2:33 obviously [7] - 4:5, 11:36, 13:34, 13:37, 13:44, 14:10, 14:25 occupation [1] - 4:19 office [2] - 2:22, 6:25 officerpj - 6:5, 6:8, 7:1 one [8] - 2:24, 3:3, 7:14, 7:20, 11:14, 11:16, 13:27, 14:47 ongoing (1) - 5:29 open [2] - 7:26, 16:12 operates [1] - 7:39 operating [3] - 2:14, 7:34, 11:34 operational (1) - 4:11 operations [3] - 2:37, 3:44, 11:37 operators [1] - 4:43 opposition [1] - 15:35 option [1] - 10:26 order [26] - 2:13, 2:33, 2:39, 8:47, 9:2, 9:15, 9:16, 9:46, 10:13, 10:33, 12:6, 12:21, 12:22, 12:23, 12:26, 13:45, 14:20, 14:21, 14:23, 14:36, 15:32, 15:34, 15:40, 15:41, 15:43, 16:20 ordered (1) - 4:47 orders [2] - 9:37, 9:39 outlined [1] - 11:38 overriding [1] - 9:18 overseeing [1] - 3:46 overview[1] - 3:33 owing [1] - 11:41 owned [1] - 2:26 owner [3] - 3:26, 5:47, 7:20 owners [10] - 4:43, 6:7, 6:22, 6:23, 6:26, 6:27, 7:2, 7:4, 8:36, 12:39 ownership [2] - 2:43, 3:6 owns [1] - 4:2

P5 [7] - 3:29, 6:40, 6:42, 9:36, 10:16, 10:26, 14:40 naid m - 4:4 paragraph (14) - 3:35. 3:36, 4:42, 5:3, 5:40, 5:44, 9:12, 12:30, 12:31, 12:34, 12:43, 12:44, 12:46, 13:1 paragraphs [1] - 12:47 parcel [1] - 2:26 parkade [8] - 2:25, 3:27, 3:30, 3:32, 6:1, 6:11, 8:34, 9:21 parking [38] - 2:3, 3:7, 3:10, 3:21, 4:27, 5:27, 5:41, 5:44, 6:9, 6:10, 6:19, 6:28, 6:29, 6:40, 7:8, 7:24, 8:11, 8:24, 8:44, 9:10, 9:18, 9:21, 9:36, 9:38, 9:44, 10:8, 10:31, 11:2, 11:7, 11:13, 11:19, 12:33, 12:39, 13:2, 13:25, 15:28 part [4] - 2:18, 2:19, 8:40, 14:10 partial [1] - 6:39 partially [1] - 6:22 parties (22) - 1:18. 1:28, 1:36, 2:3, 2:10. 3:19, 5:4, 6:20, 6:31, 8:28, 9:7, 9:20, 9:44, 10:8, 10:29, 10:38, 10:40, 12:16, 12:27, 13:37, 14:44 partles' [1] - 3:9 Partnership (1) - 1:22 party [9] - 3:1, 5:7, 13:38, 13:40, 13:44, 15:7, 15:9, 15:10, 15:11 path [1] - 5:10 pay [1] - 10:23 pending [1] - 9:39 people [1] - 11:25 percent[1] - 10:7 performance [2] -11:39, 11:46 perhaps (1) - 5:36 period [2] - 7:10, 7:14 perspective[4] -10:46, 11:15, 13:11, 15:24 petitioner(1) - 13:37 petitioners [4] - 1:41,

9:32, 11:12, 11:35

petitioning [2] - 2:28, phase (1) - 6:38 picked (1) - 4:19 plece (2) - 6:21, 6:46 pleced [1] - 7:18 place [2] - 14:21, 14:31 PM [4] - 1:4, 16:22, 17:4 point [9] - 2:11, 4:21, 8:29, 12:37, 13:35, 13:43, 14:45, 15:38, 16:4 position [1] - 15:16 positive [2] - 2:5, 3:24 positively [1] - 5:2 possibility [1] - 5:14 potential [2] - 3:14, 8:28 potentially (1) - 5:11 pre (1) - 6:37 pre-completion [1] -6:37 preclude (1) - 9:45 preferable [1] - 15:24 prejudice [1] - 9:6 prepared (2) - 4:37, 9:2 preparing [1] - 14:38 preserved (2) - 9:33. 13:45 preserving (1) - 9:6 presumably [1] - 11:4 pretty [1] - 4:21 price [3] - 3:20, 8:11, 10:24 private (1) - 4:42 problematic [1] -10:28 proceeding [2] - 2:32, 2:45 PROCEEDINGS [2] -1:4, 16:22 proceedings (2) -17:3, 17:6 proceeds [10] - 9:9. 9:34, 9:38, 9:44, 10:1, 10:7, 10:8, 10:9, 10:39, 13:2 process [11] - 2:10, 2:35, 2:40, 4:31, 5:2, 5:14, 5:18, 5:19, 5:29, 13:25, 13:32 professional [2] -11:40, 11:42 profile [1] - 4:40

profiled (1) - 4:37

prohibit [1] - 13:3

Properties [9] - 1:8,

1:21, 1:22, 1:23, 1:24, 1:27, 2:21, 2:27, 5:47 property [4] - 2:23, 2:37, 11:17, 13:27 provides [1] - 15:40 providing (1) - 7:46 purchase (8) - 3:20, 4:37, 5:13, 5:26, 8:11, 10:16, 10:24, 11:8, 14:40 purchaser [21] - 3:14, 3:16, 3:25, 5:22, 8:30, 8:38, 8:44, 9:5, 9:15, 9:28, 10:10, 10:42, 11:5, 11:6, 11:11, 12:33, 12:35, 13:10, 13:14, 13:31, 15:39 purchasers [5] - 11:1, 11:28, 15:2, 15:12, 15:13 purposes [1] - 15:4 pursuant [1] - 7:19 put [3] - 6:4, 11:31, 14:33 puts [1] - 13:30

Q

questions [3] - 11:29, 12:4, 14:47 quite [4] - 4:20, 4:29, 5:9

R

R&D(1) - 11:30 raise [2] - 14:34, 14:37 rather(2) - 9:41, 16:15 RCC[1] - 2:46 reached [4] - 2:2, 3:13, 10:15, 13:30 read(1) - 10:24 real (5) - 2:37, 6:1, 6:17, 11:18, 13:5 realistically [2] - 5:38, 14:12 really (5) - 3:8, 3:42, 7:9, 12:47, 15:36 reardon [1] - 14:2 **REARDON** [2] - 1:35, 14:3 Reardon (1) - 1:35 reardon's [3] - 6:39, 15:17, 15:18 reason [1] - 7:23 receipts [5] - 4:5, 4:22, 11:31, 11:32, 11:34

receiver[22] - 1:14, 2:36, 2:40, 3:8, 3:37, 4:19, 4:28, 5:7, 5:17, 9:4, 9:17, 9:22, 9:26, 11:3, 11:8, 11:13, 11:41, 11:44, 12:28, 12:41, 12:45, 15:19 receiver's [8] - 2:7, 3:34, 10:45, 13:22, 13:24, 13:36, 13:41, 15:1, 15:24 receivership [5] -2:14, 2:31, 2:39, 3:1, 11:47 reciprocal [1] - 13:7 recollection [1] - 4:25 recommendation(1) reconciliations [1] -4:7 record [1] - 3:34 recorded [1] - 17:6 recording [1] - 17:8 red (1) - 10:21 refer[1] - 1:30 reflected [1] - 12:23 regard [1] - 2:3 registered (1) - 3:31 regular (1) - 3:44 related [2] - 2:15, 14:44 relates [1] - 2:1 relation pj - 3:27, 4:1 relationship [1] - 7:27 relevant[1] - 14:47 remainder[1] - 2:25 renewal (1) - 4:12 report(8) - 2:7, 3:35. 3:38, 3:42, 13:36, 13:41 Reporter(1) - 17:17 REPORTER[1] - 17:1 represent(1) - 1:31 represented [1] - 7:13 required [2] - 2:36, 10:23 requiring (1) - 9:37 reservation[1] - 12:46 resolution [5] - 3:13, 5:27, 5:43, 8:32, 10:14 rescive (1) - 3:14 respect (3) - 6:40, 9:33, 12:39 respondents [1] -1:33 rest[1] - 4:41 restaurant [1] - 7:44 Restructuring [2] -1:15, 2:12

result (1) - 11:45 results [1] - 5:30 retained [1] - 9:38 retains [1] - 12:35 returns [1] - 4:8 revenue (1) - 4:18 reviewing (1) - 4:8 RFPs (1) - 4:33 Richmond [2] - 2:15, 2:16 rights ps; - 2:3, 3:9, 3:18, 3:26, 3:31, 6:21, 6:28, 6:41, 7:9, 7:11, 7:17, 7:24, 7:25, 8:1, 8:9, 8:10, 8:14, 8:15, 8:28, 8:31, 8:37, 9:6, 9:14, 9:20, 9:21, 9:30, 12:33, 12:34, 12:35, 12:46, 13:7, 13:44 road [1] - 15:36 Road [1] - 2:16 rolling (1) - 4:29 room [2] - 2:17, 4:36 rooms(1) - 4:14 roughly [1] - 14:16 running [3] - 4:45, 5:14, 11:37 runs [1] - 7:33 rushing [1] - 5:34

S

sale (10) - 2:9, 2:38, 4:16, 4:31, 8:3, 9:29, 9:35, 13:27, 13:32, 14:13 saleability [1] - 3:11 sales [1] - 13:25 SANDRELLI [35] -1:10, 1:12, 1:45, 1:47, 6:13, 6:15, 6:35, 6:45, 6:47, 7:23, 7:29, 7:31, 7:34, 7:37, 7:42, 8:5, 8:14, 8:17, 8:27, 10:18, 10:44, 11:21, 11:24, 12:9, 12:11, 12:14, 12:30, 13:16, 13:40, 15:47, 16:3, 16:10, 16:13, 16:17, 16:19 Sandrelli [7] - 1:11. 1:12, 1:42, 12:10, 15:34, 15:44, 15:46 satisfy [1] - 13:14 schedule (2) - 16:1. 16:15 scheduled (1) - 5:5 search(1) - 6:5

send [1] - 8:18 sense (3) - 2:19, 6:18, 11:16 separate(1) - 12:18 September (4) - 5:39, 14:12, 14:29, 16:2 Services [1] - 4:1 services [3] - 4:12, 7:45, 7:47 set [5] - 3:40, 4:36, 5:21, 5:23, 12:15 settlement[11] - 2:2, 2:9, 9:1, 9:13, 10:14, 12:14, 12:21, 12:23, 12:25, 12:31, 14:10 several (1) - 8:28 SFT[1] - 1:24 shall (2) - 9:33, 9:37 share [1] - 2:24 she/her[1] - 1:13 sheet[1] - 5:12 shop[1] - 7:44 short[1] - 6:36 shorter[1] - 7:14 shortly [1] - 9:47 side [2] - 4:16, 15:17 sides [1] - 14:44 signed [2] - 8:46, 15:41 significant(1) - 11:36 significantly (1) - 4:23 similariy (1) - 11:11 SISP (1) - 4:47 site [1] - 5:5 sits [2] - 2:25, 4:2 situation [2] - 4:5, 13:25 skili (1) - 17:7 slower[1] - 4:18 sole (2) - 6:5, 6:8 sort (10) - 2:17, 2:41, 3:17, 5:29, 5:30, 5:44, 6:11, 9:18, 13:8, 15:1 sorted [1] - 8:2 sorting [1] - 4:5 sought [2] - 9:46, 15:40 sound [1] - 17:6 spent[1] - 5:10 spring (1) - 4:17

second (1) - 10:22

secured [1] - 2:28

see [8] - 5:30, 6:14,

7:22, 7:41, 8:26,

selling (1) - 15:9

seeking [3] - 3:38, 8:6,

14:20

10:13

stabilize m - 3:44 stakeholders[1] -3:12 stalking [3] - 5:11, 5:12, 5:19 stall is - 6:30, 9:14. 9:38, 12:40, 13:2 stalls [17] - 3:10, 3:16, 3:21, 3:28, 4:27, 6:10, 6:28, 6:41, 7:8, 7:24, 7:25, 9:36, 10:16, 10:26, 10:32, 14:40, 15:28 stand [3] - 14:9, 15:22, 15:30 standalone (1) - 2:19 standards (1) - 17:8 statement(1) - 11:30 stay [3] - 10:46, 11:21, 15:6 staying[1] - 15:22 still (2) - 12:37, 14:30 stop [1] - 11:25 straightforward[1] -10:3 strata [6] - 6:22, 6:26. 6:27, 7:20, 8:36, 12:39 structure (1) - 8:36 structured [1] - 3:7 stuff[1] - 4:6 style(1) - 2:32 subject[1] - 12:4 subleases [1] - 7:12 submission [2] - 15:5, 15:7 SUBMISSIONS [3] -1:45, 13:19, 14:7 submissions (2) -12:5, 15:31 substantive [1] - 10:4 sufficient (1) - 11:45 suggesting (1) - 3:4 summer(2) - 4:21, 11:46 Sunwins (1) - 1:25 supernumerary[1] -16:15 support [2] - 14:9, 15:31 suppose [2] - 7:24. 11:24

T

tab [1] - 3:34 table [1] - 15:39 taiks [1] - 14:20 tax [3] - 11:16, 11:17,

try [1] - 12:18

team [2] - 6:17, 13:5 ten (1) - 7:18 tenant [1] - 6:4 tenants [1] - 6:24 term (5) - 5:12, 6:12, 7:15, 9:31, 9:37 terminate [2] - 8:41, 10:36 terminated (1) - 8:45 terminates [1] - 10:34 terminating [1] - 9:25 termination [5] - 9:23, 9:25, 9:27, 12:42, 12:44 terms (28) - 2:7, 3:19. 3:22, 3:36, 4:14, 4:18, 4:28, 4:32, 4:39, 4:40, 5:14, 5:41, 8:3, 8:20, 10:4, 10:13, 10:23, 10:30, 10:31, 10:32, 10:37, 10:38, 11:42, 12:14, 12:21, 13:5, 13:13, 15:37 there'(1 [1] - 5:36 thereafter[1] - 9:47 therewith [1] - 3:23 they'vern - 11:34 three [3] - 2:20, 6:23, 6:24 timeline [2] - 5:39, 14:13 timestamp(2) - 17:3, 17:4 timing (2) - 11:44, 14:22 title [1] - 13:6 titles [1] - 13:7 took(1) - 8:17 top (1) - 7:3 Torontorn - 16:7 total [1] - 10:7 tours [1] - 5:5 towards [1] - 5:30 towers [1] - 2:22 town [1] - 4:28 Trade [4] - 1:23, 2:21, 2:26, 5:46 transaction (2) - 8:20, 12:1 transactional [1] -11:15 transcribed [1] - 17:7 transcript[1] - 17:5 transfer [2] - 8:9, 11:17 troubled [1] - 8:30 true(1) - 17:5 trust [2] - 9:39, 11:42

trying [1] - 10:35 turn [1] - 5:12

U

uitimate pj - 7:2, 7:4, 8:9 ultimately [9] - 2:34, 2:35, 3:13, 3:21, 5:15, 6:27, 7:10. 8:21, 12:16 uncovered [2] - 3:3, 3:5 under[4] - 11:35, 12:3, 12:36, 12:38 underlining (1) - 5:47 underlying (1) - 13:6 underway [1] - 2:10 Union [4] - 1:7, 1:20, 1:21, 1:22 unique [1] - 2:24 unit (1) - 4:2 unknown (1) - 1:36 unrelated [1] - 7:45 unrestricted (1) - 3:16 unsuccessful[1] -2:34 unusual (1) - 6:18 up [5] - 4:19, 4:36. 9:41, 12:8, 14:29 update [2] - 2:7, 4:32 updated [1] - 11:30 ups [1] - 5:35 upset [1] - 8:36 users [1] - 6:19 usual [2] - 4:39, 4:46

\

valuable (1) - 15:21 value (10) - 3:21, 8:22, 8:24, 9:7, 9:10, 9:35, 10:30, 10:41, 14:41, 14:43 Vancouver[1] - 1:2 variety (1) - 5:36 various (15) - 2:42, 3:5, 3:9, 3:12, 3:19, 4:3, 4:8, 6:29, 9:7, 12:25, 12:27, 12:38, 12:39, 13:8, 13:12 vendor[1] - 8:8 Venture [1] - 2:29 Versante [20] - 1:20, 1:25, 2:4, 7:12, 7:13, 7:18, 7:19, 7:20, 7:28, 7:32, 7:33, 7:34, 7:37, 7:46, 8:43, 9:24, 9:26, 9:32, 12:44

versus [1] - 1:7 vested [1] - 10:32 vesting [1] - 10:33 vetted [1] - 12:11 vis [2] - 7:39 vis-a-vis [1] - 7:39 voluntarily [1] - 11:26

W

walk (z) - 2:8, 3:17
website (1) - 4:40
weeks (1) - 5:37
weigh (1) - 11:13
whatsoever (1) 14:41
whole (z) - 6:25, 8:34
wonder (1) - 15:5
Wong (1) - 17:16
words (1) - 3:15
works (1) - 3:18
worth (3) - 4:44, 8:25,
11:28

Y

year[1] - 7:15 years [6] - 6:13, 8:44, 6:45, 7:15, 7:18, 8:38 Yeung [2] - 1:26, 1:27

Z

zero[1] - 11:12

Exhibit "B" referred to in the Affidavit of Chantelle Wilson-Cole sworn before me at Vancouver, British Columbia this 20th day of October 2025.

A Commissioner/Notary Public for the Province of British Columbia

Benjamin La Borie

From:

Sandrelli, John < john.sandrelli@dentons.com>

Sent:

October 15, 2025 10:20 AM

To:

Benjamin La Borie

Cc:

Peter J. Reardon: Federico. Cassandra

Subject:

RE: Hotel Versante

EXTERNAL EMAIL

Ben.

Just getting back to you on the below.

Given the Parking Settlement Agreement and Order, we did not opine on the validity of the security over the parking rights per se as we thought that best to leave to Fox Island and the competing parties to argue about.

Below is our conclusion in the usual form.

VI OPINIONS REGARDING LOAN AND SECURITY DOCUMENTS

Based upon and subject to the foregoing, and the qualifications set forth below, it is our opinion that:

- 1. each of the Loan and Security Documents is valid and enforceable against each Debtor party thereto in accordance with its terms;
- 2. the PPSA Security creates in favour of Lender A a valid security interest in the personal property collateral of each Debtor party thereto described therein, to which the PPSA applies (collectively, the "Personal Property Collateral") and in which such Debtor now has rights, and is sufficient to create in favour of Lender A a valid security interest in any Personal Property Collateral in which such Debtor hereafter acquires rights when those rights are acquired, in each case to secure payment and performance of the obligations described therein as being secured thereby;
- the Fox Island Financing Statements are sufficient to perfect the security interests created by the PPSA Security;
- 4. subject to and in accordance with Section 23(2) of the British Columbia Land Title Act (the "LTA") ITCP has good safeholding and marketable title to the Hotel Property; and
- 5. subject to and in accordance with Section 26(1) of the LTA, each of the Mortgages creates and is registered as a fixed charge on the Hotel Property, subject to no prior registered financial charges other than those indicated in Part V, Section B above;

John R. Sandrelli

National Practice Group Leader, Restructuring, Insolvency and Bankruptcy

My pronouns are: He/Him/His

[5]+1 604 443 7132 | [5]+1 604 889 3792

Dentons Canada LLP | Vancouver

This lawyer practices through a law corporation.

Dentons is a global legal practice providing client services worldwide through its member firms and affiliates. Email you receive from Dentons may be confidential and protected by legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, disclosure, copying, distribution and use are prohibited; please notify us immediately and delete the email from your systems. To update your commercial electronic message preferences email dentonsinsightsca@dentons.com. Please see dentons.com for Legal Notices.

From: Benjamin La Borie <blaborie@bridgehouselaw.ca>

Sent: Tuesday, October 14, 2025 8:28 AM

To: Sandrelli, John < john.sandrelli@dentons.com>

Subject: Re: Hotel Versante

[WARNING: EXTERNAL SENDER]

The main issue here is that Fox Island has indicated that they will - despite the consent order- be seeking a declaration of their entitlement to any parking proceeds. I haven't seen their materials but I imagine they are going to rely on their security.

The sweeping statement in the Report about the opinion might be something they rely upon despite our position that 1) they agreed to push this to another day and 2) our client says they were at all times aware of the leasehold structure of the parking.

I wanted to know whether the opinion considered the unregistered Head Lease or not.

Ben

On Oct 14, 2025, at 8:18 AM, Sandrelli, John < john.sandrelli@dentons.com > wrote:

EXTERNAL EMAIL

Ben.

We agree with you regarding ITCP and I will confirm once we discuss with Deloitte.

As for the opinion, we do not normally provide to third parties. I will consider your request further but is there something in particular you are curious about? As noted in the Report, we do not opine on the criminal interest rate issue.

John R. Sandrelli

National Practice Group Leader, Restructuring, Insolvency and Bankruptcy

My pronouns are: He/Him/His

1 1 604 443 7132 | 1 1 604 889 3792

Dentons Canada LLP | Vancouver

This lawyer practices through a law corporation.

Dentons is a global legal practice providing client services worldwide through its member firms and affiliates. Email you receive from Dentons may be confidential and protected by legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, disclosure, copying, distribution and use are prohibited; please notify us immediately and delete the email from your systems. To update your commercial electronic message preferences email dentonsinsightsca@dentons.com. Please see dentons.com for Legal Notices.

From: Benjamin La Borie < blaborie@bridgehouselaw.ca>

Sent: Monday, October 13, 2025 3:57 PM

To: Sandrelli, John < john.sandrelli@dentons.com>

Cc: Peter J. Reardon (preardon@nst.ca) preardon@nst.ca>; Federico, Cassandra

<cassandra.federico@dentons.com>

Subject: Hotel Versante

[WARNING: EXTERNAL SENDER]

John.

I note that the Receiver's Report indicates that the Receiver would assign the operating company Hotel Versante Ltd. into bankruptcy to reverse its GST liability. However, the Notice of Application seeks the ability to assign "the Debtors" into bankruptcy, including ITCP.

As you know, this Receivership is limited to the property and business of the hotel. Unless I'm mistaken, a bankruptcy of ITCP would have the effect far beyond that, including terminating the Head Lease in its entirety and its other agreements. Given that the intent seems clear from the Receiver's Report, can you confirm that you'll be seeking relief limited to Hotel Versante Ltd.?

Furthermore, the Report indicates that the Receiver has received a security opinion as to Fox Island's security and seeks to make a distribution of net proceeds on that basis. Are you able to provide that to us?

Yours truly,

Benjamin La Borie

Lawyer | blaborie@bridgehouselaw.ca

Bridgehouse Law LLP
9th Floor, 900 West Hastings Street
Vancouver, British Columbia Canada V6C 1E5
www.bhlvancouver.com

Dir: 236.521.6150

Tel: 604.684.2550 Ext. 203

Fax: 604.684.0916

The information contained in this e-mail communication is PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL and intended only for the use of the party or parties named above. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify me at the telephone number shown above or by return e-mail and delete this communication and any copy immediately. Thank you.