

2023

Hfx No. 521470

Supreme Court of Nova Scotia
In Bankruptcy and Insolvency

IN THE MATTER OF: THE RECEIVERSHIP OF MERIDIEN ATLANTIC FISHING LTD., ROCKY
COAST SEAFOODS LTD. AND 9514228 CANADA INC.

Between:

THE TORONTO-DOMINION BANK

Applicant

and

**MERIDIEN ATLANTIC FISHING LTD.,
ROCKY COAST SEAFOODS LTD. and 9514228 CANADA INC.**

Respondents

**BOOK OF AUTHORITIES OF
DELOITTE RESTRUCTURING INC.**

Motion Date: Tuesday, June 11, 2024 at 2:00 p.m.

Sara L. Scott / David Wedlake
Stewart McKelvey
600-1741 Lower Water Street
Halifax, NS B3J 0J2
Telephone: (902) 420-3363
Facsimile: (902) 420-1417
**Counsel for the Receiver,
Deloitte Restructuring Inc.**

INDEX

Tab	Authority
1.	<i>Bank of Montreal v. Sportsclick Inc.</i> , 2009 NSSC 354
2.	<i>Edwards v. Edwards Dockrill Horwich Inc.</i> , 2009 NSCA 37
3.	<i>Rose-Isli Corp. v. Frame-Tech Structures Ltd.</i> , 2023 ONSC 832
4.	<i>Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp.</i> , 1991 CarswellOnt 205
5.	<i>Royal Bank of Canada v. 2M Farms Ltd.</i> , 2017 NSSC 105
6.	<i>Royal Bank of Canada v Eastern Infrastructure</i> , 2019 NSSC 297
7.	<i>Sherman Estate v Donovan</i> , 2021 SCC 25
8.	<i>Sierra Club of Canada v Canada (Minister of Finance)</i> , 2002 SCC 41
9.	<i>Yukon (Government of) v Yukon Zinc Corporation</i> , 2022 YKSC 2
	Legislation
10.	<i>Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act</i> , R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, s. 243, 247
11.	<i>Bankruptcy and Insolvency General Rules</i> , CRC, c 368, s. 6

TAB 1

SUPREME COURT OF NOVA SCOTIA

Citation: Bank of Montreal v. Sportsclick Inc., 2009 NSSC 354

Date: 20091117

Docket: Hfx 314220

Registry: Halifax

Between:

Bank of Montreal

Plaintiff

v.

Sportsclick Inc.

Defendant

Judge:

The Honourable Justice Patrick Duncan.

Heard:

November 10 and 12, 2009, in Halifax, Nova Scotia
Orally on November 12, 2009

Counsel:

Stephen Kingston and Benjamin Durnford, for the
Plaintiff
Christopher Robinson, for the Defendant
Dennis Pickup and Jonathan Saulnier, Articled Clerk,
For Third Party T &A Venture Properties Inc.

By the Court:

Introduction

[1] This is a motion that seeks an order to approve the sale by the Receiver of Sportsclick Inc. of a certain asset of Sportsclick, being the shares of a company known as Southprint Inc. The application is supported by T & A Venture Properties Inc., the intended purchaser of the asset, who is participating as an interested non party. The motion is opposed by Sportsclick.

Background

[2] Upon application of the plaintiff, Bank of Montréal, an order was issued on July 14, 2009 by the Registrar of Bankruptcy appointing Ernst & Young Inc. as the interim Receiver of Sportsclick Inc. and Sun Vette Racing Inc. pursuant to section 47 (1) of the **Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act** (Canada), R.S. 1985, c. B-3.

[3] Following appointment the Receiver offered the personal assets of the defendant for sale by tender, excepting the Southprint shares, which the Receiver characterizes as a unique asset.

[4] The Receiver learned that the defendant is the parent company of Southprint Inc. a Martinsville, Virginia, USA based company which carries on business selling hats, jackets, shirts, toys and other items with NASCAR logos and designs. It prepares various artwork to customer specifications and silkscreens these designs on apparel and other textile products.

[5] The evidence indicates that Sportsclick completed the purchase of all shares of Southprint on or about May 12, 2009. The CEO and sole director of the company is Jack Ross, who is also the president, CEO and director of the defendant.

[6] During its investigations, the Receiver determined that the plaintiff has a charge on the shares of Sportsclick in Southprint. It does not have direct security or other agreements with Southprint.

[7] The information initially gathered by the Receiver indicated the following:

- Southprint had a net operating loss of \$1.4 million in 2008 and \$1.04 million in 2007;

- Southprint lacked operating capital, was in default in payments to trade suppliers and licensors, and did not have access to a bank operating line of credit;
- the majority of Southprint's accounts receivable were factored;
- important licensing agreements of its' major products were tied to the personal relationships of a small group of management personnel within Southprint;
- that on the eve of the appointment of the Receiver in July, 2009, \$75,000 US was withdrawn from a then balance of \$76,000 US that Southprint held in a US bank. This was done on the direction of Mr. Ross. Because of the concern that this may have been done as a preferential payment, the Receiver acted as a catalyst to have the signing authority of Mr. Ross, among others, removed from the Southprint bank accounts.

[8] The Receiver sent a representative to the Virginia plant to do a preliminary review of the business and operations of Southprint. The information indicated that the company was downsizing with declining sales, employees and facilities.

[9] On July 31, 2009 the Receiver was presented with an offer in the amount of \$100,000 for the purchase of the Southprint shares. The prospective purchaser included the previous shareholders who had, only months before, sold their interest to Sportsclick. One of these persons was understood to be Butch Hamlet, one of the founders of Southprint, and a key player in the company's operation and management. The offer was reaffirmed in a letter of August 7 from counsel for the purchasers. It set 5 PM on August 12, 2009 as the deadline for acceptance.

[10] The fact of this offer was communicated to Mr. Ross and others associated with Sportsclick by counsel for the Bank of Montréal. He set out various adverse conditions associated with Southprint and states:

The Bank of Montréal is not prepared to fund a very expensive receivership of Southprint in the United States to take control and operate the company. In light of the real and adverse situation presented by Mr. Hamlet, the receiver has to consider acceptance of the offer.

[11] The Receiver discussed a potential sale of the shares to Green Swan Capital Corporation, a company that held a subordinate security interest against Southprint. It was not in a position to make an offer and so the Receiver entered into negotiations with Mr. Hamlet and others, sometimes referred to as the “US group”.

[12] In deciding to attempt a private sale of the shares, the Receiver considered the information identified previously, and also:

- that the assets of Southprint were fully encumbered, including accounts receivable factored to Amerisource Funding;

- the machinery and equipment were secured to River Community Bank.

This bank, in view of the default by guarantor Sportsclick (by its being put into receivership), made a demand for repayment of the debt owed to it in the amount of \$487,705 as of August 6, 2009;

- a review of the United States UCC filings and of the company financial statements indicated that there were multiple secured and unsecured

creditors of the company, which claims against Southprint assets would rank in priority to the plaintiff's security interest.

- that a legal opinion obtained by the Receiver indicated that under the laws of the state of Virginia, a claim by a shareholder to the assets of the company is subject to secured and unsecured creditors, making a shareholder a junior creditor;
- the Bank of Montréal again confirmed that it would not fund an action for the carrying on of the business of Southprint;
- the management team of Southprint was prepared to resign unless a deal was completed to assure the company's viability.

[13] The Receiver concluded that sale as a "going concern" represented the best option.

[14] A Nova Scotia-based group contacted the Receiver in mid-August indicating an interest in the Southprint shares. Believing that it should allow this new

expression of interest to be explored, it advised the US group who, as a result, withdrew their offer of \$100,000.

[15] No other offers were forthcoming and so the Receiver proceeded with a public tender of the Southprint shares owned by Sportsclick. This was also in response to pressure being exerted by Sportsclick management who favored a public tender process.

[16] An advertisement of the sale was posted in newspapers in Nova Scotia and in Virginia in four successive weeks commencing September 5, with the deadline for offers by September 30, 2009.

[17] In addition, Ernst & Young developed a direct marketing list of prospective buyers who were contacted and advised of the opportunity to purchase the Southprint shares. Of this listing, 17 groups requested and were provided a copy of the Information Package.

[18] The advertising costs alone are valued at in excess of \$24,000.

[19] Mr. Ross was also invited on various occasions to provide a list of names of any potentially interested parties for the purchase of these shares. No suggestions came forward.

[20] At the tender close date there was a single offer in the amount of \$25,000US made by T & A Venture Properties Inc. There has been representations by counsel for T & A that this is a company that is separate from the previous shareholders. The evidence provided by Mr. Kinsman, being the only evidence I have on this issue, is that it consists of individuals who currently have a managerial or operational role in Southprint and is the same group that previously made the \$100,000 offer.

[21] If the offer is accepted then it will barely cover the cost of the advertising.

[22] On October 13, 2009 Justice McDougall of this court issued an order appointing Ernst & Young Inc. as Receiver of all of the assets, property and undertaking of Sportsclick Inc. with broad powers that included:

- 2 (i) To market any or all of the Property, including advertising and soliciting offers in respect of the Property or any part or parts thereof and negotiating such

terms and conditions of sale as the Receiver in its discretion may deem appropriate;

(j) To apply for any vesting order or other orders necessary to convey the Property or any part of parts thereof to a purchaser or purchasers thereof, free and clear of any liens or encumbrances affecting such property;

(o) to exercise any shareholder ... rights which the Company may have; and

(p) take any steps reasonably incidental to the exercise of these powers.

[23] The Receiver has recommended to this court that it approve the sale of the Southprint shares for the sum of \$25,000US because this is the value which presented itself to the Receiver when the asset was widely exposed to the market for sale, and after Sportsclick's principals and others (such as Green Swan capital Corporation) were consulted for assistance with marketing the asset.

Position of Sportsclick

[24] Jack Ross, in his affidavit, concisely sets out the basis of the defendant's opposition to approval of the sale.

[25] He says that the value of Southprint was, “...after considerable effort and due diligence, determined to be in the region of \$4 million as at the date of acquisition by May 12, 2009.” He rejects the suggestion that the assets deteriorated to \$25,000US.

[26] He says that from the commencement of the receivership until September 2, 2009 the Southprint bank balance “consistently averaged \$200,000 +” which challenges the accuracy of the assertions that there were cash flow problems in Southprint.

[27] He questions the effort expended by the Receiver in trying to achieve reasonable value for the asset alleging that the Receiver acted improvidently, without commercial reasonableness, and without regard for the best interests of the shareholders and creditors of Sportsclick. He maintains that the assistance and guidance of members of the Sportsclick management group should have been utilized to achieve reasonable value for the shares.

[28] In his submissions, counsel for the defendant expanded on these points. He argues that there were several failings of the Receiver which led to the current situation:

- that there is no evidence before the court to demonstrate that the Receiver conducted a proper valuation of the asset at any point during the receivership;
- that in eliminating the participation of Sportsclick management from a position where they could oversee the operations of Southprint, and by allowing the previous shareholders and management group of Southprint to have unfettered control of the company, the Receiver created the current situation where those same people are able to inhibit the marketability of the asset by threatening to withdraw or engage in activities that would be detrimental to the value of Southprint;
- that the most current value by which the offer should be measured is the acquisition price paid in May, 2009 which is so substantially more than the

amount offered in the tender process as to demonstrate that it is not commercially reasonable to accept it;

- that because of the unique nature of the asset, the marketing attempt of the Receiver was inadequate in that:

1. Newspaper advertising only referred to the “shares of Southprint” as being made available for sale. In Virginia the company operated under a different business name and so the Southprint name would not be meaningful to prospective purchasers;
2. The newspaper advertising in Virginia was confined to one paper with a circulation of 170,000 people;
3. The advertisement should have provided more detail about the nature of the asset in order to generate interest and should have been more widely disseminated through newspapers with larger circulation and broader geographic appeal;

- that the targeted group was not large enough.

Position of the Receiver

[29] The applicant submits that the nature of this asset, with its adverse characteristics for operation as a going concern, was unique and of interest to a very limited class of potential purchasers who it attempted to reach with its marketing efforts. It stands by the tender process as being a commercially reasonable effort to maximize the realization value of the shares.

[30] I have been referred to the principles set out in the decision of *Royal Bank of Canada v. Soundair Corporation* [1991] O.J. 1137 (Ont. C.A.) as addressing the criteria applicable to this court's review of the Receiver's sale of assets. I am urged that all of the criteria contained therein have been met.

[31] In response to the specifics of the allegations of Mr. Ross and Sportsclick the Receiver says:

- that Mr. Kinsman, acting on behalf of Ernst & Young in this matter, is an experienced and savvy Receiver who made adequate inquiries throughout to ensure that he understood the nature and financial characteristics of Southprint;
- that he was prepared to accept the risk in walking away from the \$100,000 offer which demonstrates his commitment to achieve the best possible realization value;
- that the advertising of the shares undertaken in the tender process was consistent with the industry-standard;
- that the Receiver generated inquiries from 17 different parties through targeted marketing efforts;
- that due to the position taken by the Bank of Montréal in refusing to undertake the management or control of Southprint there was no direct route to liquidate the assets of Southprint. Further that it would be subject, as a shareholder, to taking a junior position as a creditor;

- that in triggering the removal of Sportsclick's management from signing authority at Southprint it was acting to preserve the value of the asset. The Receiver was concerned that on the direction of Sportsclick management \$75,000US was transferred from Southprint to a principle of Sportsclick on the eve of the receivership in July. Fearing a preferential payment the Receiver sought to block future such transactions. The Receiver did not intend to, nor did it communicate to Mr. Ross that he was barred from otherwise taking an operational role in Southprint;

- And finally, that it has consistently invited the assistance of Mr. Ross, but that none has been forthcoming, except to the extent that Mr. Ross indicated he would assist in return for a six month contract paying him his then current salary of approximately \$10,000 per month, an offer that the Receiver rejected. Mr. Ross rejected a counter proposal to be paid on an hourly rated basis. He also did not respond to an invitation by the Receiver to present another proposal to assist the Receiver.

Law

[32] In *Royal Bank of Canada v. Soundair Corp.*, *supra*, Galligan J.A. set out at paragraph 16, the duties which a court must perform when deciding whether a Receiver who has sold a property acted properly, which duties he summarized as follows:

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

[33] Certain principles have been enunciated by the courts in consideration of these points:

- The decision must be assessed as a matter of business judgment on the elements then available to the Receiver. That is the function of Receiver and “... to reject [such] recommendation... in any but the most exceptional circumstances... would materially diminish and weaken the role and function of the Receiver both in the perception of receivers and in the perception of any others who might have occasion to deal with them.” *see*, Anderson J. in *Crown Trust v Rosenberg* (1986), 60 O.R.(2d) 87 at 112;
- the primary interest is that of the creditors of the debtor although that is not the only nor the overriding consideration. The interests of the debtor must be taken into account. Where a purchaser has bargained at some expense in time and money to achieve the bargain then their interest too should be taken into account. *see*, *Soundair* at para 40;

- the process by which the sale of a unique asset is achieved should be consistent with commercial efficacy and integrity. In *Crown Trust Co. V.*

Rosenberg, supra, at page 124, Anderson J. said:

While every proper effort must always be made to assure maximum recovery consistent with the limitations inherent in the process, no method has yet been devised to entirely eliminate those limitations or to avoid their consequences. Certainly it is not to be found in loosening the entire foundation of the system. Thus to compare the results of the process in this case with what might have been recovered in some other set of circumstances is neither logical nor practical.

- a court should not reject the recommendation of Receiver except in special circumstances where the necessity and propriety of doing so is plain. see, *Crown Trust Co., supra*.

ANALYSIS

[34] I agree that the shares of Southprint presented as a unique or unusual asset. Southprint opened in 1991 and began operating under that name in 1992. It developed a customer base of large branded companies that grew to include Adidas, Big Dog Sportswear, J. America (college licensee), and MJ Soffe (U.S. Army exclusive licensee). In 1994 it purchased Checkered Flag Sports and

developed and marketed NASCAR apparel to retail outlets. It was owned and managed privately, with Mr. Hamlet being the president and majority shareholder.

[35] The evidence suggests the company became successful on the strength of the personal relationships of its management team, particularly with the licensors whose business was crucial to the viability of the company.

[36] Sportsclick had a Business Acquisition Plan that was intended to improve profitability in a relatively short time. i.e. within 12 months of acquisition.

However, two months after acquisition, Southprint was in receivership and unable to carry out its plan.

[37] While Sportsclick made some initial changes to the operations of Southprint, including financing and some staffing changes, it does not appear from the evidence that it had any major influence on the operations. There is no evidence that Sportsclick provided an infusion of capital for Southprint nor did anything that substantially attacked the problems affecting its financial operating capabilities.

[38] In consequence thereof, the previous management team, that included its founders, remained in place. They have continued to operate the business under the benign oversight of the Receiver who has made it clear that it was never in the Receiver's mandate to operate or manage Southprint. There is no persuasive evidence on which to conclude that the financial situation of Southprint has improved.

[39] The prospective purchaser, I am told, includes members of the current management team. Those persons have threatened to walk away from the business if a purchaser is not in place to guarantee the financial viability of the company. Their participation in the operation of the company at this time is crucial if it is to continue as a going concern.

[40] The defendant complains that this is a situation that should not have been allowed to take place and that it has negatively impacted on the market for the shares of Southprint. The inference I am asked to draw is that either by the continued involvement of the Sportsclick management team, or the more active oversight of the Receiver, the shares of this company would have made a more attractive buying opportunity. It is also suggested that the equity in the assets

alone should attract a substantially greater purchase price. All of this presupposes that there is a person or company who sees that potential as significant enough to offset the problems that acquisition will inevitably entail.

[41] The Receiver says that the market place determines value and that the marketplace has spoken. No one agrees with the defendant's view of the value that this opportunity presents. Only T & A has an interest now.

[42] For its part the Bank of Montreal, a significant secured creditor of Sportsclick, has also accepted that it is not worth pumping more money into selling the shares. They have gauged the marketplace and obviously have come to the same conclusion as the Receiver.

[43] Neither have other creditors stepped up to offer, even a dollar, to acquire these shares in hopes of somehow realizing some greater return, in a break up of the assets of Southprint, or as a going concern.

[44] Unfortunately there is no evidence on which I could conclude that any marketing scheme would attract a better price or more interest. It is speculative to

suggest that it would. It is not sufficient, in my mind, to challenge the business judgment of an experienced Receiver on the basis of speculation.

[45] The underlying assumption of the defendant's argument is that the limited interest in the company is derived from the Receiver's handling of the company and the marketing effort. In support of this view, I have been referred to the valuation put on Southprint by Sportsclick at the time of purchase which closed in May, 2009.

[46] It is suggested that that is the best, if not the only reliable way to measure the value of the shares.

[47] I have examined Southprint's financial statements, the PWC due diligence draft report of January 2009 and the Southclick Inc. Business and Acquisition Plan, also dated January 2009. I have also considered the affidavits of Jack Ross.

[48] The following is a snapshot of what I view as indicators of the relative financial health of Southprint in the years 2004-2008:

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Sales	20.1 M	18.8 M	16.7 M	14.01 M	13.9 M
Operating Loss	601.5 K	221 K	398 K	1.38 M	1.73 M
Net Operating Loss	396 K	242 K	306 K	1.04 M	1.4 M

[49] As can be seen, sales were dropping long before the current economic downturn. Net operating losses climbed to the point where they totaled \$2.44 million on sales of \$28 million in the last 2 years before Sportsclick made its purchase.

[50] Southprint was reliant for day to day operations on approximately \$4.0 million in financing that was dependent on its then shareholders' personal financing backed by a traditional lender. It closed one plant in 2008, cut back shifts, laid off employees and in January 2009 closed completely for a short period of time.

[51] As at January 2009 a number of the 2009 licencing agreements had not been signed, including the contract thought to have the most value. One account that had generated sales of almost \$2.0 million in 2007-2008 was not expected to be part of sales in 2009. It is not clear in the business plan how this significant loss of revenue was going to be replaced or how expenses were going to be controlled to off set such a loss.

[52] Notwithstanding its capital and real property assets Southprint is a company that has been in serious financial decline for several years.

[53] According to Mr. Ross's affidavit, Sportsclick acquired all of the outstanding shares of Southprint in exchange for the issuance of 6 million shares of Sportsclick to various of the former Directors and Officers of Southprint . The book value of the shares was \$3 million. The value of the Sportsclick shares on the TSX Venture Exchange at the close of business on May 12, 2009 was \$.15 per share, or \$900,000. In addition, shareholder loans owed by the two previous principals of Southprint were treated as goodwill and taken off the books of the company in a non-cash transaction. While I agree that the purchase price was

approximately \$4,000,000 in value, it was not put up in cash, which is the expectation of a Receiver.

[54] Put another way, there are certain methods of effecting a sale that would be available in an unfettered sale between a willing and financially stable vendor and a willing and financially stable purchaser that are not feasible on a liquidation. It is one of the reasons why it is common for assets to be sold off at significantly reduced prices in a Receivership from what might be negotiated in the ordinary course of business. In a liquidation the sale is typically for cash and is to be achieved in an abridged time frame. The longer the time extends, the greater the costs of the Receiver, and the greater the deterioration of the asset values to the creditors.

[55] The Sportsclick business plan for Southprint had the following general features:

- to improve the sales culture
- to reduce salary and benefit commitments by reducing staff and capping compensation

- renegotiating royalties
- reduction of some promotional costs
- to reorganize the financing
- to take advantage of the “synergies between Sportsclick and Southprint.”

[56] The result was predicted to reduce overhead by \$1 million.

[57] Sportsclick intended to sell 2 pieces of real property for \$150,000 and to obtain direct financing of \$4.0 million by factoring accounts receivable, mortgage financing, term financing and inventory financing.

[58] These forms of financing would be dependent upon the financial soundness of Sportsclick as the owner and guarantor. At no point does the plan speak to the infusion of capital by Sportsclick to Southprint.

[59] Under its current situation, Sportsclick has no ability to guarantee, nor to otherwise financially support the operations of Southprint. Creditors of Southprint

who stand ahead of the shareholder have seen this and issued demand for payment. Neither is there a prospect for the predicted benefits of the “synergies” between parent and subsidiary.

[60] Southprint can only survive as a going concern with a purchaser that has the financial ability and the will to take on a company that is now losing almost \$2 million per year on declining sales, has limited creditworthiness, and is largely dependent on the willingness of the existing management team to continue to use their knowledge of the company and of its existing business relationships to the benefit of Southprint.

[61] The Receiver has no mandate to operate Southprint. The only other option is to simply close Southprint down and liquidate the assets, hoping that the equity will cover the cost of acquisition. That option is not open to the Receiver in this case. None of the creditors of Sportsclick have seen fit to step forward to take on this challenge. Whether that is a good business decision is not relevant to the position of the Receiver, who can only act with the resources that it has available to it. As Mr. Durnford indicated in his submissions, there may be collateral issues to

this matter that arise for resolution in the principal action as between the Bank and Sportsclick, but that is not determinative of the considerations before me.

[62] Finally, I am urged to accept that the accumulated financial acumen of the management of Sportsclick in making this purchase is a reliable indicator of the accuracy of the value they attached to Southprint. With respect, even good business people fail as a result of unexpected conditions, or because of errors, some within their control, some beyond their control. In this case the fate of Sportsclick speaks to a business model that failed. I will not defer to the judgement of those who oversaw that failure over the judgment of the Receiver.

Conclusion

[63] In *Greyvest Leasing Inc. v. Merkur* [1994] O.J. 2465, the Ontario Court of Justice held at paragraph 45 as follows:

Commercial reasonableness depends upon the circumstances of the sale, including a consideration of variables such as the method of sale, the subject matter of the sale, advertising or other methods of exposure to the public, the time and place of the sale, and related expenses. A Receiver is under a particular duty to make a sufficient effort to get the best possible price for the assets. [See *Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp.* 1991 CanLII 2727 (ON C.A.), (1991), 4 O.R. (3d) 1

(C.A.).] This duty is not to obtain the best possible price but to do everything reasonably possible with a view to getting the best possible price.

[64] I am satisfied that the Receiver in this case did that. It is a most disappointing result for the creditors, and the debtor. It will at best cover some of the disbursements on sale. No one benefits greatly from this, except perhaps the principals of T & A, but the evidence suggests that they have significant challenges ahead of them to make this a profitable company, in difficult economic times. They may be the only ones who have the ability to do so.

[65] The decisions made by the Receiver were made in good faith, cognizant of the duties that a Receiver is subject to. It made business judgments that may be easy, with the benefit of hindsight, to criticize, but they were reasonable having regard to the circumstances in existence at the time. No alternatives to the targeted marketing approach have been shown to exist that would provide, beyond speculation, the potential for a greater return.

[66] The tender process, once decided upon, was carried out in a transparent and fair manner, consistent with industry standards.

[67] Having regard to the facts as set out herein, and the duties on a court as enunciated in *Soundair*, I am satisfied that the Receiver's recommendation should be accepted. I am prepared to grant an Order to give effect to the sale of the shares of Southprint to T & A Venture Property Inc for the sum of \$25,000 US.

[68] Delivered orally at Halifax, Nova Scotia this 12th day of November 2009.

Duncan J.

TAB 2

NOVA SCOTIA COURT OF APPEAL

Citation: Edwards v. Edwards Dockrill Horwich Inc.,
2009 NSCA 37

Date: 20090416

Docket: CA 298463

Registry: Halifax

Between:

Michael L. Edwards, M. L. Edwards Inc. and
Nican Incorporated

Appellants

v.

Edwards Dockrill Horwich Incorporated,
Minnej (N.S.) Incorporated, Michael
Dockrill and James N. Horwich, carrying on
business under the firm name and style of “Dockrill
Horwich Chartered Accountants”, Michael
Dockrill as principal trustee of the M. B. Dockrill
Family Trust and James N. Horwich, as principal
trustee of the J. N. Horwich Family Trust

Respondents

Judge: The Honourable Justice Roscoe

Appeal Heard: March 31, 2009

Subject: receivership, approval of receivers’ report

Summary: After a lengthy trial involving a dispute between partners in an accounting practice, the trial judge appointed two receivers to wind up the practice and to determine amounts payable by and to the parties based on his decision. When the receivers filed that report, one of the parties objected and applied to the judge to amend the report in several respects. The judge dismissed the application after finding the receivers’ report was reasonable.

Issues: Did the chambers judge apply the wrong test in dismissing the application or did the decision result in an injustice?

Result: With respect to all but one of the issues raised by the appellants, the judge applied the proper test in reviewing the receivers' report and there was no injustice requiring the intervention of the Court of Appeal.

However, with respect to the claim that the respondents may have received a \$40,000 windfall as a result of an HST input tax credit, the appeal court found that the receivers did not inquire as to the possibility of such a windfall and the chambers judge did not address the issue in his decision. Therefore, in order to prevent a possible injustice, the appeal was allowed to a limited extent and the receivers were directed to make the appropriate inquiries and report back to the chambers judge.

This information sheet does not form part of the court's judgment. Quotes must be from the judgment, not this cover sheet. The full court judgment consists of 7 pages.

NOVA SCOTIA COURT OF APPEAL

Citation: Edwards v. Edwards Dockrill Horwich Inc.,
2009 NSCA 37

Date: 20090416
Docket: CA 298463
Registry: Halifax

Between:

Michael L. Edwards, M. L. Edwards Inc. and
Nican Incorporated

Appellants

v.

Edwards Dockrill Horwich Incorporated,
Minnej (N.S.) Incorporated, Michael
Dockrill and James N. Horwich, carrying on
business under the firm name and style of “Dockrill
Horwich Chartered Accountants”, Michael
Dockrill as principal trustee of the M. B. Dockrill
Family Trust and James N. Horwich, as principal
trustee of the J. N. Horwich Family Trust

Respondents

Judges:

Roscoe, Hamilton and Fichaud, JJ.A.

Appeal Heard:

March 31, 2009, in Halifax, Nova Scotia

Held:

Appeal is allowed to a limited extent involving the HST input credit on the legal fees. In all other respects the appeal is dismissed per reasons for judgment of Roscoe, J.A.; Hamilton and Fichaud, JJ.A. concurring

Counsel:

Michael S. Ryan, Q.C. for the appellants
W. Augustus Richardson, Q.C., for the respondents

Reasons for judgment:

[1] This is an appeal from an unreported decision of Justice David MacAdam dismissing an application of the appellants to amend a joint receivers' report. The receivers were previously appointed by the judge after lengthy litigation regarding the dissolution of an accountancy practice (EDHI) and its associated management company (Minnej) formerly carried on by the individual parties.

[2] For the purposes of this appeal, it is not necessary to review the extensive background of the dispute between the parties which is set out in the decisions of Justice MacAdam. The decision after the 15 day trial is reported as 2005 NSSC 308. A supplemental decision, after several post trial applications, settling the form of order and providing more specific directions to the receivers, is reported as 2006 NSSC 157. The receivers, both chartered accountants, were directed to manage the affairs of EDHI and Minnej, ascertain amounts to be paid by the respective parties to give effect to the decision of Justice MacAdam, collect amounts owing to the companies, pay the proper creditors of the companies and distribute the balance to the shareholders. The order after trial provided 25 additional clauses of specific directions to the receivers.

[3] The receivers filed their 26 page final report with Justice MacAdam on June 21, 2007. As a result of their analysis, the receivers reported that the individual parties were to pay EDHI / Minnej the following amounts: Mr. Edwards - \$117,069.75, Mr. Dockrill - \$35,114.09 and Mr. Horwich - \$35,200.82. The receivers concluded that after payment into the corporate entities of the various amounts owed and payment of all accounts owed by the companies, there would be very little, if any, in surplus funds left to distribute to the shareholders. Mr. Edwards sought numerous clarifications from the receivers who provided further explanation of their conclusions in correspondence to Justice MacAdam.

[4] The appellants then brought an application heard by Justice MacAdam on May 1, 2008 seeking to amend the receivers' report. Specifically, the appellants sought changes, corrections or additions to the report regarding: the extent of the obligation of EDHI to reimburse Messrs. Dockrill and Horwich for legal fees and disbursements they paid to defend the action against EDHI by Mr. Edwards, the payment of directors fees, the calculation of amounts due to the shareholders, the taxation of the legal accounts payable by EDHI, an input HST tax credit on the legal fees, and the cash disbursements made by EDHI.

[5] Justice MacAdam found that there was no excess of power, fraud or lack of *bona fides* on behalf of the receivers and therefore the question was whether the receivers' report was reasonable. He also adopted the test established in **Crown Trust Co. v. Rosenberg** (1987), 39 D.L.R. (4th) 526 (Ont. High Court) where Anderson, J., stated at page 548:

. . . The court ought not to sit as on appeal from the decision of the Receiver, reviewing in minute detail every element of the process by which the decision is reached. To do so would be a futile and duplicitous exercise. The court ought not to embark on a process analogous to the trial of a claim by an unsuccessful bidder for something in the nature of specific performance. The court should not proceed against the recommendations of its Receiver except in special circumstances and where the necessity and propriety of doing so are plain. Any other rule or approach would emasculate the role of the Receiver and make it almost inevitable that the final negotiation of every sale would take place on the motion for approval.

In all of this it is necessary to keep in mind not only the function of the court but the function of the Receiver. The Receiver is selected and appointed having regard for experience and expertise in the duties which are involved. It is the function of the Receiver to conduct negotiations and to assess the practical business aspects of the problems involved in the disposition of the assets.

and at page 550:

It is equally clear, in my view, though perhaps not so clearly enunciated, that it is only in an exceptional case that the courts will intervene and proceed contrary to the Receiver's recommendations if satisfied, as I am, that the Receiver has acted reasonably, prudently and fairly and not arbitrarily.

And further at page 551:

If the court were to reject the recommendation of the Receiver in any but the most exceptional circumstances, it would materially diminish and weaken the role and function of the Receiver both in the perception of receivers and in the perception of any others who might have occasion to deal with them. It would lead to the conclusion that the decision of the Receiver was of little weight and that the real decision was always made upon the motion for approval. That would be a consequence susceptible of immensely damaging results to the disposition of assets by court-appointed receivers.

[6] Justice MacAdam found that the appellants did not meet the test of finding that the report was unreasonable or that there were exceptional circumstances

requiring the court to intervene and amend the receivers' report and he therefore dismissed the application. He indicated that if the appellants wanted further calculations to be done by the receivers, they would have to pay the receivers' fees.

[7] The grounds of appeal raised by the appellants are:

.. that MacAdam, J. erred in fact and in law in dismissing the Appellants' application for an Order directing the Receivers to amend their Report dated June 21, 2007 as follows:

- (1) by determining that the Respondents, Michael Dockrill and James N. Horwich, and their respective corporations, shall not be entitled to any indemnification in respect of legal costs which they incurred in this proceeding including, for greater certainty, costs associated with preparation of the report of Susan MacMillan at Grant Thornton and their attendance on the trial of this proceeding;
- (2) by determining whether the Respondents have claimed and recovered as an input tax credit harmonized sales tax in the approximate amount of \$40,000, being a component of the legal accounts rendered to them in this proceeding;
- (3) by performing the income calculation and allocation directed by paragraph 19 of the order granted by MacAdam, J. December 28, 2006 as amended January 15, 2007;
- (4) by pursuing taxation of all legal accounts rendered to or borne by the Respondents, Edwards Dockrill Horwich Incorporated and Minnej (N.S.) Incorporated in this proceeding;
- (5) by amending adjustment (d) to the report by reflecting \$9,000 due to the Respondent Edwards Dockrill Horwich Incorporated as a reimbursement of harmonized sales tax funded by this Respondent for the benefit of the Respondent, Dockrill Horwich Chartered Accountants with 50% of such amount to be due and owing by each of the Respondents Michael Dockrill and James N. Horwich.

[8] The judge's order was discretionary and although interlocutory, it was a final disposition in respect to the issues involving the receivers' report. Therefore the appropriate standard of review here is whether there was an error of law resulting in an injustice. See: **Canada (Attorney General) v. Foundation Co. of Canada Ltd. et al** (1990), 99 N.S.R. (2d) 327 (C.A.); **Frank v. Purdy Estate**

(1995), 142 N.S.R. (2d) 50 (C.A.); and **Clarke v. Sherman** (2002), 205 N.S.R. (2d) 112 (C.A.).

[9] I am of the view that Justice MacAdam was correct to apply a reasonableness test. A similar approach was sanctioned by this court in **Re Hoque**, (1996), 148 N.S.R. (2d) 142 where Hallett, J.A. said:

34 ...The tests to be applied by a court reviewing the decision of a trustee appointed under the **Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act** or a receiver appointed by the court respecting the sale of an asset are substantially the same. Both a trustee under the **Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act** and a receiver appointed by the court must act in a reasonable and competent manner in the performance of their duties to the creditors. A difference between a trustee acting under the provisions of the **Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act** and a receiver appointed pursuant to a court Order, is that the trustee is governed by the **Act** and the receiver by the common law and the terms of the court Order. In addition, the trustee has the benefit of a group of experienced creditors' representatives acting as inspectors who can bring their experience to bear on proposed dispositions of assets by the trustee. These differences do not alter the requirement that both trustees and receivers respectively act with integrity in a competent and reasonable manner.

35 When it comes to making business decisions relating to the sale of the bankrupt's assets, a trustee, with the authorization of the inspectors, must exercise reasonable business judgment. The trustee must provide advice to the inspectors equivalent to the advice one would expect from a reasonably competent trustee in the circumstances. Both the trustee and the inspectors are entitled to rely on legal advice from counsel for the estate. And, of course, a trustee must act with honesty and integrity. Finally, the courts should show deference to business decisions made by those entrusted by the creditors and authorized by the **Act** to make such decisions.

[10] Several of the appellants' arguments on appeal relate to the apportionment by the receivers of the legal fees between those payable by EDHI and the personal defendants. They submit that the apportionment was clearly unreasonable, that accounts for legal fees should have been subject to taxation and that the defendant should not have been reimbursed for the cost of the Grant Thornton expert's report. In addition, they submit that the receivers' failure to complete one of the tasks assigned to them by the order following the trial, with respect to the income calculation and allocation, should have been corrected by the chambers judge. Another complaint involves an adjustment for \$9,000 for HST in respect to the transfer of office furnishings between the corporate parties.

[11] With respect to these issues, I am unable to agree with the appellants' submission that Justice MacAdam erred in the application of the test in his review of the receivers' report. Having been the trial judge, he was very knowledgeable of the underlying issues and the specific directions he gave to the receivers following the trial. It is not the role of this court to second-guess the chambers judge and substitute our opinion for his, especially in a situation such as this where the judge was so experienced with the context and complexities of the litigation. To resolve some of the appellants' complaints would require a review of the entire trial transcript which is not before us on this appeal. In light of the significant deference owed to the decision under appeal, the issues noted above do not require a reassessment by this court. In my view, the judge did not err in legal principle with respect to these issues. Neither is there an injustice resulting from the decision which requires intervention of this court regarding these adjustments.

[12] However, the ground of appeal regarding the \$40,000 input tax credit for HST does raise concerns. With respect to this issue, the receivers failed to inquire into the question of whether the respondents may have received a windfall of approximately \$40,000 by receiving an input tax credit. The windfall might have arisen because they paid the legal fees of EDHI of \$309,324 including HST, and as a result of the receivers' apportionment of legal fees, they were being indemnified to the extent of \$296,421 including HST of approximately \$40,000, which they may not be required to remit to Revenue Canada. When asked by the appellants' counsel prior to filing their final report if they had considered that possibility, the receivers replied: "We did not take any steps to determine if the defendant's professional corporations recovered the HST."

[13] Although their application did not specifically refer to this issue it was squarely raised in the pre-application written submissions filed by the appellants' and fully addressed by the parties in oral argument in chambers. Unfortunately the chambers judge did not refer to this aspect of the application in his oral decision. The question becomes whether it was reasonable for the receivers not to make any inquiries as to whether the respondents received a windfall as a result of the HST input tax credit on the legal fees. Since the chambers judge did not answer that question, it is difficult for this court to defer to his reasoning. If in fact there has been a windfall, or the amount paid by EDHI to the respondents for legal fees was \$40,000 more than ought to have been reimbursed because of the input tax credit, surely an injustice would arise as a result of the chambers judge's failure to address the issue.

[14] In my view the appellants have raised a question about the receivers' report that should have been addressed. In the circumstances, the failure of the receivers to inquire into whether the respondents were required to remit the HST on the reimbursed legal fees to Revenue Canada, and if not, whether the respondents have been overpaid by EDHI, and to report their answers on these points to the trial judge, was unreasonable. If the chambers judge had found that it was not necessary for the receivers to make inquiries, or that their failure to make inquiries was reasonable, this court may have been restrained by the applicable standard of review from interfering. However, since the chambers judge did not address the issue in his decision, the decision is not subject to the usual deference.

[15] I would allow the appeal to a limited extent involving the HST input credit on the legal fees. In all other respects the appeal should be dismissed. I would order that the matter of the HST input credit on legal fees be remitted to the receivers to inquire into whether a further adjustment to the amount payable by EDHI to the respondents should be made on account of the HST on the reimbursed legal fees. The receivers should report their findings to the parties and Justice MacAdam within a reasonable time, following which any party may make further application to the chambers judge for directions and further adjustments.

[16] Given the divided success, each party should bear their own costs of the appeal.

Roscoe, J.A.

Concurred in:

Hamilton, J.A.

Fichaud, J.A.

TAB 3

CITATION: Rose-Isli Corp. v. Frame-Tech Structures Ltd., 2023 ONSC 832
COURT FILE NO.: CV-22-00682959-00CL
DATE: 20230202

SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE – ONTARIO

(COMMERCIAL LIST)

RE: ROSE-ISLI CORP., 2631214 ONTARIO INC., SEASIDE CORPORATION, and
2735440 ONTARIO INC., Applicants

AND:

FRAME-TECH STRUCTURES LTD., MICHAEL J. SMITH, FRANK
SERVELLO, CAPITAL BUILD CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT CORP.,
and 2735447 ONTARIO INC., Respondents

BEFORE: Kimmel J.

COUNSEL: *See Counsel Slip (attached)*

HEARD: December 15, 2022, January 6, 2023 (with further written submissions provided
on January 13, 2023) and January 26, 2023

ENDORSEMENT

**(RECEIVER’S MOTION FOR AVO AND CROSS-MOTION TO REDEEM AND/OR
APPROVAL OF CREDIT BID)**

[1] The court appointed receiver, Ernst & Young Inc., (the “Receiver”) of 2735447 Ontario Inc. (the “Company”) brings this motion for an approval and vesting order (“AVO”) and an order for ancillary relief. This proceeding has a unique procedural history that has resulted in several court attendances and interim endorsements.

[2] The circumstances are unusual because of the dealings between 2735440 Ontario Inc. (“273 Ontario”) and the Receiver, as well as the different interests that 273 Ontario has in the Property (defined below). 273 Ontario is both a second mortgagee that wants to be paid and a joint venture participant in the Rosehill Project that was to be developed on the Property. The Receiver was appointed upon 273 Ontario’s application under the oppression remedy, s. 248 of the *Business Corporations Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. B-16.

[3] This is the court's final decision on the Receiver's motion. It is also the final decision on 273 Ontario's cross-motion to redeem the Property or, in the alternative, for an order approving its credit bid in the court ordered sales process.¹

[4] For the reasons that follow, the Receiver's motion is granted and the cross-motion is dismissed.

Prior Court Orders

[5] Ernst & Young Inc. was appointed as the Receiver and manager over all the assets, undertakings and properties of the Company by order dated July 8, 2022 (the "Appointment Order"). This included the real property municipally described as 177, 185 and 197 Woodbridge Avenue, Vaughan, Ontario, and all proceeds thereof (the "Property"). These are the lands upon which the proposed "Rosehill Project" was to be constructed.

[6] The Receiver's powers under paragraph 3 of the Appointment Order include:

(j) [T]o market any or all of the Property, including advertising and soliciting offers in respect of the Property or any part or parts thereof and negotiating such terms and conditions of sale as the Receiver in its discretion may deem appropriate, and without limiting the generality of the foregoing, to take into account any offers to purchase the Lands or other assets of the Company that have been received and/or accepted to date as part of the sales process described in the Grossi Affidavit;

(k) [W]ith the approval of this Court, to sell, convey, transfer, lease or assign the Property or any part or parts thereof out of the ordinary course of business; provided, however, that in each such case notice under subsection 63(4) of the *Ontario Personal Property Security Act*, or section 31 of the *Ontario Mortgages Act*, as the case may be, shall not be required;

[7] The Appointment Order contemplates that the Receiver may seek court approval to convey, transfer or sell the Property and seek vesting or other orders as may be needed to convey the Property to a purchaser free and clear of any liens, encumbrances or other instruments affecting it.

[8] The prescribed responsibilities and powers of the Receiver under the Appointment Order are similar to those prescribed in insolvency situations when a receiver is appointed under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3. However, the Appointment Order was not

¹ It was noted that, as a practical matter, the latest version of 273 Ontario's credit bid would form the basis for the implementation of the right of redemption if that relief were to be granted.

predicated upon any finding that the Company was insolvent. It was made in the context of the within oppression remedy application commenced by 273 Ontario and others as a result of a breakdown in the relationship between the joint venture participants in the Rosehill Project.

[9] While the Company has not been declared insolvent, the Receiver suggests that it may now be. In any event, that issue is not before the court.

[10] When the Receiver was appointed, there appeared to be a consensus that the Property would be sold. While a credit bid from 273 Ontario was not ruled out, it declined to make a stalking horse bid.

[11] The Receiver developed a sale and marketing process in consultation with, among others, 273 Ontario. Although not required in light of the powers granted to it under the Appointment Order, the Receiver sought, and was granted, an order approving its proposed sale and marketing process. No party opposed the requested order and it was granted on September 12, 2022 (the "Sale Process Order"). The Sale Process Order authorized and directed the Receiver to commence the Sale Process (described in the Receiver's First Report) for the purpose of soliciting interest in and opportunities for a sale of the Property.

[12] The approved Sale Process was to proceed on an estimated timeline of 60 days and included the following: the retention of a listing broker, the establishment of a data room, the preparation of a confidential information memorandum, form of confidentiality agreement, teaser for prospective purchasers, the broker contacting potentially interested parties, a bid deadline of approximately 45-50 days for submissions by interested parties of a binding, irrevocable and unconditional asset purchase agreement (the "Binding APA") that was to comply with specified requirements (including a ten percent deposit, proof of financing and a closing date within five days of court approval, among other things) and the eventual selection of a successful bidder.

[13] The Receiver had the authority to extend the Sale Process timeline, acting reasonably, with a view to securing a fair and reasonable bid for the Property. The Receiver also had the authority to extend the bid deadline or cancel the Sale Process.

[14] Under the Sale Process, the successful bid and transaction would require court approval to transfer of the Property free and clear of all liens and claims, subject to any permitted encumbrances, pursuant to an approval and vesting order.

[15] The Sale Process allowed that "[i]f the Receiver receives one or more Binding APAs, it may, in the Receiver's sole discretion, negotiate with such bidders with a view to improving the bids received."

[16] The Sale Process required the Receiver to consider and review each Binding APA based on several factors, including:

Items such as the proposed purchase price and the net value provided by such bid, the claims likely to be created by such bid in relation to other bids, the counterparties to such transactions, the proposed transaction documents, other

factors affecting the speed and certainty of the closing of the transaction, the value of the transaction, any related transaction costs, the likelihood and timing of consummating such transactions, and such other matters as the Receiver may determine.

[17] The bid deadline was November 25, 2022.

The Motions

[18] The procedural history is somewhat lengthy but provides important context. It was detailed in the court's January 18, 2023 endorsement and is repeated, with necessary additions and amendments, for ease of reference herein. Capitalized terms not defined herein shall have the meaning ascribed to them in the Receiver's Reports filed in connection with these motions: the Second Report filed December 11, 2022, the First Supplement to the Second Report filed December, 19, 2022 ("Supplementary Report"), and the Second Supplement to the Second Report Filed January 25, 2023 ("Second Supplementary Report").

[19] The Receiver seeks an AVO, *inter alia*:

- a. approving the agreement of purchase and sale dated December 9, 2022 (the "APS") between the Receiver and ORA Acquisitions Inc. ("Ora" or the "Purchaser") for the purchase and sale of the assets, undertakings and properties of the Company (the "Purchased Assets"), including but not limited to the Property, and authorizing the Receiver to complete the transaction contemplated therein (the "Transaction");
- b. vesting the Purchased Assets in the Purchaser upon the closing of the Transaction, free and clear of all security interests, liens and the like, whether secured or unsecured; and
- c. ordering that immediately after the delivery of the Receiver's certificate confirming the closing of the Transaction, each of the Unit Purchaser Agreements (as defined hereinafter) shall be deemed to have been terminated by the Receiver and any rights or claims thereunder or relating thereto are not continuing obligations effective against the Property or binding on the Purchaser.

[20] The Receiver is also asking the court to grant an ancillary order (the "Ancillary Order") for, *inter alia*, the approval of: (i) the Receiver's actions and activities and statement of receipts and disbursements described in its Second Report, (ii) the creation of appropriate reserves for the fees of the Receiver and its counsel, future anticipated receivership expenses and a reserve for Registered Lien Claims (defined hereinafter), (iii) proposed distributions that would satisfy the first mortgage charge in favour of Trez Capital Limited Partnership ("Trez")² and the Receiver's

² After the court's endorsement of January 18, 2023, and just prior to the re-attendance of the parties on January 26, 2023, the Trez first mortgage was paid out and assigned to Toronto Capital. Toronto Capital is now the first ranking

Borrowings Charge (as defined in the Appointment Order), and (iv) a limited sealing order in respect of certain identified confidential exhibits to the Receiver's Second Report dated December 11, 2022.

[21] The Receiver's motion was originally returnable on December 22, 2022. It was adjourned to January 6, 2023 at the request of 273 Ontario. 273 Ontario, as a secured creditor of the Company, a joint venture participant and a bidder for the purchase of the Property, wanted the opportunity to make submissions on a more fulsome record regarding, among other things, the factors set out in *Royal Bank of Canada v. Soundair Corp.*, (1991), 4 O.R. (3d) 1 (C.A.). *Soundair* sets out the legal framework for the court to determine whether to approve the APS and Transaction.

[22] At the January 6, 2023 return date, 273 Ontario also brought its own cross-motion for an order permitting it to redeem the Property upon payment of the amounts found owing in priority to its second mortgage and asked the court to schedule a motion to disallow the Registered Lien Claims. Alternatively, 273 Ontario's cross-motion seeks an order approving its bid submitted on December 9, 2022 and supplemented on December 12, 2022 (the "Credit Bid").

[23] During the January 6, 2023 hearing, the court raised a question about the aspect of the relief sought by the Receiver that would deem the condominium unit purchase agreements (the "Unit Purchaser Agreements") to be terminated upon the closing of the Transaction. The Unit Purchaser Agreements were entered into by the Company prior to the receivership with purchasers of pre-sale residential and commercial condominium units (the "Unit Purchasers").

[24] Specifically, the court asked for the authority upon which the Receiver asserted that the interests of the Unit Purchasers are not affected by the requested order. The Receiver said (for example, in paragraph 94 of its Second Report) that this was predicated upon these Unit Purchasers having no interest in (or any claim to) the Property. This was also the basis upon which the Receiver determined that the Unit Purchasers did not need to be served with the Receiver's motion. The Receiver argued that the legal rights of the Unit Purchasers are protected by its proposal that deposits paid pursuant to the Unit Purchaser Agreements, and held by the law firm Schneider Ruggiero Spencer Milburn LLP, will be returned if the Unit Purchaser Agreements are terminated after the closing of the Transaction.

[25] At the court's request, further written submissions (reflecting inputs from both the Receiver and 273 Ontario) on this point were provided to the court on January 13, 2023.

creditor on the Project. Unlike Trez, it supports the position of 273 Ontario and the redemption right that 273 Ontario seeks to exercise. However, the court assumes that, if the AVO is granted and the Transaction with Ora is approved, Toronto Capital, now standing in the position of Trez, will want to receive the same proposed distributions that the Receiver had sought the court's approval to make to Trez to satisfy the first mortgage charge. That should be clarified before the final draft of the AVO is provided to the court to be signed.

[26] By an endorsement dated January 18, 2023, the court reluctantly further adjourned the Receiver's motion and 273 Ontario's cross-motion, for, among others, the following reasons:

- a. There may have been a misunderstanding between the Receiver and 273 Ontario about the importance and timeliness of the request by 273 Ontario for the Receiver to determine the validity of 273 Ontario's security and confirm the accepted amount of the 273 Ontario Loan and to determine the Registered Lien Claims. 273 Ontario considered both requests to be essential to its ability to exercise its right of redemption and/or make a Credit bid and to determine its essential conditions and structure. Once received, the prospect of an alternative transaction emerged (under the 273 Ontario Credit Bid or by virtue of the exercise of a right of redemption, if permitted) that does not terminate or disclaim the Unit Purchaser Agreements, albeit proposing to treat other stakeholders, such as the Registered Lien Claimants, less favourably than under the Transaction. The full implications of this have not been canvassed.
- b. Thus far, 273 Ontario's position on the cross-motion had been that its Credit Bid (or terms of redemption) will not include sufficient cash to establish a reserve for the Registered Lien Claims pending their final adjudication or resolution. Under these circumstances, the court would like to be satisfied that both Registered Lien Claimants are on notice of that position and have been given the opportunity to address the court on that issue in light of the cross-motion.
- c. While it may be reasonable to infer what the Registered Lien Claimants would prefer (to have a reserve established to protect their Registered Lien Claims until they have been determined), the court will not presume to know what the Unit Purchasers might say or what outcome they might prefer (particularly in light of the falling real estate market).
- d. There is a strong argument in favour of the Receiver's position that the Unit Purchasers have no interest in the Property and no right to any remedy other than the return of their deposits. However, this is not an absolute or guaranteed outcome. Cases on this point indicate that prejudice to those purchasers can be a relevant consideration. Even if their legal rights are determined by the Unit Purchaser Agreements, there are stakeholders whose interests (which can extend beyond strict legal rights) may also be relevant when the court decides whether to allow 273 Ontario to redeem the Property or to grant the requested AVO and Ancillary Order.
- e. Given that the termination of the Unit Purchaser Agreements is an explicit condition of the APS and sought as part of the AVO, and in the particular circumstances of this case, the Unit Purchasers should have been given notice of the Receiver's motion and the opportunity to respond to it. They may not oppose, or, their opposition may not be successful; however, they should be given the opportunity to be heard.

- f. The court would also prefer to be fully informed about whether the Receiver has valid contractual grounds upon which to terminate the Unit Purchase Agreements that it relies upon.
- g. Not every situation involving a deemed termination or approval of disclaimer of purchase agreements in pre-sale condominium projects in receivership will necessarily require notifying purchasers. Each case must be considered on its own facts. As noted, the legal rights of these purchasers may be limited, even if their interests are not necessarily limited to their strict legal rights.
- h. Prejudice (if it can be established) is also a relevant consideration. It is not just the prejudice to the Unit Purchasers, but also to the Registered Lien Claimants and to the Purchaser, that must be considered and balanced (along with the interests of the secured creditors and any other creditors that the court is typically concerned with on these types of approval motions).
- i. The Receiver will need to determine the most efficient way to put the Unit Purchasers (and perhaps the Registered Lien Claimants) on notice of the next return date and to set out a process for their positions, if any, to be coherently and efficiently put before the court.
- j. Pending the input of the Unit Purchasers, if any, the satisfaction of the condition of the APS that the Unit Purchaser Agreements be terminated or disclaimed remains uncertain.

[27] In the court's January 18, 2023 endorsement, the court cautioned that the Unit Purchaser's positions would not be the only, or determinative, factor. It was noted that when the matter returned to court on January 26, 2023, the determination of the two remaining substantive issues: a) the purported exercise of 273 Ontario's right to redeem, and b) the approval of the APS, Transaction and proposed AVO, will involve, among other things, the court's consideration of the interests of, and prejudice to, all of the different stakeholders whose rights and interests are impacted differently by the different potential outcomes: see *Kruger v. Wild Goose Vintners Inc.*, 2021 BCSC 1406, at para. 74; *BCIMC Construction Fund Corporation et al. v. The Clover on Yonge Inc.*, 2020 ONSC 3659, at para. 47; *Royal Bank of Canada; Ravelston Corp. Re.* (2005), 24 C.B.R. (5th) 256 (Ont. C.A.), at para. 40.

[28] The court foreshadowed in the January 18, 2023 endorsement that the ultimate consideration, involving the balancing of interests and alleged prejudices, may still favour approval of the APS, Transaction and AVO. That is in fact what has been decided.

Factual Background

[29] Much of the factual background was reviewed in the court's January 18, 2023 endorsement. Relevant portions, not addressed elsewhere in this endorsement, are recapped below in this section for ease of reference.³

The Project, Existing Mortgages and Sales Efforts Around the Time of the Appointment Order and Sale Process Order

[30] The Purchased Assets and the Property were part of the Rosehill Project, a joint venture between the applicants and the respondents for the development of a proposed six-story mixed use residential and commercial development. The Rosehill Project is anticipated to comprise of approximately 80 condominium units. The Company is the entity through which the joint venture was developing the Rosehill Project and is the registered owner of the Property. As at the date of the Appointment Order, 60 residential suites and one commercial unit had been pre-sold.

[31] Trez (an arm's length third party lender) provided mortgage financing to the Company, secured by a first charge on the Property that initially went into default and then matured in August and September of 2022.

[32] 273 Ontario provided mortgage financing to the Company secured by a second charge on the Property.

[33] Prior to the Appointment Order, the Company had begun marketing the Rosehill Project for sale. After the Appointment Order, the Receiver's efforts to re-engage with a pre-appointment prospective purchaser were unsuccessful.

[34] Before the court approved the Sale Process, the Receiver and 273 Ontario discussed the possibility of 273 Ontario being a stalking horse bidder or assuming the Trez first mortgage loan. 273 Ontario did not pursue either option at that time. The Sale Process did not foreclose the possibility of 273 Ontario making a bid.

The Registered Lien Claims

[35] The Receiver's First Report filed in connection with its motion to approve the Sale Process identified a construction lien registered by Capital Build on title to the Property for over \$2 million (the "Capital Build Lien"). When the Sale Process was approved, the Receiver had not completed an analysis to validate the work performed to support the Capital Build Lien or its priority.

³ Counsel for 273 Ontario pointed out at the January 26, 2023 hearing (and counsel for the Receiver did not disagree) certain inaccuracies contained in the court's January 18, 2023 endorsement regarding the timing of registration of the Registered Lien Claims which are corrected herein.

[36] In addition to the Capital Build Lien, another lien is registered on title to the Property by an architect (the “KNYMH Lien”). The KNYMH Lien and the Capital Build Lien comprise the “Registered Lien Claims” and “Registered Lien Claimants” as the case may be.

[37] 273 Ontario indicated to the Receiver that it challenged the legitimacy of the Registered Lien Claims and its priority over 273 Ontario’s second mortgage. 273 Ontario wanted the Receiver to determine the validity of the Registered Lien Claims before it made its bid.

[38] In October 2022, 273 Ontario made a specific request of the Receiver to review and determine the validity of the Registered Lien Claims. The Receiver reviewed the supporting documents for the Capital Build Lien and concluded that it was insufficient. The Receiver has advised that it intends to bring a motion for court approval to disallow that claim. The Receiver also reviewed the KNYMH Lien Claim, but allowed it. The Receiver understands that parties interested in the Registered Lien Claims may dispute the Receiver’s determinations of their respective validity and priority. Moreover, it is expected that the court will eventually have to adjudicate their validity, amount and priority.

The 273 Security and Loan Amount

[39] On October 14, 2022, counsel for 273 Ontario requested that the Receiver review 273 Ontario’s security based on the supporting documentation 273 Ontario had provided. On or around November 15, 2022, counsel for 273 Ontario asked the Receiver to confirm whether 273 Ontario’s security was valid and enforceable. On November 18, 2022, counsel for the Receiver confirmed with counsel for 273 Ontario that its security was valid and enforceable, and that the Receiver accepted \$6,389,204 as owing to 273 Ontario, assuming a payout as of December 31, 2022.

[40] On November 21, 2022, counsel for 273 Ontario wrote to the Receiver objecting to that amount. 273 Ontario claimed that it was owed \$7,047,395.23, which included, among other things, interest to the July 16, 2023 maturity date of its loan (the “273 Ontario Loan”).

The Bidding Process

a) The 273 Ontario Bid

[41] The Receiver advised counsel for 273 Ontario that any Credit bid made by 273 Ontario must provide cash in the amount of the Registered Liens Claims. That cash was to be set aside until the final determination of the validity and priority of the Registered Lien Claims, or the settlement thereof.

[42] 273 Ontario had concerns about submitting a Binding APA containing a Credit bid by the bid deadline given that: a) the Registered Lien Claims, which 273 Ontario did not believe were legitimate, had not been determined and 273 Ontario was not certain it could raise sufficient financing to satisfy both the Trez mortgage as well as the Registered Lien Claimants; and b) there was a discrepancy between the calculations of the Receiver and 273 Ontario as to the amount outstanding of the 273 Ontario Loan and that could be applied to the Credit bid.

[43] Counsel for 273 Ontario asked that the Receiver take no steps to “declare a winning bid or disregard [his] client’s bid” until the hearing of a proposed motion to extend the bid deadline, proposed to be scheduled on November 29, 2022. Counsel for the Receiver advised counsel for 273 Ontario that the Receiver had discretion to extend the November 25, 2022 bid deadline if necessary.

[44] Regardless of what may, or may not, have transpired in the lead up to the November 25, 2022 bid deadline, counsel for the Receiver worked with counsel for 273 Ontario to attempt to address 273 Ontario’s concerns thereafter. This included a suggestion that 273 Ontario submit a Credit bid which: (i) was conditional on the Registered Lien Claims being resolved to its satisfaction, and (ii) provided for a Credit bid of 273 Ontario’s debt of not less than a specified amount. Counsel for the Receiver advised counsel for 273 Ontario that the Receiver would consider any written offer made by 273 Ontario by the bid deadline, and that no motion was necessary to extend the bid deadline.

[45] 273 Ontario submitted a non-binding letter of intent on the bid deadline. Even though it did not satisfy the requirements for bids under the Sale Process (nor was it accompanied by a commitment for firm irrevocable financing or a deposit), the Receiver received and considered its terms and continued discussions with 273 Ontario thereafter.

[46] By December 2, 2022, the amount in dispute between the Receiver’s alleged amount owed under the 273 Ontario Loan, and 273 Ontario’s alleged amount owed, was about \$700,000. The Receiver advised 273 Ontario that it would accept, for the sole purpose of 273 Ontario’s Credit bid, 273 Ontario’s claim that \$7,047,395.23 was owed under the 273 Ontario Loan.

b) Ora and other Bids

[47] Ora and two other bidders submitted bids compliant with the requirements under the Sale Process on the bid deadline of November 25, 2022. The Receiver negotiated with Ora with respect to various terms of its bid. The result was that the Ora submitted an unconditional, all cash, Binding APA on December 7, 2022 (the “Ora Binding APA”), a requirement of which is that all Unit Purchaser Agreements and the unit deposits received thereunder be excluded from the Purchased Assets (as defined in the Ora Binding APA).

c) Request for Binding APA from 273 Ontario

[48] After receiving the unconditional, executed Ora Binding APA on December 7, 2022, the Receiver asked 273 Ontario to submit a Binding APA with proof of financing and a deposit by December 9, 2022.

[49] On Friday December 9, 2022, 273 Ontario submitted its Credit Bid. The bid was conditional on financing (but accompanied by a commitment letter) and was submitted with an unconditional Binding APA that the Receiver could accept.

d) The Receiver’s Decision

[50] The Receiver evaluated the Credit Bid and determined that it had significant risk around both the certainty of closing and 273 Ontario's ability to pay the cash component of the purchase price that was dependent on financing, which was itself contingent.

[51] The Receiver thereafter decided to accept the Ora Binding APA, as it contained fewer conditions, carried less closing risk and had a greater certainty of recovery for creditors generally. The Receiver considers the Ora Binding APA to represent the best executable offer received in the Sale Process. The Receiver accepted the Ora Binding APA on December 10, 2022.⁴

[52] On Monday, December 12, 2022, 273 Ontario supplemented its Credit Bid with financing commitments sufficient to pay certain priority payables, including the Trez Loan and the Receiver's Borrowing Charge, but not the Registered Lien Claims. Rather, the Credit Bid contains a closing condition that requires the Registered Lien Claims to be withdrawn or declared by the court to be invalid or dismissed. The Credit Bid does not require the termination or vesting out of the Unit Purchaser Agreements.

[53] After accepting the Ora Binding APA, the Receiver received and considered some additional material and terms presented by 273 Ontario. The Receiver attempted to facilitate a settlement between Ora and 273 Ontario that involved 273 Ontario paying a break fee to Ora. There appeared to be a settlement but 273 subsequently advised that it was not prepared to proceed with that settlement in advance of the initial return date of the Receiver's motion on December 15, 2022. This led to the request by 273 Ontario for an adjournment so that it could bring its cross-motion and make further submissions in opposition to the Receiver's motion (that procedural history is discussed above).

The APS

[54] The APS (comprised of the Ora Binding APA accepted by the Receiver) requires that title to the Property be vested in the Purchaser free and clear of the Unit Purchaser Agreements. As such, the proposed AVO vests out the Unit Purchaser Agreements.

[55] The net sale proceeds under the APS are expected to repay the first mortgage in full, and, subject to the final determination of the Registered Lien Claims, part of the 273 Ontario mortgage.

[56] Since the Property is to be transferred free and clear of all encumbrances and the Registered Lien Claims have not been finally determined, the Receiver seeks approval to hold

⁴ There was some discrepancy in the evidence about the date on which the Ora Binding APA was accepted, but it was confirmed during the January 26, 2023 hearing to have been accepted on December 10, 2022.

back the following amounts comprising a proposed reserve for Registered Lien Claims (the “Reserve”) until the Registered Lien Claims have been finally determined or resolved:

- a. Until such time that the KNYMH Lien is resolved, the Receiver proposes to hold a cash reserve of \$259,211 from the net sale proceeds of the proposed Transaction, being the full amount of the KNYMH Lien, pending further order of the court.
- b. Until such time as the validity and priority of the Capital Build Lien has been resolved, the Receiver proposes to hold a cash reserve of \$2,000,665 from the net sale proceeds of the proposed Transaction, being the full amount of the Capital Build Lien, pending further order of the court.

[57] Ora has permitted its ten percent deposit to be held in a non-interest bearing account pending the court’s determination of these motions. It has also kept liquid cash available so that it can close (with payment of its all cash purchase price) within five days of any court approval of the Transaction.

The Assignment of the Trez First Mortgage Position

[58] Trez gave notice of default under its first mortgage in August 2022. The mortgage loan matured and became due and payable in September 2022. The net proceeds from the Transaction are projected to exceed the amounts owing to Trez. As noted above, the AVO contemplates paying out this first mortgage in full.

[59] 273 Ontario advised the court that, since the hearing on January 6, 2023, it continued to work with its financier, Toronto Capital Corp. (“Toronto Capital”), towards redeeming the Property. To that end, Toronto Capital and Trez entered into a Loan Sale Agreement (and ancillary agreements) whereby Trez assigned the first mortgage charge to Toronto Capital (the “Toronto Capital Assignment”).

[60] Pursuant to the Toronto Capital Assignment, Trez was paid out in full on the first mortgage and Toronto Capital became the first priority secured creditor. This transaction closed, and the security was transferred from Trez to Toronto Capital on the morning of January 26, 2023, just prior to the hearing.

[61] Toronto Capital opposes the sale to Ora, among other things. As such, both the first-ranking (Toronto Capital) and second-ranking (273 Ontario) secured creditors now oppose the sale to Ora, and support either (i) the completion of the redemption of the Property by effecting a transfer of the Property to 273 Ontario; or (ii) the approval of the Credit Bid to effect a sale of the Property to 273 Ontario, both with the assumption of Toronto Capital’s interest such that it is preserved.

[62] 273 Ontario has advised that it incurred financing fees of approximately \$235,000 to arrange for the Toronto Capital Assignment, plus legal costs. These expenses are in addition to the amounts it has already spent funding the receivership and these proceedings.

Issues to be Decided

[63] The issues to be determined on the Receiver's motion and 273 Ontario's cross-motion were outlined in the January 18, 2023 endorsement to be as follows:

- a. Are there stakeholders who should have been served with the motions:
 - i. The Unit Purchasers?
 - ii. The Registered Lien Claimants?
- b. Does 273 Ontario have the right to redeem the Property?
- c. Should the Transaction and the APS be approved and the proposed AVO be granted?
- d. Should the Ancillary Order be granted?

Analysis

Preliminary Issues Regarding Service and Notice, and Updated Positions Regarding the Unit Purchasers and Registered Lien Claimants

[64] The service issues were addressed in the January 18, 2023 endorsement. The Receiver's Second Supplement to the Second Report provided the following updates and information arising out of that endorsement:

- a. The Receiver made efforts to contact the Unit Purchasers and their counsel of record to notify them of the motions and provide them with the link to access the court materials by email and phone. They were invited to respond to the Receiver if they wished to put their positions before the court.
- b. Some Unit Purchasers contacted the Receiver and all who expressed a desire to attend the January 26, 2023 hearing were provided with the video link.
- c. A number of Unit Purchasers attended the hearing (approximately 30), and three requested and were given the opportunity to address the court.
- d. As at January 24, 2023, of the 62 residential and commercial Unit Purchasers contacted by the Receiver, 32 indicated that they would prefer their Unit Purchaser Agreements be terminated, 9 indicated they would prefer their Unit Purchaser Agreements be maintained, and 21 did not respond, or responded without indicating a preference.
- e. The Registered Lien Claimants are represented by counsel on the Service List and both were served prior to the motion dates on December 22, 2022 and January 6, 2023. Capital Build's Bankruptcy Trustee, and the Trustee's counsel, were also served with the motion materials. KNYMH's counsel attended the January 26, 2023 hearing.
- f. The Receiver does not rely on the contractual provisions of the Unit Purchaser Agreements to terminate those contracts. The Receiver relies on the powers granted

to it under paragraph 3(c) of the Appointment Order “to manage, operate, and carry on the business of the Company, including the powers to enter into any agreements, incur any obligations in the ordinary course of business, cease to carry on all or any part of the business, or cease to perform any contracts of the Company”, as well as the court’s inherent jurisdiction as the basis for terminating the contracts and returning deposits to the Unit Purchasers.

[65] At the January 26, 2023 hearing, some Unit Purchasers expressed the view that they would like to receive their deposits back and to have their Unit Purchaser Agreements terminated, having lost faith in the Rosehill Project coming to fruition. Others indicated that they would like to see the Rosehill Project built and to proceed with their purchase. One purchaser in particular (who also provided a statutory declaration) emphasized the attractive location, its proximity to amenities and services for seniors in the area and the enhancements to their unit to accommodate their particular needs. This purchaser expressed concerns about retirement plans and the detriment to purchasers and the community over the loss of the Rosehill Project.

[66] In its submission to the court on January 26, 2023, 273 Ontario advised that if it is permitted to redeem or has its Credit Bid approved, it will provide the Unit Purchasers with 30 days to advise whether they wish to have their units put back into the pool of units to be sold by 273 Ontario going forward, and if such sales are achieved (without loss) then 273 Ontario will cancel their contracts without cost or penalty to them. 273 Ontario is prepared to have any court order approving the redemption or acceptance of its Credit Bid incorporate such a provision into the order.

[67] 273 Ontario also indicated that it is prepared to have any court order approving the redemption or acceptance of its Credit Bid contain the following mechanisms to preserve the rights of the Registered Lien Claimants pending the determination of their rights by the court as follows:

273 is prepared to bond off 10 percent of the respective amount of the Capital Build and KNYMH Liens. Alternatively, in the event the Court approves the 273 Credit Bid or permits 273 to redeem the Property, the resulting order can provide that KNYMH’s and Capital Build’s rights under the Liens are preserved in the Property to the extent they are found to be in priority to the 273 mortgage following the closing of the transaction.

[68] Counsel for KNYMH indicated at the hearing that as long as its rights under s. 44(1) of the *Construction Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. C.30 are preserved, and its lien is terminated on the basis of the payment of appropriate funds into court (the entire amount of the lien plus 25 percent for costs), or alternatively, its lien is preserved in the Property until such time as any process for the determination of the Registered Lien Claims has run its course, it takes no position on the motions.

Does 273 Ontario Have the Right to Redeem the Property and Should the Court Permit it to do so?

The Right to Redeem

[69] 273 Ontario argues that s. 2 of the *Mortgages Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. M.40 guarantees a secured creditor's right to redeem. According to 273 Ontario, "[i]t permits the mortgagor or any 'encumbrancer', such as 273 [Ontario] as [a] secured creditor, to 'assign the mortgage debt and convey the mortgaged property' to any person."

[70] Section 2(1) of the *Mortgages Act* entitles the mortgagor to require the mortgagee to assign the mortgage debt and convey the property as the mortgagor directs. The mortgagee is bound to assign and convey accordingly. Section 2(2) of the Act allows that right to be enforced by each encumbrancer. A requisition of an encumbrancer prevails over that of the mortgagor.

[71] The right to redeem is a right of a debtor, upon payment of a debt, to recovery the property pledged to a creditor as security for payment of a debt: see *Wild Goose*, at para. 69.

[72] In this case, 273 Ontario seeks to convey the Property to itself (and would have sought to assign the first mortgage debt to its financier, Toronto Capital, but that has now preemptively occurred).

[73] Neither the Receiver nor Ora appear to disagree with 273 Ontario's theoretical right to redeem the Property as the second mortgagee. While this typically arises in foreclosure or court ordered sales (under, for example, r. 64 of the *Rules of Civil Procedure*, R.R.O. 1990, Reg. 194), 273 Ontario's request to redeem it is not opposed on the basis that no such right could ever arise in the context of a court ordered sale process in a receivership.

[74] Rather, what the Receiver and Ora oppose is the timing of 273 Ontario's purported exercise of this right. They maintain that the court should not exercise its discretion to allow a creditor to exercise a right of redemption after a court-ordered Sale Process is in place and a bid has been accepted. Particularly in this case, a Sale Process that the creditor (273 Ontario) was consulted about and did not oppose when it was approved by the court.

Should 273 Ontario be Permitted to Redeem the Property?

[75] The Receiver relies on *B&M Handelman Investments Limited v. Mass Properties Inc.* (2009), 55 C.B.R. (5th) 271 (Ont. S.C.) to argue that 273 Ontario should not be permitted to exercise its right of redemption at this stage in the proceedings.

[76] In *B&M Handelman*, the court relied on the wording of the order authorizing the receiver to sell the subject property to preclude an automatic right to redeem. The court noted that in each case where the Receiver took steps to market the Property and to sell it in the ordinary course of business with the approval of the court, "it was exclusively authorized and empowered to do so, to the exclusion of all other persons including debtors and without interference from

any other person”: *B&M Handelman*, at para. 21. It was “[i]n the face of these provisions”, that the court precluded an automatic right to redeem.⁵

[77] The Receiver argues that the Appointment Order and Sale Process Order in this case should be read as containing similar language that precludes a right of redemption. I have not found similarly prescriptive language in the court orders in this case.

[78] Of more direct concern in this case is the impact that allowing 273 Ontario to exercise its right of redemption would have on the integrity of the court approved Sales Process. The policy considerations that weighed heavily on the court in *B&M Handelman*, at para. 22 are of equal concern in this case:

A mockery would be made of the practice and procedures relating to receivership sales if redemption were permitted at this stage of the proceedings. A receiver would spend time and money securing an agreement of purchase and sale that was, as is common place, subject to Court approval, and for the benefit of all stakeholders, only for there to be a redemption by a mortgagee at the last minute. This could act as a potential chill on securing the best offer and be to the overall detriment of stakeholders.

[79] These policy considerations are discussed in many of the cases decided after the case that 273 Ontario relies upon most heavily, *Bank of Montreal v. Hester Creek Estate Winery Ltd.*, 2004 BCSC 724, 2004 B.C.L.R. (4th) 149. They do not appear to have factored in the court’s decision in *Hester*, in which the court was unequivocal on the use of a redemption in a sales process:

[t]he integrity of the court process is not compromised by allowing a debtor or its trustee in bankruptcy to redeem the mortgaged property on the eve of an application to approve a sale of the property. Whenever there is a court-ordered sale process, it is always implicit that the conduct of the sale is subject to the debtor being able to pay off the secured creditor before a sale is approved by the court.

[80] The policy considerations inform the analysis in the cases decided after *Hester*, starting with *B&M Handelman*. Most recently, in *Wild Goose* at para. 74, the court noted that “[i]n a case in which a debtor seeks to redeem security after a sale has been negotiated by a receiver before a sale has been approved, consideration of the purchaser’s interest and the efficacy and the integrity of the process by which an offer was obtained *may* favour approval of the sale” (emphasis added).

⁵ As a result of *B&M Handelman*, the court in *Wild Goose*, at para. 67 expressly reserved in the court order Wild Goose’s right to redeem “that might otherwise be lost on the reasoning in [*B&M Handelman*].”

[81] While the court in *Wild Goose*, at para. 78 distinguishes *Hester* on the basis that all the secured creditors were protected by the redemption in *Hester*, the decision on whether to allow a redemption in *Wild Goose* still appears to have turned on the integrity of the sales process. At para. 80 the court notes, “[i]n my view, protecting the integrity of the sales process contemplated by the sale solicitation order outweighs Wild Goose’s claim that it should be entitled to redeem the petitioner’s security in the circumstances of the case.”

[82] What emerges from these more recent cases is that the integrity of a court approved sale process is an important consideration. If a sale process is found to be sound, it should not be permitted to be interfered with by a later attempt to redeem. Further support for this approach can be found in the court’s reasoning in *BDC v. Marlwood Golf & Country Club*, 2015 ONSC 3909, 27 C.B.R. (6th) 166, at para. 27: “[i]n this case, the sales process was properly run. Redemption of its mortgage by Marlwood in these circumstances would interfere with the integrity of that process.”

[83] The court engages in a balancing analysis of the right to redeem against the impact on the integrity of the court approved receivership process: see *BCIMC Construction Fund Corporation et al. v. The Clover on Yonge Inc.*, 2020 ONSC 3659, at para. 41. The importance of the timing of the process in relation to the purported exercise of the right to redeem is emphasized at para. 36:

In [*B&M*] *Handelman*, the Receiver had already run a bid process, had selected a purchaser and was moving to approve the purchase. Different considerations arise at that late a stage. Allowing debtors to redeem property on the sale approval motion would discourage potential purchasers from submitting bids in the first place and threaten the utility of the receivership process more generally.

The Balancing of Interests

[84] The rights enunciated in *Hester* and relied upon by 273 Ontario must be balanced with the integrity of the court approved sale process. That in turn requires a consideration of whether that sale process was carried out in a procedurally fair manner, with a view towards achieving the best (and not an improvident) price, and with regard to the interests of all stakeholders. That consideration is part of the analysis that the court must engage in under the *Soundair* principles when deciding whether to approve the Transaction and grant an AVO, discussed in the next section of this endorsement.

[85] The potential for prejudice to the different stakeholders is another consideration that is to be factored into the balancing exercise undertaken by the court in determining whether to permit the exercise of a right to redeem: see *Wild Goose*, at para. 74; *BCIMC*, at para. 47.

[86] The stakeholder interests identified in this case include:

- a. The interest of 273 Ontario, a joint venture and the fulcrum creditor, in acquiring the Property to try to preserve its debt and equity in the Rosehill Project (and avoid the losses that it will suffer if the Transaction is approved), as manifested by the relief

sought in its cross-motion for the court's approval of its request to redeem or its Credit Bid.

- b. The interest of the Receiver, in its capacity as the court appointed officer that sought the Sale Process Order and carried out the Sale Process, to protect the integrity of the court approved Sale Process.
- c. The Purchaser is also invested in the integrity of the Sale Process, having participated in it in good faith. It also has a financial interest not only in the acquisition of the Property at the price agreed to under the Ora Binding APA, but in the lost opportunity costs by allowing its deposit to be held in a non-interest bearing account since November 25, 2022 and by maintaining sufficient liquidity to close the all-cash Transaction within five days of any court approval. While it engaged with the Receiver knowing that the Sale Process could be terminated by the Receiver, that never happened.
- d. The priority interests of the first mortgagee (previously Trez and now Toronto Capital) and the Registered Lien Claimants are now protected under both the Ora Transaction and the redemption/Credit Bid scenario, so they have no prejudice to be considered. Any prejudice to Toronto Capital in respect of its plans to finance 273 Ontario has been created after the Receiver accepted the Ora Binding APA and is not a relevant consideration.
- e. The Unit Purchasers whose Unit Purchase Agreements will be terminated (and deposits returned) under the proposed Transaction, if approved. They have now been given notice and have not come forward with a strong voice of opposition to the termination of those agreements by the court.⁶ Of those who have expressed a view, more prefer this than oppose it, and more still were silent on the point. The number and substance of the opposition is underwhelming, given how far away the Rosehill Project is from completion.⁷

⁶ The purpose of requiring that the Unit Purchasers be given notice of the relief sought was so that they were made aware and given the opportunity to make submissions about whether the court could or should make the requested order deeming the Unit Purchaser Agreements to have been terminated. .

⁷ After the Unit Purchaser feedback was received and reported, 273 Ontario argued that only the interests of those who want to continue with their Unit Purchase Agreements should be considered. This was said to be logical because the court is being asked to allow the Receiver to break those agreements, whereas the Unit Purchasers in favour of that happening do not have a right themselves to break their agreements. That takes too narrow a view of the Unit Purchasers' interests. They all have an interest in what happens to their Unit Purchase Agreements as a consequence of the Transaction that the court is being asked to approve, even if they do not have the right to break, or specifically enforce, their agreements because of the terms of the Appointment Order.

- f. Any other remaining unsecured creditors are unlikely to recover under either scenario and are not being directly impacted beyond the non-recovery of their debt.

[87] The court recognizes that all stakeholder interests may not be equal: “[a]lthough the interests of the debtor and purchaser are also relevant, on a sale of assets, the receiver’s primary concern is to protect the interests of the debtor’s creditors”: *Skyepharm PLC. v. Hyal Pharmaceutical Corp.* (1999), 12 C.B.R. (4th) 87 (Ont. S.C.), at para. 6.

[88] The other stakeholder interests in this case are either neutral or militate in favour of preserving the integrity of the Sale Process, which is what is stacked up against 273 Ontario’s interests as a secured creditor and joint venture participant that will not fully recover its debt, investment or costs of the receivership if the Transaction is approved and is completed.

[89] While the situation in this case is distinguishable from most of the decided cases in that it is a secured fulcrum creditor, rather than the debtor company in default, seeking to redeem, that does not diminish the importance of the integrity of the court approved Sale Process.

[90] The normal course would be for the Credit Bid to be made at the outset of the Sale Process as the stalking horse bid. However, 273 Ontario was not willing or able to put forward a bid at the outset of the process. Asking the court to consider an improved Credit Bid (as of January 26, 2023) that may now be executable more than a month after the extended bid deadline under the Sale Process (and almost two months after the original bid deadline) undermines the integrity of the Sale Process.

[91] Similarly, 273 Ontario only sought to redeem at the end of the court approved Sale Process that it was consulted on and participated in, after it became apparent that it was not able to make a competitive bid by the time of the extended bid deadline it was given of December 9, 2022. Allowing this right to be exercised at that late stage also undermines the Sale Process. If 273 Ontario had wanted to reserve its right to redeem to the end of the Sale Process, that is something that should have been expressly addressed at the time the Sale Process Order was made.

[92] To be clear, it is not, as was suggested by 273 Ontario, the mere fact that the Receiver decided to accept the Ora Binding APA on December 10, 2023 that the court is looking at when considering whether the right to redeem is available. It is the fact that there was a court approved Sale Process that 273 Ontario was consulted about, did not oppose and participated in and only sought to override by a redemption when it was unable to make a competitive bid.

[93] The existence of the APS (accepted Ora Binding APA) was always subject to court approval. If not approved, or if the court was not prepared to order the deemed termination of the Unit Purchase Agreements (with the result that the condition of the APS would have failed unless waived by both the Receiver and Ora) then 273 Ontario might have been permitted to step in with its redemption or Credit Bid. But that has not transpired.

[94] The court has the jurisdiction to approve the deemed termination of the Unit Purchaser Agreements. The proposed treatment of the Unit Purchasers upon said termination is consistent

with their contractual remedies for a breach of their agreements. No compelling reason has been presented not to approve this, if it is otherwise determined that the *Soundair* principles are satisfied (discussed in the next section).

[95] The weighing of the interests (and prejudice) of all stakeholders is also an integral part of the consideration of the *Soundair* principles. If the Receiver is found to have carried out the court approved Sale Process in a manner consistent with the *Soundair* principles, the balance will favour protecting the integrity of the Sale Process over 273 Ontario's right of redemption.

Should the Transaction and APS be Approved and the Proposed AVO Granted?

[96] The proposed sale to Ora must be demonstrated to meet the sale approval test from *Soundair*. To do so, the Receiver must demonstrate that:

- a. sufficient effort was made to obtain the best price and that the receiver has not acted improvidently;
- b. it has considered the interests of all stakeholders;
- c. the process under which offers were obtained and the sale agreement was arrived at was consistent with commercial efficacy and integrity; and
- d. there has not been any unfairness in the working out of the process.

a) The Receiver's Efforts and Actions Were Provident

[97] According to the Court of Appeal in *Soundair*,

[W]hen a receiver's sale is before the court for confirmation the only issues are the propriety of the conduct of the receiver and whether it acted providently. The function of the court at that stage is not to step in and do the receiver's work or change the sale strategy adopted by the receiver. Creditors who asked the court to appoint a receiver to dispose of assets should not be allowed to take over control of the process by the simple expedient of supporting another purchaser if they do not agree with the sale made by the receiver. That would take away all respect for the process of sale by a court-appointed receiver.

...

When deciding whether a receiver had acted providently, the court should examine the conduct of the receiver in light of the information the receiver had when it agreed to accept an offer. In this case, the court should look at the receiver's conduct in the light of the information it had when it made its decision on March 8, 1991. The court should be very cautious before deciding that the receiver's conduct was improvident based upon information which has come to light after it made its decision.

[98] The Receiver consulted with stakeholders, including 273 Ontario, in developing the Sale Process, which was followed. The confidential exhibits filed indicate a range of bid prices with differing conditions. Even the pre-Sale Process bid was conditional on due diligence and was withdrawn. Aside from that one withdrawn pre-Sale Process bid, the Ora Binding APA reflects a purchase price within the range of other all cash bids received and within the (low end of the) range of estimates of value from three independent brokers.

[99] If there was a subsequent bid that demonstrates that Ora's price was improvidently low, that might be a relevant *ex post facto* consideration, but there is no comparable bid in this case. What we have is just a willingness on the part of 273 Ontario, a second mortgagee and investor who stands to lose a lot under the Ora Transaction to take on the risk and burden of the first mortgage, the Registered Lien Claims (to the extent they are ultimately determined to be valid and payable) and other expenses that will rank ahead of the second mortgage. 273 Ontario argues that its bid is almost 50 percent higher than the Ora Binding APA purchase price. However, that is not a reasonable comparison as the 273 Ontario Credit Bid is not a market bid that reflects any independent value assessment to which the court could compare the Ora bid. It is more appropriately characterized as the by-product of the value of the registered security on the Property.

[100] Some of the other criticisms of 273 Ontario about the Receiver's conduct and actions are addressed under the third category of *Soundair* (process related) considerations, although there may be some overlap between the first and third categories.

[101] For purposes of this first part of the analysis, the Ora Binding APA has not been demonstrated to be improvident.

b) Consideration of Stakeholder Interests

[102] Under the second consideration, I agree with 273 Ontario that the court should be primarily concerned with the interests of creditors. It is secondarily concerned with the process considerations and the interests of other stakeholders: see *Soundair*, citing *Crown Trust Co. et al. v. Rosenberg et al.* (1986), 60 O.R. (2d) 87 (H.C.).

[103] The fact that the secured creditor (273 Ontario now effectively operating from the first and second secured positions) supports its own bid is not surprising or a particularly weighty factor. However, as was observed in the concurring opinion in the Court of Appeal's decision in *Soundair*,

I should like to add that where there is a small number of creditors who are the only parties with a real interest in the proceeds of the sale (i.e., where it is clear that the highest price attainable would result in recovery so low that no other creditors, shareholders, guarantors, etc., could possibly benefit therefrom), the wishes of the interested creditors should be very seriously considered by the receiver.

[104] The court understands that 273 Ontario stands to lose a great deal if the Transaction and the Ora Binding APA are approved. There can be no doubt that the interests of the creditors are an important consideration and that the opinion of the creditors as to which offer ought to be accepted is something to be taken into account. However, that should not be at the expense of the integrity of the Sale Process.

[105] 273 Ontario's desire to have the opportunity to make a Credit Bid was facilitated by the Receiver in the accommodations it afforded to 273 Ontario up to December 9, 2022. The Receiver went to great lengths to accommodate 273 Ontario, but 273 Ontario was not able to put together a firm unconditional bid by December 9, 2022, when it was told it had to.

[106] At that time, the Receiver also had to consider the interests of Trez (the first priority secured creditor) and make a business judgment about whether to proceed with the Ora Binding APA or 273 Ontario's Credit Bid after it was received on December 9, 2022. That decision was made with regard to the factors that were outlined in the court approved Sale Process, including the relative closing and execution risks associated with each.

[107] 273 Ontario complains that the Receiver rushed to accept the Ora Binding APA on December 10, 2022 rather than continuing to engage with a view to receiving an unconditional Credit Bid from 273 Ontario, after it threatened to exercise its right to redeem the Property. However, by December 10, 2022, the Receiver was in the position of having to accept the Ora Binding APA or risk losing the Transaction. The Ora Binding APA was the only available closable deal at the time that had a certain outcome of full recovery for the first secured creditor, Trez. This is owing to the fact that 273 Ontario did not have firm financing to satisfy the first priority secured loan, whether by redemption or through a Credit Bid.

[108] The Receiver, in its discretion, determined that there was a risk of losing the Ora Binding APA and that is what led to the decision to accept it after evaluating the two options available. The Receiver's judgment at the time, for which no grounds have been suggested as warranting a lack of deference, was that Ora could walk from the Transaction if the Receiver did not sign back the Ora Binding APA. The Receiver was worried about the terms and conditions of the Credit Bid and its conditional financing at the time.⁸ The Receiver's business judgment about the potential loss of the Ora Binding APA, weighed against the inability of 273 Ontario to come forward with a firm Credit Bid, is not something that the court should second guess.

[109] As was observed in the earlier discussion about balancing stakeholder interests, in this case it largely comes down to a balancing of the integrity of the Sale Process against 273 Ontario's interests. The following passage from *Soundair* is instructive:

⁸ 273 Ontario suggested that the Receiver should have known, or could have asked and been told, that the financing would be waived by the lender, despite what the commitment letter said. If that was the case, that was something 273 Ontario could have conveyed to the Receiver, but did not do so.

The process is very important. It should be carefully protected so that the ability of court-appointed receivers to negotiate the best price possible is strengthened and supported.

[110] The integrity of the Sale Process is not just about the fact that the Ora Binding APA had been accepted, for reasons indicated earlier.

[111] The record is clear that consideration was given to all stakeholders' interests. The Purchaser's interests were not given more or undue weight over the interests of secured creditors. If anything, it was the interests of Trez, the first secured lender at the time, that the Receiver was, justifiably, concerned about if the Transaction was lost. The second secured lender's interests were not disregarded, ignored or given unfair consideration; they just did not tip the balance in the ultimate decision by the Receiver to accept the Binding Ora APA.

[112] Similarly, the interests of the Unit Purchasers, whose agreements the court is being asked to deem to have been terminated, were considered. It was determined that they were being treated in accordance with their contractual rights upon any breach or termination of the Unit Purchase Agreements by the Company. Although their contractual remedies upon termination are not being compromised (they are getting their deposits back as they would be entitled to on any breach), a minority of them, when given the opportunity, expressed disappointment that their expectation of purchasing a completed unit in the Rosehill Project will not be met. The majority appear to be content with the preservation of their contractual remedies upon termination or breach and the return of their deposits, a reasonable expectation that will be met if the Transaction is approved.

[113] In the end, what is important is that all relevant stakeholder interests were considered and balanced by the Receiver, including those of 273 Ontario. I am satisfied that they were.

c) The Commercial Efficacy and Integrity of the Sale Process

[114] 273 Ontario has criticized the manner in which the Receiver reached out to some prospective bidders (and failed to follow-up directly with one of the known pre-Sale Process bidders), as well as the fact that an outdated draft non-reliance appraisal report was not in the data room. The Receiver has explained its actions with reference to these criticisms in a manner that satisfies the court. They do not diminish the integrity of the Sale Process that the Receiver followed.

[115] 273 Ontario also criticizes the Receiver for running a "fire sale" because it was mentioned in its materials for the Sale Process that the Rosehill Project had "fallen into receivership," thereby suggesting there was an insolvency situation. Having considered all the evidence about the implementation of the Sale Process, I do not consider this to be a fair characterization of the Receiver's conduct during the Sale Process. Nor was it improper for the fact that the Rosehill Project was in receivership to have been mentioned; the Receiver has to identify itself as such when engaging with prospective purchasers.

[116] It has not been suggested that the court approved Sale Process itself lacked commercial efficacy or integrity. Nor has it been demonstrated that the Receiver failed to follow that process. I am satisfied that the process under which bids were obtained and the APS was arrived at was consistent with commercial efficacy and integrity.

d) No Unfairness in the Working out of the Process

[117] The Receiver engaged with 273 Ontario and made efforts to take its interest in making a bid into account. Even after it missed the bid deadline, 273 Ontario's offer letter was received and considered and 273 Ontario was encouraged and given time to compile a bid.

[118] Further, the Receiver treated 273 Ontario fairly in receiving and considering the bid it eventually made, which was not accompanied by proof of financing and was not accompanied by a Binding APA. Whereas the Receiver could have rejected this for non-compliance, it did not do so.

[119] 273 Ontario complains that it was "jammed" because of the Receiver's delay in confirming the validity, enforceability and amount owing under the 273 Ontario Loan and in dealing with the Registered Lien Claims, both of which 273 Ontario maintains impacted its ability to submit a Binding APA. The Receiver maintains that it responded in a timely manner to requests from 273 Ontario about these matters. It even eventually agreed to allow 273 Ontario's second mortgage claim to be valued at the full amount 273 Ontario submitted, and not at the lesser amount that the Receiver had valued it at for other purposes.

[120] 273 Ontario also complains that the Receiver first invited it to make its Credit Bid conditional upon the resolution of the Registered Lien Claims to 273 Ontario's satisfaction and then gave as one of its reasons for preferring the Ora Binding APA that 273 Ontario's Credit Bid was conditional upon the Registered Lien Claims being withdrawn or found to be invalid. The suggestion that a bid could be made conditional upon a satisfactory resolution of these claims does not mean that this condition would not be factored into the evaluation of the bid, it just meant that the requirement that the bid be unconditional for it to even be considered was being waived (as an accommodation to 273 Ontario, something that the Receiver did not have to do).

[121] It is suggested that the Receiver should have started to validate 273 Ontario's mortgage security in July 2022, and that its delay until its final confirmation of the amount on December 3, 2022 was unreasonable. The Receiver has explained the normal course approach to validating a security. Moreover, the record demonstrates a timely response to 273 Ontario's request that it do so when made in October 2022, including allowance for a higher amount than what the Receiver considered appropriate for the purposes of the Credit Bid that it permitted 273 Ontario to make after the bid deadline had already passed.

[122] Similar criticisms are made about the Receiver's failure to prioritize the evaluation of the Capital Build Lien (which 273 Ontario had maintained was fraudulent from the outset). Yet, when asked to prioritize this, the Receiver did so and made the decision to seek approval from the court to disallow it. The timing of 273 Ontario's requests for the security review (and subsequent request for confirmation of the accepted amount of the 273 Loan) and for the

determination of the Registered Lien Claims have been addressed earlier in this endorsement. 273 Ontario suggests that, because it was funding the receivership, its requests should have been given priority by the Receiver. The Receiver's duties are to the court and all stakeholders. But it did prioritize issues when they were raised by 273 Ontario, so these complaints are unfounded both legally and factually.

[123] If 273 Ontario had wanted its mortgage security validated and the Registered Lien Claims dealt with before the bid deadline under the Sale Process, it could have asked that this be done at the time of the court's approval of the Sale Process Order. It did not do so. Now it suggests that the Receiver was remiss in not appreciating how important this was to 273 Ontario's participation in the Sale Process. I do not accept that to be a valid criticism of the Receiver.

[124] At worst, there appears to have been a misunderstanding between the Receiver and 273 Ontario about whether the Receiver was working on evaluating 273 Ontario's security and the Registered Lien Claims prior to the specific requests from 273 Ontario that it do so commencing in October 2022. The Receiver addressed these points during the Sale Process when it was asked to do so in October 2022. The real issue is that 273 Ontario did not agree with, and was perhaps surprised by, the Receiver's assessments once received. The court does not accept the assertion by 273 Ontario that the Receiver did not address these matters in a timely and diligent manner. Even if 273 Ontario had thought, or hoped, they were being addressed earlier, that possible misunderstanding does not rise to the level of a failing on the Receiver's part.

[125] 273 Ontario argues that, but for the Receiver's artificial and aggressive deadlines, and its failure to address the two issues 273 Ontario requested it to take care of well before the bid deadline, the Toronto Capital funding commitment would have been provided to the Receiver before the bid deadline and its bid would not have suffered from the identified execution risks. I have difficulty with the position that this delay was the Receiver's fault. The deadlines were prescribed under the Sale Process. It is not lost on the court that 273 Ontario was engaged in a Sale Process that was primarily directed to prospective third-party purchasers. It declined to put in a stalking horse bid in advance of the Sale Process Order and then had to scramble when it decided to do so once the Sale Process was underway.

[126] 273 Ontario, at some point in the process, became concerned about the value of the bids that might materialize and began to work on its Credit Bid. 273 Ontario then found itself scrambling to find financing for a Credit Bid and was not able to do so even by the extended deadline of December 9, 2022. I am not persuaded that this was a function of any unfairness in the Sale Process that the Receiver followed, or its conduct in dealing with requests from 273 Ontario to review its security and determine the Registered Lien Claims.

[127] 273 Ontario then complains that after it submitted its Credit Bid, it was rejected out of hand without any further negotiation after the Receiver rushed to accept the Ora Binding APA. 273 Ontario complains that the Receiver did not contact it to invite it to remove conditions before accepting the Ora Binding APA. 273 Ontario suggests that this was done for Ora between November 25 and December 6. In fact, it was done for both Ora and 273 Ontario before the December 9, 2022 deadline. Suggestions were made in an effort to assist 273 Ontario in putting

in its Credit Bid despite the challenges it was facing. 273 Ontario did not raise concerns about conditions on its financing with the Receiver before submitting its Credit Bid on December 9, 2022.

[128] The Receiver extended an accommodation to 273 Ontario by allowing it to continue in the Sale Process after the November 25, 2022 Bid Deadline and to work forward from its offer letter to its Credit Bid on the same time line as it afforded to Ora to move forward from its initial Bid to the Binding Ora APA that was submitted on December 7, 2022, and then 273 Ontario was given two days after that to submit its Credit Bid. 273 Ontario was not treated unfairly in this process. Ora and 273 Ontario were both afforded opportunities to improve their bids after November 25, 2022 and were treated equitably during that period.

[129] Events that occurred after the Ora Binding APS was accepted on December 10, 2022 are of marginal relevance, unless they shed light upon matters that were known or ought to have been known at the relevant time. In the category of marginal relevance would be the assignment of the Trez first priority mortgage to Toronto Capital that has alleviated some of the execution risk associated with the 273 Ontario Credit Bid that the Receiver had identified when it decided to accept the Ora Binding APA. The fact that almost two months later, 273 Ontario was able to get financing in place to take out the first secured mortgage does not diminish the legitimacy of the Receiver's concerns about the relatively more significant execution risk associated with the Credit Bid when it was considering which bid was in the best interests of the stakeholders of the Company on December 10, 2022.

[130] Lastly, I do not find there to have been anything unfair about the Receiver's efforts to facilitate a commercial resolution between 273 Ontario and Ora after the Ora Binding APA had been accepted and 273 Ontario was able to obtain financing. No one tried to hold 273 Ontario to that resolution, even though it agreed to it and later indicated that it had felt pressured to enter into it and was not prepared to follow through with it.

[131] The fact that the terms and limitations on the 273 Credit Bid ultimately submitted were less favourable in the Receiver's assessment than other bids does not mean it was not properly considered. I find that 273 Ontario was treated fairly by the Receiver in the working out of the Sale Process.

e) Approval of the APS, Transaction and AVO

[132] Accordingly, the *Soundair* principles having been satisfied, the APS and Transaction are approved and the AVO is granted.

Should the Ancillary Order be Granted?

[133] Counsel for 273 Ontario suggested that the requested ancillary relief should be delayed, regardless of the outcome of the decision on the AVO because there are concerns about fees that 273 Ontario has not had time to address. However, the Receiver is not seeking approval of its fees under the Ancillary Order. The relief it is seeking is related to the AVO.

[134] If the *Soundair* requirements are found to have been met and the Receiver's conduct in carrying out the Sale Process is not impugned, it should not be open to further challenge. The Receiver's actions and activities during the relevant period should be approved. The approval of the statement of receipts and disbursements is simply a recognition of what amounts were received and paid. It is not an approval of any amounts that may have been paid to the Receiver and its counsel. The Receiver will still be required to seek those approvals in the normal course with the appropriate fee affidavits.

[135] In the meantime, establishing a reserve or holdback from the sale proceeds to satisfy the fees, in such amounts as may ultimately be approved, is a prudent and reasonable thing to do, particularly given the breakdown in the relationship between the Receiver and 273 Ontario.

[136] The proposed distributions, to the first mortgagee and on account of the Receiver's Borrowing Charge (for amounts borrowed and previously approved) appear to be reasonable. If the new first mortgagee, Toronto Capital, does not want to be paid out then that can be addressed in the context of the Ancillary Order being settled. I will hold off in signing it for now, but if it does want to be paid out, I would approve that distribution.

[137] Finally, the requested sealing order is appropriate.

[138] The requested partial sealing order is limited in its scope (only specifically identified confidential exhibits) and in time (until the Transaction is completed). It is necessary to protect commercially sensitive information that could negatively impact the Company and its stakeholders if this transaction is not completed and further efforts to sell the property must be undertaken.

[139] The proposed partial sealing order appropriately balances the open court principle and legitimate commercial requirements for confidentiality. It is necessary to avoid any interference with subsequent attempts to market and sell the property, and to avoid any prejudice that might be caused by publicly disclosing confidential and commercially-sensitive information prior to the completion of the now approved Ora Transaction.

[140] These salutary effects outweigh any deleterious effects, including the effects on the public interest in open and accessible court proceedings. I am satisfied that the limited nature

and scope of the proposed sealing order is appropriate and satisfies the *Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)*, 2002 SCC 41, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522 requirements, as modified by the reformulation of the test in *Sherman Estate v. Donovan*, 2021 SCC 25, 458 D.L.R. (4th) 361, at para. 38.

[141] Granting this order is consistent with the court's practice of granting limited partial sealing orders in conjunction with approval and vesting orders.

[142] The Receiver is directed to ensure that the sealed confidential exhibits are provided to the court clerk at the filing office in an envelope with a copy of this endorsement and the signed order with the relevant provisions highlighted so that the confidential exhibits can be physically sealed. At the appropriate time, the Receiver shall also seek an unsealing order.

Costs and Final Disposition

[143] The Receiver's Motion for an AVO and Ancillary Order is granted on the terms indicated herein. 273 Ontario's cross-motion is dismissed.

[144] There was not sufficient time booked at any of the hearings to address the issue of costs. The parties should exchange cost outlines and try to reach an agreement on costs. If they are unable to do so they are directed to arrange a scheduling appointment before me so that an efficient procedure can be established for the costs of these motions to be determined.

[145] Before signing the proposed AVO and Ancillary Order, I wanted to give the parties the opportunity to consider if anything further needs to be changed in the forms that were originally submitted by the Receiver, given the passage of time and with the benefit of the court's endorsement. Updated forms of orders may be submitted to me for consideration (with blacklines to indicate changes made) by emailing them to my judicial assistant: lina.bunoza@ontario.ca

[146] The court recognizes that this decision will have significant implications for 273 Ontario and the Rosehill Project. However, after permitting the adjournments to allow for a full airing of the multitude of issues raised on the merits, this is the outcome that has been reached. I am appreciative of the efforts and helpful submissions provided by all counsel.

KIMMEL J.

Date: February 2, 2023



SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE

COUNSEL SLIP

COURT FILE NO.:

CV-22-00682959-00CL

HEARING 26 JANUARY 2023

DATE:

NO. ON LIST: 3

TITLE OF PROCEEDING: ROSE-ISLI CORP. et al v. FRAME-TECH STRUCTURES LTD. et al

BEFORE JUSTICE: MADAM JUSTICE KIMMEL

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION

For Plaintiff, Applicant, Moving Party, Crown:

Name of Person Appearing	Name of Party	Contact Info
JASON WADDEN (<i>counsel</i>)	Rose-Isli Corp., 2631214 Ontario Inc., Seaside	jwadden@tyrllp.com
CARLOS SAYAO (<i>counsel</i>)	Corporation, 2735440 Ontario Inc.	csayao@tyrllp.com

For Other:

Name of Person Appearing	Name of Party	Contact Info
--------------------------	---------------	--------------

SHARON KOUR (<i>counsel</i>)	Ernst & Young Inc. (Receiver)	skour@reconllp.com
CAITLIN FELL (<i>counsel</i>)		cfell@reconllp.com
SHAUN PARSON (<i>counsel</i>)		sparson@reconllp.com
NATHANIEL READ-ELLIS (<i>counsel</i>)	Ora Acquisitions Inc. (Purchaser)	nreadellis@agbllp.com
SEAN PIERCE (<i>counsel</i>)		spierce@agbllp.com
ADAM WYGODNY (<i>counsel</i>)	Purchasers of Unit No. 604	awygodny@groiaco.com
CAMERON NEIL (<i>counsel</i>)	KNYMH lien claimant	neilc@simpsonwisle.com
<p>In total there were approximately 38 observers and participants at the hearing, including the above named counsel and a number of individual purchasers. Three purchasers, <i>MARY RAPPULO</i>, <i>NICOLA LACANTORE</i>, and <i>VINCENZO PATERINO</i> addressed the court.</p>		

TAB 4

Most Negative Treatment: Distinguished

Most Recent Distinguished: [PCAS Patient Care Automation Services Inc., Re](#) | 2012 ONSC 3367, 2012 CarswellOnt 7248, 91 C.B.R. (5th) 285, 216 A.C.W.S. (3d) 551 | (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List], Jun 9, 2012)

1991 CarswellOnt 205
Ontario Court of Appeal

Royal Bank v. Soundair Corp.

1991 CarswellOnt 205, [1991] O.J. No. 1137, 27 A.C.W.S. (3d) 1178,
46 O.A.C. 321, 4 O.R. (3d) 1, 7 C.B.R. (3d) 1, 83 D.L.R. (4th) 76

**ROYAL BANK OF CANADA (plaintiff/respondent) v. SOUNDAIR CORPORATION
(respondent), CANADIAN PENSION CAPITAL LIMITED (appellant)
and CANADIAN INSURERS' CAPITAL CORPORATION (appellant)**

Goodman, McKinlay and Galligan JJ.A.

Heard: June 11, 12, 13 and 14, 1991

Judgment: July 3, 1991

Docket: Doc. CA 318/91

Counsel: *J. B. Berkow* and *S. H. Goldman* , for appellants Canadian Pension Capital Limited and Canadian Insurers' Capital Corporation.

J. T. Morin, Q.C. , for Air Canada.

L.A.J. Barnes and *L.E. Ritchie* , for plaintiff/respondent Royal Bank of Canada.

S.F. Dunphy and *G.K. Ketcheson* , for Ernst & Young Inc., receiver of respondent Soundair Corporation.

W.G. Horton , for Ontario Express Limited.

N.J. Spies , for Frontier Air Limited.

Related Abridgment Classifications

Debtors and creditors

VII Receivers

VII.6 Conduct and liability of receiver

VII.6.a General conduct of receiver

Headnote

Receivers --- Conduct and liability of receiver — General conduct of receiver

Court considering its position when approving sale recommended by receiver.

S Corp., which engaged in the air transport business, had a division known as AT. When S Corp. experienced financial difficulties, one of the secured creditors, who had an interest in the assets of AT, brought a motion for the appointment of a receiver. The receiver was ordered to operate AT and to sell it as a going concern. The receiver had two offers. It accepted the offer made by OEL and rejected an offer by 922 which contained an unacceptable condition. Subsequently, 922 obtained an order allowing it to make a second offer removing the condition. The secured creditors supported acceptance of the 922 offer. The court approved the sale to OEL and dismissed the motion to approve the 922 offer. An appeal was brought from this order.

Held:

The appeal was dismissed.

Per Galligan J.A.: When a court appoints a receiver to use its commercial expertise to sell an airline, it is inescapable that it intends to rely upon the receiver's expertise and not upon its own. The court should be reluctant to second-guess, with the benefit of hindsight, the considered business decisions made by its receiver.

The conduct of the receiver should be reviewed in the light of the specific mandate given to him by the court. The order appointing the receiver did not say how the receiver was to negotiate the sale. The order obviously intended, because of the unusual nature of the asset being sold, to leave the method of sale substantially to the discretion of the receiver.

To determine whether a receiver has acted providently, the conduct of the receiver should be examined in light of the information the receiver had when it agreed to accept an offer. On the date the receiver accepted the OEL offer, it had only two offers: that of OEL, which was acceptable, and that of 922, which contained an unacceptable condition. The decision made was a sound one in the circumstances. The receiver made a sufficient effort to obtain the best price, and did not act improvidently.

The court must exercise extreme caution before it interferes with the process adopted by a receiver to sell an unusual asset. It is important that prospective purchasers know that, if they are acting in good faith, bargain seriously with a receiver and enter into an agreement with it, a court will not lightly interfere with the commercial judgment of the receiver to sell the assets to them.

Per McKinlay J.A. (concurring in the result): It is most important that the integrity of procedures followed by court-appointed receivers be protected in the interests of both commercial morality and the future confidence of business persons in their dealings with receivers. In all cases, the court should carefully scrutinize the procedure followed by the receiver. While the procedure carried out by the receiver in this case was appropriate, given the unfolding of events and the unique nature of the asset involved, it may not be a procedure that is likely to be appropriate in many receivership sales.

Per Goodman J.A. (dissenting): It was imprudent and unfair on the part of the receiver to ignore an offer from an interested party which offered approximately triple the cash down payment without giving a chance to the offeror to remove the conditions or other terms which made the offer unacceptable to the receiver. The offer accepted by the receiver was improvident and unfair insofar as two creditors were concerned.

Table of Authorities

Cases considered:

Beauty Counsellors of Canada Ltd., Re (1986), 58 C.B.R. (N.S.) 237 (Ont. S.C.) — referred to

British Columbia Development Corp. v. Spun Cast Industries Ltd. (1977), 26 C.B.R. (N.S.) 28, 5 B.C.L.R. 94 (S.C.) — referred to

Cameron v. Bank of Nova Scotia (1981), 38 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1, 45 N.S.R. (2d) 303, 86 A.P.R. 303 (C.A.) — referred to

Crown Trust Co. v. Rosenberg (1986), 67 C.B.R. (N.S.) 320n, 60 O.R. (2d) 87, 22 C.P.C. (2d) 131, 39 D.L.R. (4th) 526 (H.C.) — applied

Salima Investments Ltd. v. Bank of Montreal (1985), 59 C.B.R. (N.S.) 242, 41 Alta. L.R. (2d) 58, 65 A.R. 372, 21 D.L.R. (4th) (C.A.) — referred to

Selkirk, Re (1986), 58 C.B.R. (N.S.) 245 (Ont. S.C.) — referred to

Selkirk, Re (1987), 64 C.B.R. (N.S.) 140 (Ont. S.C.) — referred to

Statutes considered:

Employment Standards Act, R.S.O. 1980, c. 137.

Environmental Protection Act, R.S.O. 1980, c. 141.

Galligan J.A. :

1 This is an appeal from the order of Rosenberg J. made on May 1, 1991. By that order, he approved the sale of Air Toronto to Ontario Express Limited and Frontier Air Limited, and he dismissed a motion to approve an offer to purchase Air Toronto by 922246 Ontario Limited.

2 It is necessary at the outset to give some background to the dispute. Soundair Corporation ("Soundair") is a corporation engaged in the air transport business. It has three divisions. One of them is Air Toronto. Air Toronto operates a scheduled airline from Toronto to a number of mid-sized cities in the United States of America. Its routes serve as feeders to several of Air Canada's routes. Pursuant to a connector agreement, Air Canada provides some services to Air Toronto and benefits from the feeder traffic provided by it. The operational relationship between Air Canada and Air Toronto is a close one.

3 In the latter part of 1989 and the early part of 1990, Soundair was in financial difficulty. Soundair has two secured creditors who have an interest in the assets of Air Toronto. The Royal Bank of Canada (the "Royal Bank") is owed at least \$65 million dollars. The appellants Canadian Pension Capital Limited and Canadian Insurers' Capital Corporation (collectively

called "CCFL") are owed approximately \$9,500,000. Those creditors will have a deficiency expected to be in excess of \$50 million on the winding up of Soundair.

4 On April 26, 1990, upon the motion of the Royal Bank, O'Brien J. appointed Ernst & Young Inc. (the "receiver") as receiver of all of the assets, property and undertakings of Soundair. The order required the receiver to operate Air Toronto and sell it as a going concern. Because of the close relationship between Air Toronto and Air Canada, it was contemplated that the receiver would obtain the assistance of Air Canada to operate Air Toronto. The order authorized the receiver:

(b) to enter into contractual arrangements with Air Canada to retain a manager or operator, including Air Canada, to manage and operate Air Toronto under the supervision of Ernst & Young Inc. until the completion of the sale of Air Toronto to Air Canada or other person.

Also because of the close relationship, it was expected that Air Canada would purchase Air Toronto. To that end, the order of O'Brien J. authorized the Receiver:

(c) to negotiate and do all things necessary or desirable to complete a sale of Air Toronto to Air Canada and, if a sale to Air Canada cannot be completed, to negotiate and sell Air Toronto to another person, subject to terms and conditions approved by this Court.

5 Over a period of several weeks following that order, negotiations directed towards the sale of Air Toronto took place between the receiver and Air Canada. Air Canada had an agreement with the receiver that it would have exclusive negotiating rights during that period. I do not think it is necessary to review those negotiations, but I note that Air Canada had complete access to all of the operations of Air Toronto and conducted due diligence examinations. It became thoroughly acquainted with every aspect of Air Toronto's operations.

6 Those negotiations came to an end when an offer made by Air Canada on June 19, 1990, was considered unsatisfactory by the receiver. The offer was not accepted and lapsed. Having regard to the tenor of Air Canada's negotiating stance and a letter sent by its solicitors on July 20, 1990, I think that the receiver was eminently reasonable when it decided that there was no realistic possibility of selling Air Toronto to Air Canada.

7 The receiver then looked elsewhere. Air Toronto's feeder business is very attractive, but it only has value to a national airline. The receiver concluded reasonably, therefore, that it was commercially necessary for one of Canada's two national airlines to be involved in any sale of Air Toronto. Realistically, there were only two possible purchasers, whether direct or indirect. They were Air Canada and Canadian Airlines International.

8 It was well known in the air transport industry that Air Toronto was for sale. During the months following the collapse of the negotiations with Air Canada, the receiver tried unsuccessfully to find viable purchasers. In late 1990, the receiver turned to Canadian Airlines International, the only realistic alternative. Negotiations began between them. Those negotiations led to a letter of intent dated February 11, 1990. On March 6, 1991, the receiver received an offer from Ontario Express Limited and Frontier Airlines Limited, who are subsidiaries of Canadian Airlines International. This offer is called the OEL offer.

9 In the meantime, Air Canada and CCFL were having discussions about making an offer for the purchase of Air Toronto. They formed 922246 Ontario Limited ("922") for the purpose of purchasing Air Toronto. On March 1, 1991, CCFL wrote to the receiver saying that it proposed to make an offer. On March 7, 1991, Air Canada and CCFL presented an offer to the receiver in the name of 922. For convenience, its offers are called the "922 offers."

10 The first 922 offer contained a condition which was unacceptable to the receiver. I will refer to that condition in more detail later. The receiver declined the 922 offer and on March 8, 1991, accepted the OEL offer. Subsequently, 922 obtained an order allowing it to make a second offer. It then submitted an offer which was virtually identical to that of March 7, 1991, except that the unacceptable condition had been removed.

11 The proceedings before Rosenberg J. then followed. He approved the sale to OEL and dismissed a motion for the acceptance of the 922 offer. Before Rosenberg J., and in this court, both CCFL and the Royal Bank supported the acceptance of the second 922 offer.

12 There are only two issues which must be resolved in this appeal. They are:

(1) Did the receiver act properly when it entered into an agreement to sell Air Toronto to OEL?

(2) What effect does the support of the 922 offer by the secured creditors have on the result?

13 I will deal with the two issues separately.

1. Did the Receiver Act Properly in Agreeing to Sell to OEL?

14 Before dealing with that issue, there are three general observations which I think I should make. The first is that the sale of an airline as a going concern is a very complex process. The best method of selling an airline at the best price is something far removed from the expertise of a court. When a court appoints a receiver to use its commercial expertise to sell an airline, it is inescapable that it intends to rely upon the receiver's expertise and not upon its own. Therefore, the court must place a great deal of confidence in the actions taken and in the opinions formed by the receiver. It should also assume that the receiver is acting properly unless the contrary is clearly shown. The second observation is that the court should be reluctant to second-guess, with the benefit of hindsight, the considered business decisions made by its receiver. The third observation which I wish to make is that the conduct of the receiver should be reviewed in the light of the specific mandate given to him by the court.

15 The order of O'Brien J. provided that if the receiver could not complete the sale to Air Canada that it was "to negotiate and sell Air Toronto to another person." The court did not say how the receiver was to negotiate the sale. It did not say it was to call for bids or conduct an auction. It told the receiver to negotiate and sell. It obviously intended, because of the unusual nature of the asset being sold, to leave the method of sale substantially in the discretion of the receiver. I think, therefore, that the court should not review minutely the process of the sale when, broadly speaking, it appears to the court to be a just process.

16 As did Rosenberg J., I adopt as correct the statement made by Anderson J. in *Crown Trust Co. v. Rosenberg* (1986), 60 O.R. (2d) 87, 67 C.B.R. (N.S.) 320n, 22 C.P.C. (2d) 131, 39 D.L.R. (4th) 526 (H.C.), at pp. 92-94 [O.R.], of the duties which a court must perform when deciding whether a receiver who has sold a property acted properly. When he set out the court's duties, he did not put them in any order of priority, nor do I. I summarize those duties as follows:

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

17 I intend to discuss the performance of those duties separately.

1. Did the Receiver make a sufficient effort to get the best price and did it act providently?

18 Having regard to the fact that it was highly unlikely that a commercially viable sale could be made to anyone but the two national airlines, or to someone supported by either of them, it is my view that the receiver acted wisely and reasonably when it negotiated only with Air Canada and Canadian Airlines International. Furthermore, when Air Canada said that it would submit no further offers and gave the impression that it would not participate further in the receiver's efforts to sell, the only course reasonably open to the receiver was to negotiate with Canadian Airlines International. Realistically, there was nowhere else to go but to Canadian Airlines International. In doing so, it is my opinion that the receiver made sufficient efforts to sell the airline.

19 When the receiver got the OEL offer on March 6, 1991, it was over 10 months since it had been charged with the responsibility of selling Air Toronto. Until then, the receiver had not received one offer which it thought was acceptable. After substantial efforts to sell the airline over that period, I find it difficult to think that the receiver acted improvidently in accepting the only acceptable offer which it had.

20 On March 8, 1991, the date when the receiver accepted the OEL offer, it had only two offers, the OEL offer, which was acceptable, and the 922 offer, which contained an unacceptable condition. I cannot see how the receiver, assuming for the moment that the price was reasonable, could have done anything but accept the OEL offer.

21 When deciding whether a receiver had acted providently, the court should examine the conduct of the receiver in light of the information the receiver had when it agreed to accept an offer. In this case, the court should look at the receiver's conduct in the light of the information it had when it made its decision on March 8, 1991. The court should be very cautious before deciding that the receiver's conduct was improvident based upon information which has come to light after it made its decision. To do so, in my view, would derogate from the mandate to sell given to the receiver by the order of O'Brien J. I agree with and adopt what was said by Anderson J. in *Crown Trust Co. v. Rosenberg*, supra, at p. 112 [O.R.]:

Its decision was made as a matter of business judgment *on the elements then available to it*. It is of the very essence of a receiver's function to make such judgments and in the making of them to act seriously and responsibly so as to be prepared to stand behind them.

If the court were to reject the recommendation of the Receiver in any but the most exceptional circumstances, it would materially diminish and weaken the role and function of the Receiver both in the perception of receivers and in the perception of any others who might have occasion to deal with them. It would lead to the conclusion that the decision of the Receiver was of little weight and that the real decision was always made upon the motion for approval. That would be a consequence susceptible of immensely damaging results to the disposition of assets by court-appointed receivers.

[Emphasis added.]

22 I also agree with and adopt what was said by Macdonald J.A. in *Cameron v. Bank of Nova Scotia* (1981), 38 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1, 45 N.S.R. (2d) 303, 86 A.P.R. 303 (C.A.), at p. 11 [C.B.R.]:

In my opinion if the decision of the receiver to enter into an agreement of sale, subject to court approval, with respect to certain assets is reasonable and sound under the circumstances *at the time existing* it should not be set aside simply because a later and higher bid is made. To do so would literally create chaos in the commercial world and receivers and purchasers would never be sure they had a binding agreement.

[Emphasis added.]

23 On March 8, 1991, the receiver had two offers. One was the OEL offer, which it considered satisfactory but which could be withdrawn by OEL at any time before it was accepted. The receiver also had the 922 offer, which contained a condition that was totally unacceptable. It had no other offers. It was faced with the dilemma of whether it should decline to accept the OEL offer and run the risk of it being withdrawn, in the hope that an acceptable offer would be forthcoming from 922. An affidavit filed by the president of the receiver describes the dilemma which the receiver faced, and the judgment made in the light of that dilemma:

24. An asset purchase agreement was received by Ernst & Young on March 7, 1991 which was dated March 6, 1991. This agreement was received from CCFL in respect of their offer to purchase the assets and undertaking of Air Toronto. Apart from financial considerations, which will be considered in a subsequent affidavit, the *Receiver determined that it would not be prudent to delay acceptance of the OEL agreement to negotiate a highly uncertain arrangement with Air Canada and CCFL*. Air Canada had the benefit of an 'exclusive' in negotiations for Air Toronto and had clearly indicated its intention take itself out of the running while ensuring that no other party could seek to purchase Air Toronto and maintain the Air Canada connector arrangement vital to its survival. The CCFL offer represented a radical reversal of this position by Air

Canada at the eleventh hour. However, it contained a significant number of conditions to closing which were entirely beyond the control of the Receiver. As well, the CCFL offer came less than 24 hours before signing of the agreement with OEL which had been negotiated over a period of months, at great time and expense.

[Emphasis added.] I am convinced that the decision made was a sound one in the circumstances faced by the receiver on March 8, 1991.

24 I now turn to consider whether the price contained in the OEL offer was one which it was provident to accept. At the outset, I think that the fact that the OEL offer was the only acceptable one available to the receiver on March 8, 1991, after 10 months of trying to sell the airline, is strong evidence that the price in it was reasonable. In a deteriorating economy, I doubt that it would have been wise to wait any longer.

25 I mentioned earlier that, pursuant to an order, 922 was permitted to present a second offer. During the hearing of the appeal, counsel compared at great length the price contained in the second 922 offer with the price contained in the OEL offer. Counsel put forth various hypotheses supporting their contentions that one offer was better than the other.

26 It is my opinion that the price contained in the 922 offer is relevant only if it shows that the price obtained by the receiver in the OEL offer was not a reasonable one. In *Crown Trust Co. v. Rosenberg*, supra, Anderson J., at p. 113 [O.R.], discussed the comparison of offers in the following way:

No doubt, as the cases have indicated, situations might arise where the disparity was so great as to call in question the adequacy of the mechanism which had produced the offers. It is not so here, and in my view that is substantially an end of the matter.

27 In two judgments, Saunders J. considered the circumstances in which an offer submitted after the receiver had agreed to a sale should be considered by the court. The first is *Re Selkirk* (1986), 58 C.B.R. (N.S.) 245 (Ont. S.C.), at p. 247:

If, for example, in this case there had been a second offer of a substantially higher amount, then the court would have to take that offer into consideration in assessing whether the receiver had properly carried out his function of endeavouring to obtain the best price for the property.

28 The second is *Re Beauty Counsellors of Canada Ltd.* (1986), 58 C.B.R. (N.S.) 237 (Ont. S.C.), at p. 243:

If a substantially higher bid turns up at the approval stage, the court should consider it. Such a bid may indicate, for example, that the trustee has not properly carried out its duty to endeavour to obtain the best price for the estate.

29 In *Re Selkirk* (1987), 64 C.B.R. (N.S.) 140 (Ont. S.C.), at p. 142, McRae J. expressed a similar view:

The court will not lightly withhold approval of a sale by the receiver, particularly in a case such as this where the receiver is given rather wide discretionary authority as per the order of Mr. Justice Trainor and, of course, where the receiver is an officer of this court. Only in a case where there seems to be some unfairness in the process of the sale or *where there are substantially higher offers which would tend to show that the sale was improvident* will the court withhold approval. It is important that the court recognize the commercial exigencies that would flow if prospective purchasers are allowed to wait until the sale is in court for approval before submitting their final offer. This is something that must be discouraged.

[Emphasis added.]

30 What those cases show is that the prices in other offers have relevance only if they show that the price contained in the offer accepted by the receiver was so unreasonably low as to demonstrate that the receiver was improvident in accepting it. I am of the opinion, therefore, that if they do not tend to show that the receiver was improvident, they should not be considered upon a motion to confirm a sale recommended by a court-appointed receiver. If they were, the process would be changed from a sale by a receiver, subject to court approval, into an auction conducted by the court at the time approval is sought. In my

opinion, the latter course is unfair to the person who has entered bona fide into an agreement with the receiver, can only lead to chaos, and must be discouraged.

31 If, however, the subsequent offer is so substantially higher than the sale recommended by the receiver, then it may be that the receiver has not conducted the sale properly. In such circumstances, the court would be justified itself in entering into the sale process by considering competitive bids. However, I think that that process should be entered into only if the court is satisfied that the receiver has not properly conducted the sale which it has recommended to the court.

32 It is necessary to consider the two offers. Rosenberg J. held that the 922 offer was slightly better or marginally better than the OEL offer. He concluded that the difference in the two offers did not show that the sale process adopted by the receiver was inadequate or improvident.

33 Counsel for the appellants complained about the manner in which Rosenberg J. conducted the hearing of the motion to confirm the OEL sale. The complaint was that when they began to discuss a comparison of the two offers, Rosenberg J. said that he considered the 922 offer to be better than the OEL offer. Counsel said that when that comment was made, they did not think it necessary to argue further the question of the difference in value between the two offers. They complain that the finding that the 922 offer was only marginally better or slightly better than the OEL offer was made without them having had the opportunity to argue that the 922 offer was substantially better or significantly better than the OEL offer. I cannot understand how counsel could have thought that by expressing the opinion that the 922 offer was better, Rosenberg J. was saying that it was a significantly or substantially better one. Nor can I comprehend how counsel took the comment to mean that they were foreclosed from arguing that the offer was significantly or substantially better. If there was some misunderstanding on the part of counsel, it should have been raised before Rosenberg J. at the time. I am sure that if it had been, the misunderstanding would have been cleared up quickly. Nevertheless, this court permitted extensive argument dealing with the comparison of the two offers.

34 The 922 offer provided for \$6 million cash to be paid on closing with a royalty based upon a percentage of Air Toronto profits over a period of 5 years up to a maximum of \$3 million. The OEL offer provided for a payment of \$2 million on closing with a royalty paid on gross revenues over a 5-year period. In the short term, the 922 offer is obviously better because there is substantially more cash up front. The chances of future returns are substantially greater in the OEL offer because royalties are paid on gross revenues, while the royalties under the 922 offer are paid only on profits. There is an element of risk involved in each offer.

35 The receiver studied the two offers. It compared them and took into account the risks, the advantages and the disadvantages of each. It considered the appropriate contingencies. It is not necessary to outline the factors which were taken into account by the receiver because the manager of its insolvency practice filed an affidavit outlining the considerations which were weighed in its evaluation of the two offers. They seem to me to be reasonable ones. That affidavit concluded with the following paragraph:

24. On the basis of these considerations the Receiver has approved the OEL offer and has concluded that it represents the achievement of the highest possible value at this time for the Air Toronto division of SoundAir.

36 The court appointed the receiver to conduct the sale of Air Toronto, and entrusted it with the responsibility of deciding what is the best offer. I put great weight upon the opinion of the receiver. It swore to the court which appointed it that the OEL offer represents the achievement of the highest possible value at this time for Air Toronto. I have not been convinced that the receiver was wrong when he made that assessment. I am, therefore, of the opinion that the 922 offer does not demonstrate any failure upon the part of the receiver to act properly and providently.

37 It follows that if Rosenberg J. was correct when he found that the 922 offer was in fact better, I agree with him that it could only have been slightly or marginally better. The 922 offer does not lead to an inference that the disposition strategy of the receiver was inadequate, unsuccessful or improvident, nor that the price was unreasonable.

38 I am, therefore, of the opinion the the receiver made a sufficient effort to get the best price, and has not acted improvidently.

2. Consideration of the Interests of all Parties

39 It is well established that the primary interest is that of the creditors of the debtor: see *Crown Trust Co. v. Rosenberg* , supra, and *Re Selkirk* , supra (Saunders J.). However, as Saunders J. pointed out in *Re Beauty Counsellors* , supra at p. 244 [C.B.R.], "it is not the only or overriding consideration."

40 In my opinion, there are other persons whose interests require consideration. In an appropriate case, the interests of the debtor must be taken into account. I think also, in a case such as this, where a purchaser has bargained at some length and doubtless at considerable expense with the receiver, the interests of the purchaser ought to be taken into account. While it is not explicitly stated in such cases as *Crown Trust Co. v. Rosenberg* , supra, *Re Selkirk* (1986), supra, *Re Beauty Counsellors* , supra, *Re Selkirk* (1987), supra, and (*Cameron*), supra, I think they clearly imply that the interests of a person who has negotiated an agreement with a court-appointed receiver are very important.

41 In this case, the interests of all parties who would have an interest in the process were considered by the receiver and by Rosenberg J.

3. Consideration of the Efficacy and Integrity of the Process by which the Offer was Obtained

42 While it is accepted that the primary concern of a receiver is the protecting of the interests of the creditors, there is a secondary but very important consideration, and that is the integrity of the process by which the sale is effected. This is particularly so in the case of a sale of such a unique asset as an airline as a going concern.

43 The importance of a court protecting the integrity of the process has been stated in a number of cases. First, I refer to *Re Selkirk* , supra, where Saunders J. said at p. 246 [C.B.R.]:

In dealing with the request for approval, the court has to be concerned primarily with protecting the interest of the creditors of the former bankrupt. A secondary but important consideration is that the process under which the sale agreement is arrived at should be consistent with commercial efficacy and integrity.

In that connection I adopt the principles stated by Macdonald J.A. of the Nova Scotia Supreme Court (Appeal Division) in *Cameron v. Bank of N.S.* (1981), 38 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1, 45 N.S.R. (2d) 303, 86 A.P.R. 303 (C.A.) , where he said at p. 11:

In my opinion if the decision of the receiver to enter into an agreement of sale, subject to court approval, with respect to certain assets is reasonable and sound under the circumstances at the time existing it should not be set aside simply because a later and higher bid is made. To do so would literally create chaos in the commercial world and receivers and purchasers would never be sure they had a binding agreement. On the contrary, they would know that other bids could be received and considered up until the application for court approval is heard — this would be an intolerable situation.

While those remarks may have been made in the context of a bidding situation rather than a private sale, I consider them to be equally applicable to a negotiation process leading to a private sale. Where the court is concerned with the disposition of property, the purpose of appointing a receiver is to have the receiver do the work that the court would otherwise have to do.

44 In *Salima Investments Ltd. v. Bank of Montreal* (1985), 59 C.B.R. (N.S.) 242, 41 Alta. L.R. (2d) 58, 65 A.R. 372, 21 D.L.R. (4th) 473 at p. 476 [D.L.R.], the Alberta Court of Appeal said that sale by tender is not necessarily the best way to sell a business as an ongoing concern. It went on to say that when some other method is used which is provident, the court should not undermine the process by refusing to confirm the sale.

45 Finally, I refer to the reasoning of Anderson J. in *Crown Trust Co. v. Rosenberg* , supra, at p. 124 [O.R.]:

While every proper effort must always be made to assure maximum recovery consistent with the limitations inherent in the process, no method has yet been devised to entirely eliminate those limitations or to avoid their consequences. *Certainly it is not to be found in loosening the entire foundation of the system. Thus to compare the results of the process in this case with what might have been recovered in some other set of circumstances is neither logical nor practical .*

[Emphasis added.]

46 It is my opinion that the court must exercise extreme caution before it interferes with the process adopted by a receiver to sell an unusual asset. It is important that prospective purchasers know that, if they are acting in good faith, bargain seriously with a receiver and enter into an agreement with it, a court will not lightly interfere with the commercial judgment of the receiver to sell the asset to them.

47 Before this court, counsel for those opposing the confirmation of the sale to OEL suggested many different ways in which the receiver could have conducted the process other than the way which he did. However, the evidence does not convince me that the receiver used an improper method of attempting to sell the airline. The answer to those submissions is found in the comment of Anderson J. in *Crown Trust Co. v. Rosenberg*, supra, at p. 109 [O.R.]:

The court ought not to sit as on appeal from the decision of the Receiver, reviewing in minute detail every element of the process by which the decision is reached. To do so would be a futile and duplicitous exercise.

48 It would be a futile and duplicitous exercise for this court to examine in minute detail all of circumstances leading up to the acceptance of the OEL offer. Having considered the process adopted by the receiver, it is my opinion that the process adopted was a reasonable and prudent one.

4. Was there unfairness in the process?

49 As a general rule, I do not think it appropriate for the court to go into the minutia of the process or of the selling strategy adopted by the receiver. However, the court has a responsibility to decide whether the process was fair. The only part of this process which I could find that might give even a superficial impression of unfairness is the failure of the receiver to give an offering memorandum to those who expressed an interest in the purchase of Air Toronto.

50 I will outline the circumstances which relate to the allegation that the receiver was unfair in failing to provide an offering memorandum. In the latter part of 1990, as part of its selling strategy, the receiver was in the process of preparing an offering memorandum to give to persons who expressed an interest in the purchase of Air Toronto. The offering memorandum got as far as draft form, but was never released to anyone, although a copy of the draft eventually got into the hands of CCFL before it submitted the first 922 offer on March 7, 1991. A copy of the offering memorandum forms part of the record, and it seems to me to be little more than puffery, without any hard information which a sophisticated purchaser would require in or der to make a serious bid.

51 The offering memorandum had not been completed by February 11, 1991. On that date, the receiver entered into the letter of intent to negotiate with OEL. The letter of intent contained a provision that during its currency the receiver would not negotiate with any other party. The letter of intent was renewed from time to time until the OEL offer was received on March 6, 1991.

52 The receiver did not proceed with the offering memorandum because to do so would violate the spirit, if not the letter, of its letter of intent with OEL.

53 I do not think that the conduct of the receiver shows any unfairness towards 922. When I speak of 922, I do so in the context that Air Canada and CCFL are identified with it. I start by saying that the receiver acted reasonably when it entered into exclusive negotiations with OEL. I find it strange that a company, with which Air Canada is closely and intimately involved, would say that it was unfair for the receiver to enter into a time-limited agreement to negotiate exclusively with OEL. That is precisely the arrangement which Air Canada insisted upon when it negotiated with the receiver in the spring and summer of 1990. If it was not unfair for Air Canada to have such an agreement, I do not understand why it was unfair for OEL to have a similar one. In fact, both Air Canada and OEL in its turn were acting reasonably when they required exclusive negotiating rights to prevent their negotiations from being used as a bargaining lever with other potential purchasers. The fact that Air Canada insisted upon an exclusive negotiating right while it was negotiating with the receiver demonstrates the commercial efficacy of

OEL being given the same right during its negotiations with the receiver. I see no unfairness on the part of the receiver when it honoured its letter of intent with OEL by not releasing the offering memorandum during the negotiations with OEL.

54 Moreover, I am not prepared to find that 922 was in any way prejudiced by the fact that it did not have an offering memorandum. It made an offer on March 7, 1991, which it contends to this day was a better offer than that of OEL. 922 has not convinced me that if it had an offering memorandum, its offer would have been any different or any better than it actually was. The fatal problem with the first 922 offer was that it contained a condition which was completely unacceptable to the receiver. The receiver, properly, in my opinion, rejected the offer out of hand because of that condition. That condition did not relate to any information which could have conceivably been in an offering memorandum prepared by the receiver. It was about the resolution of a dispute between CCFL and the Royal Bank, something the receiver knew nothing about.

55 Further evidence of the lack of prejudice which the absence of an offering memorandum has caused 922 is found in CCFL's stance before this court. During argument, its counsel suggested as a possible resolution of this appeal that this court should call for new bids, evaluate them and then order a sale to the party who put in the better bid. In such a case, counsel for CCFL said that 922 would be prepared to bid within 7 days of the court's decision. I would have thought that, if there were anything to CCFL's suggestion that the failure to provide an offering memorandum was unfair to 922, that it would have told the court that it needed more information before it would be able to make a bid.

56 I am satisfied that Air Canada and CCFL have, and at all times had, all of the information which they would have needed to make what to them would be a commercially viable offer to the receiver. I think that an offering memorandum was of no commercial consequence to them, but the absence of one has since become a valuable tactical weapon.

57 It is my opinion that there is no convincing proof that if an offering memorandum had been widely distributed among persons qualified to have purchased Air Toronto, a viable offer would have come forth from a party other than 922 or OEL. Therefore, the failure to provide an offering memorandum was neither unfair, nor did it prejudice the obtaining of a better price on March 8, 1991, than that contained in the OEL offer. I would not give effect to the contention that the process adopted by the receiver was an unfair one.

58 There are two statements by Anderson J. contained in *Crown Trust Co. v. Rosenberg*, supra, which I adopt as my own. The first is at p. 109 [O.R.]:

The court should not proceed against the recommendations of its Receiver except in special circumstances and where the necessity and propriety of doing so are plain. Any other rule or approach would emasculate the role of the Receiver and make it almost inevitable that the final negotiation of every sale would take place on the motion for approval.

The second is at p. 111 [O.R.]:

It is equally clear, in my view, though perhaps not so clearly enunciated, that it is only in an exceptional case that the court will intervene and proceed contrary to the Receiver's recommendations if satisfied, as I am, that the Receiver has acted reasonably, prudently and fairly and not arbitrarily.

In this case the receiver acted reasonably, prudently, fairly and not arbitrarily. I am of the opinion, therefore, that the process adopted by the receiver in reaching an agreement was a just one.

59 In his reasons for judgment, after discussing the circumstances leading to the 922 offer, Rosenberg J. said this:

They created a situation as of March 8th, where the Receiver was faced with two offers, one of which was in acceptable form and one of which could not possibly be accepted in its present form. The Receiver acted appropriately in accepting the OEL offer.

I agree.

60 The receiver made proper and sufficient efforts to get the best price that it could for the assets of Air Toronto. It adopted a reasonable and effective process to sell the airline which was fair to all persons who might be interested in purchasing it. It is my opinion, therefore, that the receiver properly carried out the mandate which was given to it by the order of O'Brien J. It follows that Rosenberg J. was correct when he confirmed the sale to OEL.

II. The effect of the support of the 922 offer by the two secured creditors.

61 As I noted earlier, the 922 offer was supported before Rosenberg J., and in this court, by CCFL and by the Royal Bank, the two secured creditors. It was argued that, because the interests of the creditors are primary, the court ought to give effect to their wish that the 922 offer be accepted. I would not accede to that suggestion for two reasons.

62 The first reason is related to the fact that the creditors chose to have a receiver appointed by the court. It was open to them to appoint a private receiver pursuant to the authority of their security documents. Had they done so, then they would have had control of the process and could have sold Air Toronto to whom they wished. However, acting privately and controlling the process involves some risks. The appointment of a receiver by the court insulates the creditors from those risks. But, insulation from those risks carries with it the loss of control over the process of disposition of the assets. As I have attempted to explain in these reasons, when a receiver's sale is before the court for confirmation, the only issues are the propriety of the conduct of the receiver and whether it acted providently. The function of the court at that stage is not to step in and do the receiver's work, or change the sale strategy adopted by the receiver. Creditors who asked the court to appoint a receiver to dispose of assets should not be allowed to take over control of the process by the simple expedient of supporting another purchaser if they do not agree with the sale made by the receiver. That would take away all respect for the process of sale by a court-appointed receiver.

63 There can be no doubt that the interests of the creditor are an important consideration in determining whether the receiver has properly conducted a sale. The opinion of the creditors as to which offer ought to be accepted is something to be taken into account. But if the court decides that the receiver has acted properly and providently, those views are not necessarily determinative. Because, in this case, the receiver acted properly and providently, I do not think that the views of the creditors should override the considered judgment of the receiver.

64 The second reason is that, in the particular circumstances of this case, I do not think the support of CCFL and the Royal Bank of the 922 offer is entitled to any weight. The support given by CCFL can be dealt with summarily. It is a co-owner of 922. It is hardly surprising and not very impressive to hear that it supports the offer which it is making for the debtor's assets.

65 The support by the Royal Bank requires more consideration and involves some reference to the circumstances. On March 6, 1991, when the first 922 offer was made, there was in existence an inter-lender agreement between the Royal Bank and CCFL. That agreement dealt with the share of the proceeds of the sale of Air Toronto which each creditor would receive. At the time, a dispute between the Royal Bank and CCFL about the interpretation of that agreement was pending in the courts. The unacceptable condition in the first 922 offer related to the settlement of the inter-lender dispute. The condition required that the dispute be resolved in a way which would substantially favour CCFL. It required that CCFL receive \$3,375,000 of the \$6 million cash payment and the balance, including the royalties, if any, be paid to the Royal Bank. The Royal Bank did not agree with that split of the sale proceeds.

66 On April 5, 1991, the Royal Bank and CCFL agreed to settle the inter-lender dispute. The settlement was that if the 922 offer was accepted by the court, CCFL would receive only \$1 million, and the Royal Bank would receive \$5 million plus any royalties which might be paid. It was only in consideration of that settlement that the Royal Bank agreed to support the 922 offer.

67 The Royal Bank's support of the 922 offer is so affected by the very substantial benefit which it wanted to obtain from the settlement of the inter-lender dispute that, in my opinion, its support is devoid of any objectivity. I think it has no weight.

68 While there may be circumstances where the unanimous support by the creditors of a particular offer could conceivably override the proper and provident conduct of a sale by a receiver, I do not think that this is such a case. This is a case where the receiver has acted properly and in a provident way. It would make a mockery out of the judicial process, under which a mandate

was given to this receiver to sell this airline if the support by these creditors of the 922 offer were permitted to carry the day. I give no weight to the support which they give to the 922 offer.

69 In its factum, the receiver pointed out that, because of greater liabilities imposed upon private receivers by various statutes such as the *Employment Standards Act*, R.S.O. 1980, c. 137, and the *Environmental Protection Act*, R.S.O. 1980, c. 141, it is likely that more and more the courts will be asked to appoint receivers in insolvencies. In those circumstances, I think that creditors who ask for court-appointed receivers and business people who choose to deal with those receivers should know that if those receivers act properly and providently, their decisions and judgments will be given great weight by the courts who appoint them. I have decided this appeal in the way I have in order to assure business people who deal with court-appointed receivers that they can have confidence that an agreement which they make with a court-appointed receiver will be far more than a platform upon which others may bargain at the court approval stage. I think that persons who enter into agreements with court-appointed receivers, following a disposition procedure that is appropriate given the nature of the assets involved, should expect that their bargain will be confirmed by the court.

70 The process is very important. It should be carefully protected so that the ability of court-appointed receivers to negotiate the best price possible is strengthened and supported. Because this receiver acted properly and providently in entering into the OEL agreement, I am of the opinion that Rosenberg J. was right when he approved the sale to OEL and dismissed the motion to approve the 922 offer.

71 I would, accordingly, dismiss the appeal. I would award the receiver, OEL and Frontier Airlines Limited their costs out of the Soundair estate, those of the receiver on a solicitor-client scale. I would make no order as to the costs of any of the other parties or intervenors.

McKinlay J.A. :

72 I agree with Galligan J.A. in result, but wish to emphasize that I do so on the basis that the undertaking being sold in this case was of a very special and unusual nature. It is most important that the integrity of procedures followed by court-appointed receivers be protected in the interests of both commercial morality and the future confidence of business persons in their dealings with receivers. Consequently, in all cases, the court should carefully scrutinize the procedure followed by the receiver to determine whether it satisfies the tests set out by Anderson J. in *Crown Trust Co. v. Rosenberg* (1986), 67 C.B.R. (N.S.) 320n, 60 O.R. (2d) 87, 22 C.P.C. (2d) 131, 39 D.L.R. (4th) 526 (H.C.). While the procedure carried out by the receiver in this case, as described by Galligan J.A., was appropriate, given the unfolding of events and the unique nature of the assets involved, it is not a procedure that is likely to be appropriate in many receivership sales.

73 I should like to add that where there is a small number of creditors who are the only parties with a real interest in the proceeds of the sale (i.e., where it is clear that the highest price attainable would result in recovery so low that no other creditors, shareholders, guarantors, etc., could possibly benefit therefore), the wishes of the interested creditors should be very seriously considered by the receiver. It is true, as Galligan J.A. points out, that in seeking the court appointment of a receiver, the moving parties also seek the protection of the court in carrying out the receiver's functions. However, it is also true that in utilizing the court process, the moving parties have opened the whole process to detailed scrutiny by all involved, and have probably added significantly to their costs and consequent shortfall as a result of so doing. The adoption of the court process should in no way diminish the rights of any party, and most certainly not the rights of the only parties with a real interest. Where a receiver asks for court approval of a sale which is opposed by the only parties in interest, the court should scrutinize with great care the procedure followed by the receiver. I agree with Galligan J.A. that in this case that was done. I am satisfied that the rights of all parties were properly considered by the receiver, by the learned motions court judge, and by Galligan J.A.

Goodman J.A. (dissenting):

74 I have had the opportunity of reading the reasons for judgment herein of Galligan and McKinlay J.A. Respectfully, I am unable to agree with their conclusion.

75 The case at bar is an exceptional one in the sense that upon the application made for approval of the sale of the assets of Air Toronto, two competing offers were placed before Rosenberg J. Those two offers were that of OEL and that of 922, a company incorporated for the purpose of acquiring Air Toronto. Its shares were owned equally by CCFL and Air Canada. It was conceded by all parties to these proceedings that the only persons who had any interest in the proceeds of the sale were two secured creditors, viz., CCFL and the Royal Bank of Canada. Those two creditors were unanimous in their position that they desired the court to approve the sale to 922. We were not referred to, nor am I aware of, any case where a court has refused to abide by the unanimous wishes of the only interested creditors for the approval of a specific offer made in receivership proceedings.

76 In *British Columbia Developments Corp. v. Spun Cast Industries Ltd.* (1977), 26 C.B.R. (N.S.) 28, 5 B.C.L.R. 94 (S.C.), Berger J. said at p. 30 [C.B.R.]:

Here all of those with a financial stake in the plant have joined in seeking the court's approval of the sale to Fincas. This court does not have a roving commission to decide what is best for investors and businessmen when they have agreed among themselves what course of action they should follow. It is their money.

77 I agree with that statement. It is particularly apt to this case. The two secured creditors will suffer a shortfall of approximately \$50 million. They have a tremendous interest in the sale of assets which form part of their security. I agree with the finding of Rosenberg J. that the offer of 922 is superior to that of OEL. He concluded that the 922 offer is marginally superior. If by that he meant that mathematically it was likely to provide slightly more in the way of proceeds, it is difficult to take issue with that finding. If, on the other hand, he meant that having regard to all considerations it was only marginally superior, I cannot agree. He said in his reasons:

I have come to the conclusion that knowledgeable creditors such as the Royal Bank would prefer the 922 offer even if the other factors influencing their decision were not present. No matter what adjustments had to be made, the 922 offer results in more cash immediately. Creditors facing the type of loss the Royal Bank is taking in this case would not be anxious to rely on contingencies especially in the present circumstances surrounding the airline industry.

78 I agree with that statement completely. It is apparent that the difference between the two offers insofar as cash on closing is concerned amounts to approximately \$3 million to \$4 million. The bank submitted that it did not wish to gamble any further with respect to its investment, and that the acceptance and court approval of the OEL offer in effect supplanted its position as a secured creditor with respect to the amount owing over and above the down payment and placed it in the position of a joint entrepreneur, but one with no control. This results from the fact that the OEL offer did not provide for any security for any funds which might be forthcoming over and above the initial down payment on closing.

79 In *Cameron v. Bank of Nova Scotia* (1981), 38 C.B.R. (N.S.) 1, 45 N.S.R. (2d) 303, 86 A.P.R. 303 (C.A.), Hart J.A., speaking for the majority of the court, said at p. 10 [C.B.R.]:

Here we are dealing with a receiver appointed at the instance of one major creditor, who chose to insert in the contract of sale a provision making it subject to the approval of the court. This, in my opinion, shows an intention on behalf of the parties to invoke the normal equitable doctrines which place the court in the position of looking to the interests of all persons concerned before giving its blessing to a particular transaction submitted for approval. In these circumstances the court would not consider itself bound by the contract entered into in good faith by the receiver but would have to look to the broader picture to see that that contract was for the benefit of the creditors as a whole. When there was evidence that a higher price was readily available for the property the chambers judge was, in my opinion, justified in exercising his discretion as he did. Otherwise he could have deprived the creditors of a substantial sum of money.

80 This statement is apposite to the circumstances of the case at bar. I hasten to add that in my opinion it is not only price which is to be considered in the exercise of the judge's discretion. It may very well be, as I believe to be so in this case, that the amount of cash is the most important element in determining which of the two offers is for the benefit and in the best interest of the creditors.

81 It is my view, and the statement of Hart J.A. is consistent therewith, that the fact that a creditor has requested an order of the court appointing a receiver does not in any way diminish or derogate from his right to obtain the maximum benefit to be derived from any disposition of the debtor's assets. I agree completely with the views expressed by McKinlay J.A. in that regard in her reasons.

82 It is my further view that any negotiations which took place between the only two interested creditors in deciding to support the approval of the 922 offer were not relevant to the determination by the presiding judge of the issues involved in the motion for approval of either one of the two offers, nor are they relevant in determining the outcome of this appeal. It is sufficient that the two creditors have decided unanimously what is in their best interest, and the appeal must be considered in the light of that decision. It so happens, however, that there is ample evidence to support their conclusion that the approval of the 922 offer is in their best interests.

83 I am satisfied that the interests of the creditors are the prime consideration for both the receiver and the court. In *Re Beauty Counsellors of Canada Ltd.* (1986), 58 C.B.R. (N.S.) 237 (Ont. S.C.), Saunders J. said at p. 243:

This does not mean that a court should ignore a new and higher bid made after acceptance where there has been no unfairness in the process. The interests of the creditors, while not the only consideration, are the prime consideration.

84 I agree with that statement of the law. In *Re Selkirk* (1986), 58 C.B.R. (N.S.) 245 (Ont. S.C.), Saunders J. heard an application for court approval of the sale by the sheriff of real property in bankruptcy proceedings. The sheriff had been previously ordered to list the property for sale subject to approval of the court. Saunders J. said at p. 246:

In dealing with the request for approval, the court has to be concerned primarily with protecting the interests of the creditors of the former bankrupt. A secondary but important consideration is that the process under which the sale agreement is arrived at should be consistent with commercial efficacy and integrity.

85 I am in agreement with that statement as a matter of general principle. Saunders J. further stated that he adopted the principles stated by Macdonald J.A. in *Cameron*, supra, quoted by Galligan J.A. in his reasons. In *Cameron*, the remarks of Macdonald J.A. related to situations involving the calling of bids and fixing a time limit for the making of such bids. In those circumstances the process is so clear as a matter of commercial practice that an interference by the court in such process might have a deleterious effect on the efficacy of receivership proceedings in other cases. But Macdonald J.A. recognized that even in bid or tender cases where the offeror for whose bid approval is sought has complied with all requirements, a court might not approve the agreement of purchase and sale entered into by the receiver. He said at pp. 11-12 [C.B.R.]:

There are, of course, many reasons why a court might not approve an agreement of purchase and sale, viz., where the offer accepted is so low in relation to the appraised value as to be unrealistic; or, where the circumstances indicate that insufficient time was allowed for the making of bids or that inadequate notice of sale by bid was given (where the receiver sells property by the bid method); or, where it can be said that the proposed sale is not in the best interest of either the creditors or the owner. Court approval must involve the delicate balancing of competing interests and not simply a consideration of the interests of the creditors.

86 The deficiency in the present case is so large that there has been no suggestion of a competing interest between the owner and the creditors.

87 I agree that the same reasoning may apply to a negotiation process leading to a private sale, but the procedure and process applicable to private sales of a wide variety of businesses and undertakings with the multiplicity of individual considerations applicable and perhaps peculiar to the particular business is not so clearly established that a departure by the court from the process adopted by the receiver in a particular case will result in commercial chaos to the detriment of future receivership proceedings. Each case must be decided on its own merits, and it is necessary to consider the process used by the receiver in the present proceedings and to determine whether it was unfair, improvident or inadequate.

88 It is important to note at the outset that Rosenberg J. made the following statement in his reasons:

On March 8, 1991 the trustee accepted the OEL offer subject to court approval. The Receiver at that time had no other offer before it that was in final form or could possibly be accepted. The Receiver had at the time the knowledge that Air Canada with CCFL had not bargained in good faith and had not fulfilled the promise of its letter of March 1st. The Receiver was justified in assuming that Air Canada and CCFL's offer was a long way from being in an acceptable form and that Air Canada and CCFL's objective was to interrupt the finalizing of the OEL agreement and to retain as long as possible the Air Toronto connector traffic flowing into Terminal 2 for the benefit of Air Canada.

89 In my opinion there was no evidence before him or before this court to indicate that Air Canada, with CCFL, had not bargained in good faith, and that the receiver had knowledge of such lack of good faith. Indeed, on his appeal, counsel for the receiver stated that he was not alleging Air Canada and CCFL had not bargained in good faith. Air Canada had frankly stated at the time that it had made its offer to purchase, which was eventually refused by the receiver, that it would not become involved in an "auction" to purchase the undertaking of Air Canada and that, although it would fulfil its contractual obligations to provide connecting services to Air Toronto, it would do no more than it was legally required to do insofar as facilitating the purchase of Air Toronto by any other person. In so doing, Air Canada may have been playing "hardball," as its behaviour was characterized by some of the counsel for opposing parties. It was nevertheless merely openly asserting its legal position, as it was entitled to do.

90 Furthermore, there was no evidence before Rosenberg J. or this court that the receiver had assumed that Air Canada and CCFL's objective in making an offer was to interrupt the finalizing of the OEL agreement and to retain as long as possible the Air Toronto connector traffic flowing into Terminal 2 for the benefit of Air Canada. Indeed, there was no evidence to support such an assumption in any event, although it is clear that 922, and through it CCFL and Air Canada, were endeavouring to present an offer to purchase which would be accepted and/or approved by the court in preference to the offer made by OEL.

91 To the extent that approval of the OEL agreement by Rosenberg J. was based on the alleged lack of good faith in bargaining and improper motivation with respect to connector traffic on the part of Air Canada and CCFL, it cannot be supported.

92 I would also point out that rather than saying there was no other offer before it that was final in form, it would have been more accurate to have said that there was *no unconditional* offer before it.

93 In considering the material and evidence placed before the court, I am satisfied that the receiver was at all times acting in good faith. I have reached the conclusion, however, that the process which he used was unfair insofar as 922 is concerned, and improvident insofar as the two secured creditors are concerned.

94 Air Canada had been negotiating with Soundair Corporation for the purchase from it of Air Toronto for a considerable period of time prior to the appointment of a receiver by the court. It had given a letter of intent indicating a prospective sale price of \$18 million. After the appointment of the receiver, by agreement dated April 30, 1990, Air Canada continued its negotiations for the purchase of Air Toronto with the receiver. Although this agreement contained a clause which provided that the receiver "shall not negotiate for the sale ... of Air Toronto with any person except Air Canada," it further provided that the receiver would not be in breach of that provision merely by receiving unsolicited offers for all or any of the assets of Air Toronto. In addition, the agreement, which had a term commencing on April 30, 1990, could be terminated on the fifth business day following the delivery of a written notice of termination by one party to the other. I point out this provision merely to indicate that the exclusivity privilege extended by the receiver to Air Canada was of short duration at the receiver's option.

95 As a result of due diligence investigations carried out by Air Canada during the months of April, May and June of 1990, Air Canada reduced its offer to \$8.1 million conditional upon there being \$4 million in tangible assets. The offer was made on June 14, 1990, and was open for acceptance until June 29, 1990.

96 By amending agreement dated June 19, 1990, the receiver was released from its covenant to refrain from negotiating for the sale of the Air Toronto business and assets to any person other than Air Canada. By virtue of this amending agreement, the receiver had put itself in the position of having a firm offer in hand, with the right to negotiate and accept offers from other

persons. Air Canada, in these circumstances, was in the subservient position. The receiver, in the exercise of its judgment and discretion, allowed the Air Canada offer to lapse. On July 20, 1990, Air Canada served a notice of termination of the April 30, 1990 agreement.

97 Apparently as a result of advice received from the receiver to the effect that the receiver intended to conduct an auction for the sale of the assets and business of the Air Toronto division of Soundair Corporation, the solicitors for Air Canada advised the receiver by letter dated July 20, 1990, in part as follows:

Air Canada has instructed us to advise you that it does not intend to submit a further offer in the auction process.

98 This statement, together with other statements set forth in the letter, was sufficient to indicate that Air Canada was not interested in purchasing Air Toronto in the process apparently contemplated by the receiver at that time. It did not form a proper foundation for the receiver to conclude that there was no realistic possibility of selling Air Toronto [to] Air Canada, either alone or in conjunction with some other person, in different circumstances. In June 1990, the receiver was of the opinion that the fair value of Air Toronto was between \$10 million and \$12 million.

99 In August 1990, the receiver contacted a number of interested parties. A number of offers were received which were not deemed to be satisfactory. One such offer, received on August 20, 1990, came as a joint offer from OEL and Air Ontario (an Air Canada connector). It was for the sum of \$3 million for the good will relating to certain Air Toronto routes, but did not include the purchase of any tangible assets or leasehold interests.

100 In December 1990, the receiver was approached by the management of Canadian Partner (operated by OEL) for the purpose of evaluating the benefits of an amalgamated Air Toronto/Air Partner operation. The negotiations continued from December of 1990 to February of 1991, culminating in the OEL agreement dated March 8, 1991.

101 On or before December 1990, CCFL advised the receiver that it intended to make a bid for the Air Toronto assets. The receiver, in August of 1990, for the purpose of facilitating the sale of Air Toronto assets, commenced the preparation of an operating memorandum. He prepared no less than six draft operating memoranda with dates from October 1990 through March 1, 1991. None of these were distributed to any prospective bidder despite requests having been received therefor, with the exception of an early draft provided to CCFL without the receiver's knowledge.

102 During the period December 1990 to the end of January 1991, the receiver advised CCFL that the offering memorandum was in the process of being prepared and would be ready soon for distribution. He further advised CCFL that it should await the receipt of the memorandum before submitting a formal offer to purchase the Air Toronto assets.

103 By late January, CCFL had become aware that the receiver was negotiating with OEL for the sale of Air Toronto. In fact, on February 11, 1991, the receiver signed a letter of intent with OEL wherein it had specifically agreed not to negotiate with any other potential bidders or solicit any offers from others.

104 By letter dated February 25, 1991, the solicitors for CCFL made a written request to the receiver for the offering memorandum. The receiver did not reply to the letter because he felt he was precluded from so doing by the provisions of the letter of intent dated February 11, 1991. Other prospective purchasers were also unsuccessful in obtaining the promised memorandum to assist them in preparing their bids. It should be noted that, exclusivity provision of the letter of intent expired on February 20, 1991. This provision was extended on three occasions, viz., February 19, 22 and March 5, 1991. It is clear that from a legal standpoint the receiver, by refusing to extend the time, could have dealt with other prospective purchasers, and specifically with 922.

105 It was not until March 1, 1991, that CCFL had obtained sufficient information to enable it to make a bid through 922. It succeeded in so doing through its own efforts through sources other than the receiver. By that time the receiver had already entered into the letter of intent with OEL. Notwithstanding the fact that the receiver knew since December of 1990 that CCFL wished to make a bid for the assets of Air Toronto (and there is no evidence to suggest that at that time such a bid would be in conjunction with Air Canada or that Air Canada was in any way connected with CCFL), it took no steps to provide CCFL

with information necessary to enable it to make an intelligent bid, and indeed suggested delaying the making of the bid until an offering memorandum had been prepared and provided. In the meantime, by entering into the letter of intent with OEL, it put itself in a position where it could not negotiate with CCFL or provide the information requested.

106 On February 28, 1991, the solicitors for CCFL telephoned the receiver and were advised for the first time that the receiver had made a business decision to negotiate solely with OEL and would not negotiate with anyone else in the interim.

107 By letter dated March 1, 1991, CCFL advised the receiver that it intended to submit a bid. It set forth the essential terms of the bid and stated that it would be subject to customary commercial provisions. On March 7, 1991 CCFL and Air Canada, jointly through 922, submitted an offer to purchase Air Toronto upon the terms set forth in the letter dated March 1, 1991. It included a provision that the offer was conditional upon the interpretation of an inter-lender agreement which set out the relative distribution of proceeds as between CCFL and the Royal Bank. It is common ground that it was a condition over which the receiver had no control, and accordingly would not have been acceptable on that ground alone. The receiver did not, however, contact CCFL in order to negotiate or request the removal of the condition, although it appears that its agreement with OEL not to negotiate with any person other than OEL expired on March 6, 1991.

108 The fact of the matter is that by March 7, 1991, the receiver had received the offer from OEL which was subsequently approved by Rosenberg J. That offer was accepted by the receiver on March 8, 1991. Notwithstanding the fact that OEL had been negotiating the purchase for a period of approximately 3 months, the offer contained a provision for the sole benefit of the purchaser that it was subject to the purchaser obtaining "a financing commitment within 45 days of the date hereof in an amount not less than the Purchase Price from the Royal Bank of Canada or other financial institution upon terms and conditions acceptable to them. In the event that such a financing commitment is not obtained within such 45 day period, the purchaser or OEL shall have the right to terminate this agreement upon giving written notice of termination to the vendor on the first Business Day following the expiry of the said period." The purchaser was also given the right to waive the condition.

109 In effect, the agreement was tantamount to a 45-day option to purchase, excluding the right of any other person to purchase Air Toronto during that period of time and thereafter if the condition was fulfilled or waived. The agreement was, of course, stated to be subject to court approval.

110 In my opinion, the process and procedure adopted by the receiver was unfair to CCFL. Although it was aware from December 1990 that CCFL was interested in making an offer, it effectively delayed the making of such offer by continually referring to the preparation of the offering memorandum. It did not endeavour during the period December 1990 to March 7, 1991, to negotiate with CCFL in any way the possible terms of purchase and sale agreement. In the result, no offer was sought from CCFL by the receiver prior to February 11, 1991, and thereafter it put itself in the position of being unable to negotiate with anyone other than OEL. The receiver then, on March 8, 1991, chose to accept an offer which was conditional in nature without prior consultation with CCFL (922) to see whether it was prepared to remove the condition in its offer.

111 I do not doubt that the receiver felt that it was more likely that the condition in the OEL offer would be fulfilled than the condition in the 922 offer. It may be that the receiver, having negotiated for a period of 3 months with OEL, was fearful that it might lose the offer if OEL discovered that it was negotiating with another person. Nevertheless, it seems to me that it was imprudent and unfair on the part of the receiver to ignore an offer from an interested party which offered approximately triple the cash down payment without giving a chance to the offeror to remove the conditions or other terms which made the offer unacceptable to it. The potential loss was that of an agreement which amounted to little more than an option in favour of the offeror.

112 In my opinion the procedure adopted by the receiver was unfair to CCFL in that, in effect, it gave OEL the opportunity of engaging in exclusive negotiations for a period of 3 months, notwithstanding the fact that it knew CCFL was interested in making an offer. The receiver did not indicate a deadline by which offers were to be submitted, and it did not at any time indicate the structure or nature of an offer which might be acceptable to it.

113 In his reasons, Rosenberg J. stated that as of March 1, CCFL and Air Canada had all the information that they needed, and any allegations of unfairness in the negotiating process by the receiver had disappeared. He said:

They created a situation as of March 8, where the receiver was faced with two offers, one of which was acceptable in form and one of which could not possibly be accepted in its present form. The Receiver acted appropriately in accepting the OEL offer.

If he meant by "acceptable in form" that it was acceptable to the receiver, then obviously OEL had the unfair advantage of its lengthy negotiations with the receiver to ascertain what kind of an offer would be acceptable to the receiver. If, on the other hand, he meant that the 922 offer was unacceptable in its form because it was conditional, it can hardly be said that the OEL offer was more acceptable in this regard, as it contained a condition with respect to financing terms and conditions "*acceptable to them*."

114 It should be noted that on March 13, 1991, the representatives of 922 first met with the receiver to review its offer of March 7, 1991, and at the request of the receiver, withdrew the inter-lender condition from its offer. On March 14, 1991, OEL removed the financing condition from its offer. By order of Rosenberg J. dated March 26, 1991, CCFL was given until April 5, 1991, to submit a bid, and on April 5, 1991, 922 submitted its offer with the inter-lender condition removed.

115 In my opinion, the offer accepted by the receiver is improvident and unfair insofar as the two creditors are concerned. It is not improvident in the sense that the price offered by 922 greatly exceeded that offered by OEL. In the final analysis it may not be greater at all. The salient fact is that the cash down payment in the 922 offer constitutes proximately two thirds of the contemplated sale price, whereas the cash down payment in the OEL transaction constitutes approximately 20 to 25 per cent of the contemplated sale price. In terms of absolute dollars, the down payment in the 922 offer would likely exceed that provided for in the OEL agreement by approximately \$3 million to \$4 million.

116 In *Re Beauty Counsellors of Canada Ltd.*, supra, Saunders J. said at p. 243 [C.B.R.]:

If a substantially higher bid turns up at the approval stage, the court should consider it. Such a bid may indicate, for example, that the trustee has not properly carried out its duty to endeavour to obtain the best price for the estate. In such a case the proper course might be to refuse approval and to ask the trustee to recommence the process.

117 I accept that statement as being an accurate statement of the law. I would add, however, as previously indicated, that in determining what is the best price for the estate, the receiver or court should not limit its consideration to which offer provides for the greater sale price. The amount of down payment and the provision or lack thereof to secure payment of the balance of the purchase price over and above the down payment may be the most important factor to be considered, and I am of the view that is so in the present case. It is clear that that was the view of the only creditors who can benefit from the sale of Air Toronto.

118 I note that in the case at bar the 922 offer in conditional form was presented to the receiver before it accepted the OEL offer. The receiver, in good faith, although I believe mistakenly, decided that the OEL offer was the better offer. At that time the receiver did not have the benefit of the views of the two secured creditors in that regard. At the time of the application for approval before Rosenberg J., the stated preference of the two interested creditors was made quite clear. He found as fact that knowledgeable creditors would not be anxious to rely on contingencies in the present circumstances surrounding the airline industry. It is reasonable to expect that a receiver would be no less knowledgeable in that regard, and it is his primary duty to protect the interests of the creditors. In my view, it was an improvident act on the part of the receiver to have accepted the conditional offer made by OEL, and Rosenberg J. erred in failing to dismiss the application of the receiver for approval of the OEL offer. It would be most inequitable to foist upon the two creditors, who have already been seriously hurt, more unnecessary contingencies.

119 Although in other circumstances it might be appropriate to ask the receiver to recommence the process, in my opinion, it would not be appropriate to do so in this case. The only two interested creditors support the acceptance of the 922 offer, and the court should so order.

120 Although I would be prepared to dispose of the case on the grounds stated above, some comment should be addressed to the question of interference by the court with the process and procedure adopted by the receiver.

121 I am in agreement with the view expressed by McKinlay J.A. in her reasons that the undertaking being sold in this case was of a very special and unusual nature. As a result, the procedure adopted by the receiver was somewhat unusual. At the outset, in accordance with the terms of the receiving order, it dealt solely with Air Canada. It then appears that the receiver contemplated a sale of the assets by way of auction, and still later contemplated the preparation and distribution of an offering memorandum inviting bids. At some point, without advice to CCFL, it abandoned that idea and reverted to exclusive negotiations with one interested party. This entire process is not one which is customary or widely accepted as a general practice in the commercial world. It was somewhat unique, having regard to the circumstances of this case. In my opinion, the refusal of the court to approve the offer accepted by the receiver would not reflect on the integrity of procedures followed by court-appointed receivers, and is not the type of refusal which will have a tendency to undermine the future confidence of business persons in dealing with receivers.

122 Rosenberg J. stated that the Royal Bank was aware of the process used and tacitly approved it. He said it knew the terms of the letter of intent in February 1991, and made no comment. The Royal Bank did, however, indicate to the receiver that it was not satisfied with the contemplated price, nor the amount of the down payment. It did not, however, tell the receiver to adopt a different process in endeavouring to sell the Air Toronto assets. It is not clear from the material filed that at the time it became aware of the letter of intent that it knew that CCFL was interested in purchasing Air Toronto.

123 I am further of the opinion that a prospective purchaser who has been given an opportunity to engage in exclusive negotiations with a receiver for relatively short periods of time which are extended from time to time by the receiver, and who then makes a conditional offer, the condition of which is for his sole benefit and must be fulfilled to his satisfaction unless waived by him, and which he knows is to be subject to court approval, cannot legitimately claim to have been unfairly dealt with if the court refuses to approve the offer and approves a substantially better one.

124 In conclusion, I feel that I must comment on the statement made by Galligan J.A. in his reasons to the effect that the suggestion made by counsel for 922 constitutes evidence of lack of prejudice resulting from the absence of an offering memorandum. It should be pointed out that the court invited counsel to indicate the manner in which the problem should be resolved in the event that the court concluded that the order approving the OEL offer should be set aside. There was no evidence before the court with respect to what additional information may have been acquired by CCFL since March 8, 1991, and no inquiry was made in that regard. Accordingly, I am of the view that no adverse inference should be drawn from the proposal made as a result of the court's invitation.

125 For the above reasons I would allow the appeal one set of costs to CCFL-922, set aside the order of Rosenberg J., dismiss the receiver's motion with one set of costs to CCFL-922 and order that the assets of Air Toronto be sold to numbered corporation 922246 on the terms set forth in its offer with appropriate adjustments to provide for the delay in its execution. Costs awarded shall be payable out of the estate of Soundair Corporation. The costs incurred by the receiver in making the application and responding to the appeal shall be paid to him out of the assets of the estate of Soundair Corporation on a solicitor-client basis. I would make no order as to costs of any of the other parties or intervenors.

Appeal dismissed.

TAB 5

SUPREME COURT OF NOVA SCOTIA
IN BANKRUPTCY AND INSOLVENCY

Citation: *Royal Bank of Canada v. 2M Farms Ltd.*, 2017 NSSC 105

Date: 2017-04-18

Docket: Hfx. No. 425907

Registry: Halifax

Between:

Royal Bank of Canada

Applicant

v.

2M Farms Ltd.

Respondent

Decision

Judge: The Honourable Justice Moir

Heard: February 23, 2017 & March 2, 2017, in Halifax, Nova Scotia

Oral Decision: March 3, 2017

**Transcribed &
Edited:** April 18, 2017, in Halifax, Nova Scotia

Counsel: Gavin D.F. MacDonald & Meryn Steves, for the Applicant
Tim Peacock, for the Intervenor, National Building Group
Inc.
Marc Comeau, for Dana Robinson Fisheries Limited

Moir, J. (Orally):

Introduction

[1] BDO Canada Limited, as receiver of 2M Farms Ltd., moves for approval of a sale of a five acre lot including a potato warehouse and as counsel puts it: “foreclose out the encumbrances on title to the property.” The receivership and power of sale are to enforce security for bank debts. The only known encumbrancer, besides the plaintiff, had been joined as a party.

[2] The other encumbrancer is National Building Group Inc. It has a builder’s lien that was registered after the banks’ security. The priority between the banks’ security and the builder’s lien is in dispute. National Building Group seeks to make a case under s. 8(3) of the *Builder’s Lien Act*.

[3] The proposed order provides for proceeds of sale to be paid into court and for the proceeds to stand in the place of the property pending determination of the priorities.

[4] In addition to the issues of approving the sale and ordering the proceeds be paid into court, I raised questions about the proposed terms for the order for sale by the receiver. Also, some questions about the appropriateness of permitting sale

before priorities are settled have been raised by National Building Group. I will deal with those issues after determining whether to accept the receiver's recommendation.

Approval of Sale

[5] The receiver submits that *Royal Bank of Canada v. Soundair Corporation* [1991] O.J. 1137 (CA) is the leading case on approval of sales. It emphasizes: (1) sufficiency of the sales effort, (2) interests of the parties, (3) efficacy or integrity of the sale process, and (4) fairness in working out the process.

[6] The *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* was amended after *Soundair*. The amendment established a national receivership and included a provision on the general duties of receivers, which must now be kept in mind when approval of a receiver sale is sought. An appointment of a receiver to enforce security is now usually made under both the national receivership provisions and provincial law (both statutory and common law).

[7] As stated by Justice Wood at paragraph 14 of *ECBC v. Crown Jewel Resort Ranch Inc.*, 2014 NSSC 420: "it is not the role of the Court to review in detail every element of the process followed by the Receiver". Under s. 247(b) of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, a receiver must deal with the receivership property

in a commercially reasonable manner. Justice Wood followed long standing authorities when he held, also at paragraph 14 of *Crown Jewel*, that the court will consider fairness of the process that led to the sale.

[8] As I see it, the general obligation under s. 247(b) is the touchstone for approval of a sale by the receiver when the receiver has been appointed under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, alone or in combination with provincial law. Commercial reasonableness is the touchstone for approval. The case law tells us that commercial reasonableness includes fairness, efficacy, integrity, and sufficiency of the sale process. It also tells us that the interests of the parties have to be borne in mind.

[9] BDO Canada Limited was appointed receiver of 2M Farms Ltd. in April 2014 and it was given power to sell assets, mainly the potato warehouse in Berwick. The Royal Bank of Canada held a general security agreement and a collateral mortgage of the property. National Building Group Inc. registered a builders' lien. It appears that the Royal Bank is owed about a million dollars and National Building Group is owed about \$130,000. These are the only secured creditors of the warehouse property. As I said, priority is in dispute.

[10] The land is five acres just outside Berwick. The bank financed and the National Building Group constructed a building on the property. It is a 18,300 square foot vegetable warehouse equipped to store and ventilate potatoes. The construction was nearly complete when the bank called its' loans and National Building Group filed its' lien.

[11] To finish the building, a new owner will have to install heating, plumbing, and septic systems. A part of the concrete floor remains to be poured.

[12] The receiver listed the property with a firm of commercial realtors in July, 2014 for about \$700,000. No offers were received until June, 2015. Offers were well under list prices. As a consequence of the apparent lack of interest in the first year and disappointing offers after that, the receiver reduced the list price from time to time. In rounded figures the list prices went as follows:

February, 2015.....	\$600,000
January, 2016.....	\$550,000
March, 2016.....	\$500,000
June, 2016.....	\$425,000
July, 2016.....	\$350,000
October, 2016.....	\$315,000.

[13] The realtors reported regularly to the receiver and the bank. The reports, and testimony from one of the realtors, evidenced the marketing efforts and recommendations on listing prices. The evidence also shows that there were at least three impediments in the market. First, was the incomplete state of the construction. Secondly, uses desired by at least one potential purchaser required a change from the agriculture A1 zone attached to the five acres. Thirdly, there were problems with egress in the winter months.

[14] Four offers were made and negotiated over. The first was for \$300,000 in June, 2015. The receiver attempted to move the price to \$400,000 but the party was not interested. In August, 2015 \$200,000 was offered. The negotiations stopped at \$240,000. In June, 2016 there was an offer of \$275,000, which the receiver succeeded in increasing to \$350,000. The agreement failed when the purchaser attempted to negotiate a lengthy extension of a due diligence condition, mainly to pursue a change in the zoning.

[15] In November of 2016, Dana Robinson Fisheries Limited offered \$200,000. Negotiations only got this party to \$210,000. The receiver accepted an offer of that much, subject of course to approval by the court. That is the sale that concerns us today.

[16] National Building Group criticizes the sale in a number of ways. An MLS listing was not pursued. For several months before the sale there were no signs on the road that passes the property. There was a sign visible from Highway 101, but it was inadequate. At one time, the property could have been sold for \$300,000, which is \$90,000 more than the present sale.

[17] National Building Group also argues “the reasonableness of the purchase price... is a difficult analysis without an accounting by the receiver of the expenses incurred in the management and marketing of the property.” It proposed that we determine the priorities before considering sale approval or “delay the proposed sale for 30 days to allow for an accounting”, and an opportunity for National Building Group “to explore its’ options”.

[18] The difficulty with these arguments is that the purchaser will not be bound unless the receiver closes on the closing date or an agreed extension of it. The court cannot “delay the proposed sale”. Further, I failed to see the connection between expense of receivership and the reasonableness of the sale price. The representatives of the lien holder explained that knowing the amount of the expense was requisite to National Building Group formulating or soliciting an amount to be offered now.

[19] This argument is augmented by the disclosure that there was a failure in communications between the receiver and National Building Group about the sale. Also, National Building Group counsel argues that the receiver's failure to consult when reducing the list price to \$315,000 caused unfairness and obscured transparency. I will dispose of the other criticisms, then come back to the issue of whether National Building Group was treated fairly.

[20] The decision to reject the \$300,000 offer was made almost two years ago. At that time the list price was \$600,000, appraisals were available, and experienced commercial realtors were advising. To seek \$400,000 was a judgement made by the receiver in the circumstances of that time. It may not have been commercially reasonable to accept \$300,000 at that time.

[21] The complaint about signs takes us into a review far too detailed for a motion to approve a receiver's sale. Also, I refer to the details of the marketing effort and the testimony of Mr. Tom Carpenter, which I accept.

[22] The complaint about MLS was fully answered by Mr. Carpenter. That kind of listing is not usually helpful for marketing a commercial property in the Annapolis Valley. What is important is that MLS realtors were regularly informed

about the property and the list prices. This was one of the several marketing techniques Mr. Carpenter's firm used, and it did lead to potential purchasers.

[23] In light of the amount of secured debt and the appraisals, a \$210,000 purchase price is disappointing. However, the property was exposed to the market for over twenty months while it was the subject of a professional marketing effort. I find the sale is commercially reasonable, unless it treats National Building Group unfairly.

[24] Communications between the receiver and National Building Group were through lawyers.

[25] In this case, the receiver chose to discharge its' power of sale by listing with a commercial realtor and exercising skill and judgement as exposure to the market unfolded. Just as when a receiver markets secured property through tender, auction, or direct negotiations, the receiver who employs a realtor advances a sale by the court.

[26] On May 8, 2015, National Building Group wrote to the receiver and its' lawyer complaining that there was no forsale sign on the warehouse property and requesting a report on the marketing efforts. That complaint and request was reiterated by National Building Group's counsel on August 13, 2015.

[27] Receiver's counsel provided a full response on August 13, 2015. He advised of the two offers and the termination of negotiations when the potential purchasers were unwilling to come up towards what the receiver believed at the time was a reasonable price. He said negotiations with a "sophisticated property owner" were underway. He provided a detailed report from Mr. Carpenter. And, receiver's counsel wrote "Again, if your client knows of any person willing and able to make an offer on the property, they should encourage that person to make the offer either to the listing brokerage or to the receiver directly."

[28] There was further correspondence in December 2015 and January 2016 which included various requests by National Building Group for disclosure and disclosure by the receiver in response.

[29] By letter dated June 17, 2016, receiver's counsel advised National Building Groups counsel of the \$350,000 agreement purchase and sale and provided a copy. A little over a month later counsel had to advise that the agreement was terminated under the due diligence conditions.

[30] An inadvertent failure occurred on November 24, 2016. The agreement of purchase and sale now sought to be approved had been concluded. On that day, receivers' counsel prepared a letter to be sent by email to National Building

Groups' counsel. It was to advise of the \$210,000 sale to Dana Robinson Fisheries Limited. Copies were sent to the receiver, but through inadvertence nothing was sent to the main addressee.

[31] After the approval hearing started, National Building Group produced an offer of \$230,000 and evidence that another offer could be coming. That offer would be for \$236,500.

[32] A motion to approve a sale by the receiver is not an opportunity to reopen the marketing effort. Potential purchasers need to understand that a contract with the receiver will be approved if it is commercially reasonable. The integrity of the sale process depends on this. See Justice Nunn's decision in *Bank of Montreal v. Maitland Seafoods Ltd.* (1983), 57 N.S.R. (2d) 20 (S.C.).

[33] The failure to send the email on November 24, 2016, caused no unfairness to National Building Group. If it wanted to drum up interest in the receiver's sale it ought to have done so as the receiver suggested and directed interested parties to the realtor or the receiver before an agreement of purchase sale was finalized. On November 24, 2016, there was nothing left for National Building Group to do because the receiver was subject to a binding agreement of sale subject to an approval process that cannot be turned into a new opportunity for making offers.

[34] National Building Group says that the prospects it has recently solicited show that the receiver could have gotten a better price last November if National Building Group was advised of the sale. Again, producing slightly higher offers after the agreement of purchase and sale was completed would make no difference. To make a difference, National Building Group needed to solicit interest before the receiver contracted in good faith with a purchaser.

[35] National Building Group was not consulted about the reductions in list prices. It says this caused unfairness. There are three answers to that. First, National Building Group knew the receiver had concluded that the earlier list prices were too high because in June, 2016 National Building Group was told of the \$350,000 sale. Second, list prices are public. Third, the lowest list price and the actual sale price exceed the debt owed to National Building Group. The reductions in list price would be of practical concern to the Royal Bank, to the defendant, to any guarantors, but not to National Building Group.

[36] I find that the sale process was fairly conducted in the interest of the various parties.

Proposed Terms for Foreclosure

[37] The draft order approving the sale provides for a receivers' deed and a receivers' certificate that would foreclosure "all of the right, title and interest of 2M Farms Ltd. and all those claiming through it". That language is fine for an order for sale to which all of those claiming through the mortgagor are bound.

[38] However, the draft order goes further. It says:

including all property interests, security interests (whether contractual, statutory or otherwise), mortgages, trusts or deemed trusts (whether contractual, statutory or otherwise), liens, executions, levees, charges or other financial or monetary claims whether or not they have attached or been perfected, registered or filed or whether secured, unsecured or otherwise (collectively the "Claims"), including without limiting the generality of the foregoing (i) any encumbrances or charges created by orders of the Court in this proceeding; (ii) all mortgages and charges held by the Applicant; and, (iii) all recorded interests showing in the parcel register for the Property (collectively, the "Encumbrances").

Clearly, this language captures unascertained or unknown property interests.

[39] Does the broad language of the proposed order exceed the bounds of Nova Scotia receivership sales?

Foreclosure-Based Versus Vesting Order-Based Receiverships

[40] Counsel for the receiver writes:

With respect for the concerns identified in *enterprise Cape Breton Corporation v. Crown Jewel Resort Ranch Inc.* 2014 NSSC 420, the Applicant submits the following arguments in favour of the Court's power to order a sale of property by a receiver and foreclose out the various encumbrances on title subsequent to the security of the Applicant.

[41] Counsel then argues that s. 15 the *Real Property Act* incorporates the English Conveyancing Act, 1881 into Nova Scotia law. Subsection 25(2) of the English statute permitted the high court to order a sale of mortgaged property.

[42] This same argument, and others, were put forward by Mr. Robert G. MacKeigan, later of Queen's Counsel, in an extensive brief on receivership sales in *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Yarcom Cable T.V. Limited and K-Right Communications Limited*, 1977 S.H. No. 13482. For the past forty years that brief has often been consulted by lawyers and judges. So much so, that it should be regarded as a published authority, as a reliable record of long standing practices, and as a work that has much influenced receivership practice in our province.

[43] Mr. MacKeigan finds, in the statutes, judicial decisions, and learned texts he cites equitable and statutory sources for our power to order a receiver's sale in proceedings to enforce security. He grounds the power in the equitable jurisdiction to order foreclosure.

[44] Justice Wood's decision in *ECBC v. Crown Jewel Resort Ranch Inc.* is not about the foreclosure-based receivership order that has been our practice for many years. In that case the receiver agreed to a sale. It sought approval. The subsequent encumbrancers got notice. Justice Wood approved the sale. The problem was that the receiver, following the practice in Ontario, sought a vesting order rather than an order for sale effecting foreclosure. Vesting orders are statutory and we have no statute for them. See paragraphs 19 and 20 of *Crown Jewel*.

[45] Also, the receiver of *Crown Jewel* had agreed to provide a deed and the purchaser had an opportunity to investigate title, consistent with our foreclosure-based receivership. Justice Wood said at paragraph 25:

The effect of the vesting order requested by the Receiver is that the purchaser assumes no risk with respect to the title and the Court discharges all encumbrances. There is no need for the purchaser to investigate title and raise objections. The Receiver has not explained why the Court should provide this assurance and override the terms of the Agreement.

[46] The *Crown Jewel* decision suggests that we may not have broad authority to grant vesting orders on unlimited grounds. It, therefore, questions the use of a vesting order-based receivership sale. It does not, however, raise any question about our foreclosure-based receivership sale.

[47] I respectfully adopt Justice Wood's reasons in *Crown Jewel*. In my opinion, there is no statutory authority in Nova Scotia giving the court unbound authority to vest property. In my opinion, a power to sell a stranger's interests without notice cannot be found in "take any other action that the Court considers advisable", the words of paragraph 242(1)(c) of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*. In Nova Scotia, a receiver appointed to enforce securities sells the right, title, interest, property, and demand of the debtor at the time of the security or afterwards and the interests of the those claiming by, through, or under the debtor.

[48] I am prepared to make an order along those lines and not an order that appears to end unascertained or unknown rights the way a vesting order might do.

The Need to Join Interested Parties

[49] We do not take rights away from people without giving them a chance to be heard. So, the foreclosure-based receivership sale requires subsequent encumbrancers to be parties.

[50] I am told that a receiver had to get releases from subsequent encumbrancers in some unreported cases. Not joining subsequent encumbrancers as parties could be fatal to foreclosure. If joined in a receivership proceeding to enforce security in

this province, subsequent encumbrancers are foreclosed by the receiver's sale and have no right that may require a release.

[51] *Snell's Equity* says this at page 947:

When a foreclosure claim is made, all encumbrancers subsequent to the claimant, as well as all other persons interested in the equity of redemption must be made parties or they will not be bound by the foreclosure decree.

John McGhee, Q.C., *Snell's Equity, Thirty-Third Edition* (2015, Sweet & Maxwell, London).

[52] There are several ways in which a subsequent encumbrancer may be bound by an order for a receivers' sale that enforces security. They can be joined as defendants without naming them in the style of cause or claiming anything against them besides foreclosure. They can be made parties through the mechanism of a notice to subsequent encumbrancer under Rule 35.12. Or, they may be privies prevented by collateral estoppel for denying the foreclosure.

[53] The problem with relying on the third way is that the parties, and more importantly, the purchaser have no certainty until there is finding against the subsequent encumbrancer. The better practice therefore, is to join all subsequent encumbrancers as parties by the first or second method. In the case of 2M Farms, the only known encumbrancers are parties.

Dispute about Priorities

[54] When priorities are in dispute, the court commonly orders a sale with the proceeds standing in the place of the property. This preserves the value of the property while allowing time for a resolution or determination of the dispute. See, Rule 42.09.

[55] Thus, even if National Building Group Inc. turns out to have priority, the purchaser will take title free of that interest.

Conclusion

[56] I will grant an order approving the sale agreed to by the receiver. The order will contain the terms for approval and for payment into court found in the draft order. The terms concerning foreclosure need to conform with what I have said on that subject.

Moir, J.

TAB 6

SUPREME COURT OF NOVA SCOTIA

Citation: Royal Bank of Canada v. Eastern Infrastructure Inc., 2019 NSSC 297

Date: 20191010

Docket: 483616

Registry: Halifax

Between:

Royal Bank of Canada

Plaintiff

v.

Eastern Infrastructure Inc. and Allcrete Restoration Limited

Defendant

Decision

Judge: The Honourable Justice Peter P. Rosinski

Heard: September 19, 2019, in Halifax, Nova Scotia

Counsel: Gavin MacDonald, for Royal Bank of Canada
Stephen Kingston, for the Receiver

By the Court:

Introduction

[1] The companies herein have previously been placed into receivership. The Receiver has requested that, *inter alia*, I authorize an Approval and Vesting Order (Auction) to allow it to sell assets of the companies that are encumbered. While it appears that such orders had been granted by this court as recently as 2011 (re-Scanwood Canada Limited, Halifax number 342377, per John Murphy, J.), more recent decisions have concluded that, absent legislation providing this court the authority to do so, this court has no jurisdiction to grant such vesting orders.

[2] Speaking only for myself on this issue and with the greatest of respect to those holding contrary opinions, I am satisfied that, although there is no distinctly expressed basis in Nova Scotian legislation to do so, this court does have jurisdiction pursuant to s. 243(1)(c) the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act (BIA) to grant such vesting orders. I find it appropriate to do so in the circumstances of this case¹.

The authority for vesting orders pursuant to s. 243(1)(c) BIA

¹ Attached hereto as Appendix “A” is the order granted.

[3] Regarding the concern that such orders should no longer be granted on the basis of the authority provided by section 243 (1)(c) BIA, based on decisions by Justices Michael Wood (as he then was) and Moir, wherein they concluded there was no such jurisdiction to do so (*Enterprise Cape Breton Corp. v Crown Jewel Resort Ranch Inc.*, 2014 NSSC 420 and *Royal Bank of Canada v 2M Farms Ltd.*, 2017 NSSC 105), I note that Justice Wood relied on an Ontario Court of Appeal decision, *Regal Constellation Hotel Ltd., Re*, [2004] O.J. No. 2744, in making his *obiter dicta* (para 22) comment regarding jurisdiction. That decision suggested that such vesting orders must be grounded in legislation, such as the Ontario legislation, the *Courts of Justice Act* (para. 31 *Regal*).

[4] As Justice Blair stated for the court in *Regal*:

[23] Underlying these considerations are the principles the courts apply when reviewing a sale by a court-appointed receiver. They exercise considerable caution when doing so, and will interfere only in special circumstances -- particularly when the receiver has been dealing with an unusual or difficult asset. Although the courts will carefully scrutinize the procedure followed by a receiver, they rely upon the expertise of their appointed receivers, and are reluctant to second-guess the considered business decisions made by the receiver in arriving at its recommendations. The court will assume that the receiver is acting properly unless the contrary is clearly shown. See *Royal Bank of Canada v. Soundair Corp.* (1991), 4 O.R. (3d) 1, 83 D.L.R. (4th) 76 (C.A.).

[24] In *Soundair*, at p. 6 O.R., Galligan J.A. outlined the duties of a court when deciding whether a receiver who has sold a property has acted properly. Those duties, in no order of priority, are to consider and determine:

- (a) whether the receiver has made a sufficient effort to get the best price and has not acted improvidently;
- (b) the interests of the parties;

(c) the efficacy and integrity of the process by which offers are obtained; and

(d) whether there has been unfairness in the working out of the process.

[25] In *Soundair* as well, McKinlay J.A. emphasized [at p. 19 O.R.] the importance of protecting the integrity of the procedures followed by a court-appointed receiver "in the interests of both commercial morality and the future confidence of business persons in their dealings with receivers".

[26] A court-appointed receiver is an officer of the court. It has a fiduciary duty to act honestly and fairly on behalf of all claimants with an interest in the debtor's property, including the debtor (and, where the debtor is a corporation, its shareholders). It must make candid and full disclosure to the court of all material facts respecting pending applications, whether favourable or unfavourable. See *Toronto-Dominion Bank v. Usarco Ltd.* (2001), 196 D.L.R. (4th) 448, 17 M.P.L.R. (3d) 57 (Ont. C.A.), per Austin J.A. at paras. 28-31, and the authorities referred to by him, for a more elaborate outline of these principles. It has been said with respect to a court-appointed receiver's standard of care that the receiver "must act with meticulous correctness, but not to a standard of perfection": Bennett on Receiverships, 2nd ed. (Toronto: Carswell, 1999) at p. 181, cited in *Toronto-Dominion Bank v. Usarco*, supra, at p. 459 D.L.R.

[27] The foregoing principles must be kept in mind when considering the exercise of discretion by the motions judges in the context of these proceedings.

...

[31] In Ontario, the power to grant a vesting order is conferred by the Courts of Justice Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. C.43, s. 100, which provides as follows:

100. A court may by order vest in any person an interest in real or personal property that the court has authority to order be disposed of, encumbered or conveyed.

[32] The vesting order itself is a creature of statute, although it has its origins in equitable concepts regarding the enforcement of remedies granted by the Court of Chancery. Vesting orders were discussed by this court in *Chippewas of Sarnia Band v. Canada (Attorney General)* (2000), 51 O.R. (3d) 641 195, D.L.R. (4th) 135 (C.A.) at pp. 726-27 O.R., p. 227 D.L.R., where it was observed that:

Vesting orders are equitable in origin and discretionary in nature. The Court of Chancery made in personam orders, directing parties to deal with property in accordance with the judgment of the court. Judgments of the Court of Chancery were enforced on proceedings for contempt, followed by imprisonment or sequestration. The statutory power to make a vesting order supplemented the contempt power by allowing the court to effect the change of title directly: see McGhee, *Snell's Equity*, 30th ed., (London: Sweet and Maxwell, 2000) at pp. 41-42.

(Emphasis added)

[33] A vesting order, then, has a dual character. It is on the one hand a court order ("allowing the court to effect the change of title directly"), and on the other hand a conveyance of title (vesting "an interest in real or personal property" in the party entitled thereto under the order). This duality has important ramifications for an appeal of the original court decision granting the vesting order because, in my view, once the vesting order has been registered on title, its attributes as a conveyance prevail and its attributes as an order are spent; the change of title has been effected. Any appeal from it is therefore moot.

[34] I reach this conclusion for the following reasons.

...

[45] Vesting orders properly registered on title, then -- like other conveyances -- are not immune from attack. However, any such attack is limited to the remedies provided under the Land Titles Act and no longer may lie by way of appeal from the original decision granting the vesting order. Title has effectively been changed and innocent third parties are entitled to rely upon that change. The effect of the vesting order qua order has been spent."

[5] Notably, the BIA has changed since the issuance of the *Regal* decision, however it does not appear that that factor was brought to Justice Wood's attention. As a result of the legislative change the Ontario Court of Appeal itself has given a much more comprehensive decision recently that comes to the opposite result, namely, in *Third Eye Capital Corporation v Ressources Dianor Inc.*, 2019 ONCA 508 per Pepall JA:

“(e) Section 243 of the BIA

43 The BIA is remedial legislation and should be given a liberal interpretation to facilitate its objectives: *Ford Motor Company of Canada, Limited v. Welcome Ford Sales Ltd.*, 2011 ABCA 158, 505 A.R. 146, at para. 43; *Nautical Data International Inc., Re*, 2005 NLTD 104, 249 Nfld. & P.E.I.R. 247, at para. 9; *Re Bell*, 2013 ONSC 2682, at para. 125; and *Scenna v. Gurizzan* (1999), 11 C.B.R. (4th) 293 (Ont. S.C.), at para. 4. Within this context, and in order to understand the scope of s. 243, it is helpful to review the wording, purpose, and history of the provision.

The Wording and Purpose of s. 243

44 Section 243 was enacted in 2005 and came into force in 2009. It authorizes the court to appoint a receiver where it is "just or convenient" to do so. As explained by the Supreme Court in *Saskatchewan (Attorney General) v. Lemare Lake Logging Ltd.*, 2015 SCC 53, [2015] 3 S.C.R. 419, prior to 2009, receivership proceedings involving assets in more than one province were complicated by the simultaneous proceedings that were required in different jurisdictions. There had been no legislative provision authorizing the appointment of a receiver with authority to act nationally. Rather, receivers were appointed under provincial statutes, such as the CJA, which resulted in a requirement to obtain separate appointments in each province or territory where the debtor had assets. "Because of the inefficiency resulting from this multiplicity of proceedings, the federal government amended its bankruptcy legislation to permit their consolidation through the appointment of a national receiver": *Lemare Lake Logging*, at para. 1. Section 243 was the outcome.

45 Under s. 243, the court may appoint a receiver to, amongst other things, take any other action that the court considers advisable. Specifically, s. 243(1) states:

243(1). Subject to subsection (1.1), on application by a secured creditor, a court may appoint a receiver to do any or all of the following if it considers it to be just or convenient to do so:

- (a) take possession of all or substantially all of the inventory, accounts receivable or other property of an insolvent person or bankrupt that was acquired for or used in relation to a business carried on by the insolvent person or bankrupt;
- (b) exercise any control that the court considers advisable over that property and over the insolvent person's or bankrupt's business; or,
- (c) take any other action that the court considers advisable.

46 "Receiver" is defined very broadly in s. 243(2), the relevant portion of which states:

243(2) [I]n this Part, **receiver** means a person who

- (a) is appointed under subsection (1); or
- (b) is appointed to take or takes possession or control -- of all or substantially all of the inventory, accounts receivable or other property of an insolvent person or bankrupt that was acquired for or used in relation to a business carried on by the insolvent person or bankrupt -- under

(i)an agreement under which property becomes subject to a security (in this Part referred to as a "security agreement"), or

(ii)a court order made under another Act of Parliament, or an Act of a legislature of a province, that provides for or authorizes the appointment of a receiver or a receiver -- manager. [Emphasis in original.]

47 *Lemare Lake Logging* involved a constitutional challenge to Saskatchewan's farm security legislation. **The Supreme Court concluded, at para. 68, that s. 243 had a simple and narrow purpose: the establishment of a regime allowing for the appointment of a national receiver and the avoidance of a multiplicity of proceedings and resulting inefficiencies.** It was not meant to circumvent requirements of provincial laws such as the 150 day notice of intention to enforce requirement found in the Saskatchewan legislation in issue.

...

71 In contrast, as I will discuss further, typically the nub of a receiver's responsibility is the liquidation of the assets of the insolvent debtor. There is much less debate about the objectives of a receivership, and thus less of an impetus for legislative guidance or codification. In this respect, the purpose and context of the sales provisions in s. 65.13 of the BIA and s. 36 of the CCAA are distinct from those of s. 243 of the BIA. Due to the evolving use of the restructuring powers of the court, the former demanded clarity and codification, whereas the law governing sales in the context of receiverships was well established. Accordingly, rather than providing a detailed code governing sales, **Parliament utilized broad wording to describe both a receiver and a receiver's powers under s. 243. In light of this distinct context and legislative purpose, I do not find that the absence of the express language found in s. 65.13 of the BIA and s. 36 of the CCAA from s. 243 forecloses the possibility that the broad wording in s. 243 confers jurisdiction to grant vesting orders.**

Section 243 -- Jurisdiction to Grant a Sales Approval and Vesting Order

72 This brings me to an analysis of the broad language of s. 243 in light of its distinct legislative history, objective and purposes. As I have discussed, s. 243 was enacted by Parliament to establish a receivership regime that eliminated a patchwork of provincial proceedings. In enacting this provision, Parliament imported into s. 243(1)(c) the broad wording from the former s. 47(2)(c) which courts had interpreted as conferring jurisdiction to direct an interim receiver to do not only what "justice dictates" but also what "practicality demands". Thus, in interpreting s. 243, it is important to elaborate on the purpose of receiverships generally.

73 The purpose of a receivership is to "enhance and facilitate the preservation and realization of the assets for the benefit of creditors": *Hamilton Wentworth Credit Union Ltd. v. Courtcliffe Parks Ltd.* (1995), 23 O.R. (3d) 781 (Gen. Div.), at p. 787. Such a purpose is generally achieved through a liquidation of the debtor's assets: Wood, at p. 515. **As the Appeal Division of the Nova Scotia Supreme Court noted in *Bayhold Financial Corp. v. Clarkson Co. Ltd. and Scouler* (1991), 108 N.S.R. (2d) 198 (N.S.C.A.), at para. 34, "the essence of a receiver's powers is to liquidate the assets".** The receiver's "primary task is to ensure that the highest value is received for the assets so as to maximise the return to the creditors": *1117387 Ontario Inc. v. National Trust Company*, 2010 ONCA 340, 262 O.A.C. 118, at para. 77.

74 This purpose is reflected in commercial practice. Typically, the order appointing a receiver includes a power to sell: see for example the Commercial List Model Receivership Order, at para. 3(k). There is no express power in the BIA authorizing a receiver to liquidate or sell property. However, such sales are inherent in court-appointed receiverships and the jurisprudence is replete with examples: see e.g. *bcIMC Construction Fund Corp. v. Chandler Homer Street Ventures Ltd.*, 2008 BCSC 897, 44 C.B.R. (5th) 171 (in Chambers), *Royal Bank v. Fracmaster Ltd.*, 1999 ABCA 178, 11 C.B.R. (4th) 230, *Skyepharma PLC v. Hyal Pharmaceutical Corp.* (1999), 12 C.B.R. (4th) 87 (Ont. S.C.), *aff'd* (2000), 47 O.R. (3d) 234 (C.A.).

75 Moreover, the mandatory statutory receiver's reports required by s. 246 of the BIA direct a receiver to file a "statement of all property of which the receiver has taken possession or control that has not yet been sold or realized" during the receivership (emphasis added): *Bankruptcy and Insolvency General Rules*, C.R.C. c. 368, r. 126 ("BIA Rules").

76 It is thus evident from a broad, liberal, and purposive interpretation of the BIA receivership provisions, including s. 243(1)(c), that implicitly the court has the jurisdiction to approve a sale proposed by a receiver and courts have historically acted on that basis. There is no need to have recourse to provincial legislation such as s.100 of the CJA to sustain that jurisdiction.

77 Having reached that conclusion, the question then becomes whether this jurisdiction under s. 243 extends to the implementation of the sale through the use of a vesting order as being incidental and ancillary to the power to sell. In my view it does. I reach this conclusion for two reasons. First, vesting orders are necessary in the receivership context to give effect to the court's jurisdiction to approve a sale as conferred by s. 243. Second, this interpretation is consistent with, and furthers the purpose of, s. 243. I will explain."

[6] Thus, the *obiter dicta* in *Crown Jewel* has been superseded by legislative change. Justice Moir did not cite any other authority than *Crown Jewel*.

[7] *Lemare Logging* was released one year after Justice Wood made his comments in *Crown Jewel*. Although Nova Scotia does not have express provincial legislation giving the court jurisdiction to make such vesting orders, it is clear that in appropriate circumstances courts can rely on s 243(1)(c) BIA to do so. In *Dianor*, the court cited *Crown Jewel* at para. 78, noting that “...the case law on vesting orders in the insolvency context is limited.”

[8] Regarding what are the appropriate circumstances to make such orders, I keep in mind Justice Duncan’s list of considerations set out in *Bank of Montréal v. Sportsclick Inc.*, 2009 NSSC 354 at paras 32-33, which the court will eventually apply to all such sales:

“Law

32 In *Royal Bank of Canada v. Soundair Corp.*, *supra*, Galligan J.A. set out at paragraph 16, the duties which a court must perform when deciding whether a Receiver who has sold a property acted properly, which duties he summarized as follows:

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

33 Certain principles have been enunciated by the courts in consideration of these points:

The decision must be assessed as a matter of business judgment on the

elements then available to the Receiver. That is the function of Receiver and "... to reject [such] recommendation ... in any but the most exceptional circumstances ... would materially diminish and weaken the role and function of the Receiver both in the perception of receivers and in the perception of any others who might have occasion to deal with them." *see*, Anderson J. in *Crown Trust v. Rosenberg* (1986), 60 O.R. (2d) 87 at 112;

the primary interest is that of the creditors of the debtor although that is not the only nor the overriding consideration. The interests of the debtor must be taken into account. Where a purchaser has bargained at some expense in time and money to achieve the bargain then their interest too should be taken into account. *see*, *Soundair* at para. 40;

the process by which the sale of a unique asset is achieved should be consistent with commercial efficacy and integrity. In *Crown Trust Co. v. Rosenberg*, *supra*, at page 124, Anderson J. said:

While every proper effort must always be made to assure maximum recovery consistent with the limitations inherent in the process, no method has yet been devised to entirely eliminate those limitations or to avoid their consequences. Certainly it is not be found in loosening the entire foundation of the system. Thus to compare the results of the process in this case with what might have been recovered in some other set of circumstances is neither logical nor practical.

a court should not reject the recommendation of Receiver except in special circumstances where the necessity and propriety of doing so is plain. *see*, *Crown Trust Co., supra*."


Conclusion

[9] As a matter of law, and on the circumstances in this case, I am prepared to grant the Approval and Vesting Order (Auction) as drafted.

Rosinski, J

Appendix “A”

2018



Hfx. No. 483616

Supreme Court of Nova Scotia
in Bankruptcy and Insolvency

Between:

Royal Bank of Canada

Plaintiff

and

Eastern Infrastructure Inc. and
Allcrete Restoration Limited

Defendants

APPROVAL AND VESTING ORDER (AUCTION)

Before the Honourable Justice Peter P. Rosinski in Chambers:

UPON HEARING Stephen Kingston on behalf of Ernst & Young Inc. (the "**Receiver**") in its capacity as Court-appointed Receiver for Eastern Infrastructure Inc. and Allcrete Restoration Limited (collectively, the "**Debtor**");

AND UPON appearing that appropriate Notice of this Motion has been provided to all interested parties;

AND UPON having read the First Report of the Receiver dated September 11, 2019 (the "**Receiver's First Report**") and all other materials filed in connection with this Motion;

AND UPON the Receiver having negotiated an Auction Agreement (the "**Auction Agreement**") with Mirterra Industrial Appraisers & Auctioneers (the "**Auctioneer**") as more particularly described in the Receiver's First Report;

AND UPON the Receiver having applied for an Order authorizing and approving the Receiver to execute the Auction Agreement as regards the sale of the Debtor's Alberta Assets as described in the Receiver's First Report (the "**Alberta Assets**"), and vesting the Debtor's right, title and interest in and to the Alberta Assets in the purchasers thereof free and clear of all claims.

NOW UPON MOTION:

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

1. This Honourable Court does hereby grant its approval and authorization to the Receiver to execute the Auction Agreement on the same or substantially the same terms as described in the Receiver's First Report.


2. The Receiver is hereby authorized and directed to take such additional steps and execute such additional documents as may be necessary or desirable for the completion of the transactions (the "**Transactions**") contemplated by the Auction Agreement and for the conveyance of items sold at auction (the "**Purchased Assets**").
3. Upon the Auctioneer completing the sale of any of the Alberta Assets to a successful bidder (the "**Purchaser**") and upon receipt of the purchase price by the Auctioneer and delivery by the Auctioneer of a Bill of Sale or similar evidence of purchase to the Purchaser (the "**Purchaser Bill of Sale**"), all rights, title and interest of the Debtor in and to the assets described in the Purchaser Bill of Sale shall vest in such Purchaser, free and clear of and from any and all security interests (whether contractual, statutory, or otherwise), hypothecs, mortgages, trusts or deemed trusts (whether contractual, statutory, or otherwise), liens, executions, levies, charges or other financial or monetary claims, whether or not they attached or been perfected, registered or filed and whether secured, unsecured or otherwise (collectively, the "**Claims**") including, without limiting the generality of the foregoing:
 - (a) any encumbrances or charges created by Orders of this Honourable Court dated February 4, 2019 and June 7, 2019; and
 - (b) all charges, security interests or claims evidenced by registrations pursuant to the *Personal Property Security Act* (Nova Scotia) or any other personal property registry system.
4. For the purposes of determining the nature and priority of Claims, the monies payable to the Receiver under the Auction Agreement from the sale of the Alberta Assets shall stand in the place of and stead of the Alberta Assets, and that from and after the delivery of the Purchaser Bill of Sale all claims shall attach to the net proceeds from the sale of the Alberta Assets with the same priority as they had with respect to the Alberta Assets immediately prior to the sale, as if the Alberta Assets had not been sold and remained in the possession or control of the person having that possession or control immediately prior to the sale.
5. Notwithstanding:
 - (a) the pendency of these proceedings;
 - (b) any application for a bankruptcy order now or hereafter issued pursuant to the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* (Canada) in respect of the debtors and any bankruptcy order issued pursuant to any such applications; and
 - (c) any assignment of bankruptcy made in respect of the Debtor;

the vesting of the Alberta Assets in a purchaser pursuant to this Order shall be binding on any trustee in bankruptcy that may be appointed in respect of the Debtor and shall not be void or avoidable by creditors of the Debtor, nor shall it constitute nor be deemed to be a settlement, fraudulent preference, assignment, fraudulent conveyance, transfer at undervalue, or other reviewable transaction under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* (Canada) or any other applicable federal or provincial legislation, nor shall it constitute oppressive or unfairly prejudicial conduct pursuant to any applicable federal or provincial legislation.

- 3 -

6. This Court here requests the aid and recognition of any Court, tribunal, regulatory or administrative body having jurisdiction in Canada or in the United States to give effect to this Order and to assist the Receiver and its agents in carrying out the terms of this Order. All Courts, tribunals, regulatory and administrative bodies are hereby respectfully requested to make such Orders and to provide such assistance to the Receiver, as an Officer of this Court, as may be necessary or desirable to give effect to this Order or to assist the Receiver and its agents in carrying out the terms of this Order.

Dated at Halifax, Nova Scotia this 19 day of September, 2019


Prothonotary

KIMBERLEY WEBBER
Deputy Prothonotary

TAB 7



SUPREME COURT OF CANADA

CITATION: Sherman Estate v.
Donovan, 2021 SCC 25

APPEAL HEARD:
October 6, 2020
JUDGMENT RENDERED:
June 11, 2021
DOCKET: 38695

BETWEEN:

**Estate of Bernard Sherman and Trustees of the Estate and
Estate of Honey Sherman and Trustees of the Estate**
Appellants

and

**Kevin Donovan and
Toronto Star Newspapers Ltd.**
Respondents

- and -

**Attorney General of Ontario, Attorney General of British Columbia,
Canadian Civil Liberties Association, Income Security Advocacy Centre,
Ad IDEM/Canadian Media Lawyers Association, Postmedia Network Inc.,
CTV, a Division of Bell Media Inc., Global News, a division of Corus
Television Limited Partnership, The Globe and Mail Inc.,
Citytv, a division of Rogers Media Inc.,
British Columbia Civil Liberties Association,
HIV & AIDS Legal Clinic Ontario, HIV Legal Network
and Mental Health Legal Committee**
Intervenors

CORAM: Wagner C.J. and Moldaver, Karakatsanis, Brown, Rowe, Martin and Kasirer JJ.

REASONS FOR Kasirer J. (Wagner C.J. and Moldaver, Karakatsanis, Brown, Rowe and Martin JJ. concurring)

JUDGMENT:
(paras. 1 to
108)

NOTE: This document is subject to editorial revision before its reproduction in final form in the *Canada Supreme Court Reports*.

SHERMAN ESTATE v. DONOVAN

**Estate of Bernard Sherman and Trustees of the Estate and
Estate of Honey Sherman and Trustees of the Estate**

Appellants

v.

**Kevin Donovan and
Toronto Star Newspapers Ltd.**

Respondents

and

**Attorney General of Ontario,
Attorney General of British Columbia,
Canadian Civil Liberties Association,
Income Security Advocacy Centre,
Ad IDEM/Canadian Media Lawyers Association,
Postmedia Network Inc., CTV, a Division of Bell Media Inc.,
Global News, a division of Corus Television Limited Partnership,
The Globe and Mail Inc., Citytv, a division of Rogers Media Inc.,
British Columbia Civil Liberties Association,
HIV & AIDS Legal Clinic Ontario,
HIV Legal Network and Mental Health Legal Committee**

Interveners

Indexed as: Sherman Estate v. Donovan

2021 SCC 25

File No.: 38695.

2020: October 6; 2021: June 11.

Present: Wagner C.J. and Moldaver, Karakatsanis, Brown, Rowe, Martin and Kasirer JJ.

ON APPEAL FROM THE COURT OF APPEAL FOR ONTARIO

Courts — Open court principle — Sealing orders — Discretionary limits on court openness — Important public interest — Privacy — Dignity — Physical safety — Unexplained deaths of prominent couple generating intense public scrutiny and prompting trustees of estates to apply for sealing of probate files — Whether privacy and physical safety concerns advanced by estate trustees amount to important public interests at such serious risk to justify issuance of sealing orders.

A prominent couple was found dead in their home. Their deaths had no apparent explanation and generated intense public interest. To this day, the identity and motive of those responsible remain unknown, and the deaths are being investigated as homicides. The estate trustees sought to stem the intense press scrutiny prompted by the events by seeking sealing orders of the probate files. Initially granted, the sealing orders were challenged by a journalist who had reported on the couple's deaths, and by the newspaper for which he wrote. The application judge sealed the probate files, concluding that the harmful effects of the sealing orders were substantially outweighed by the salutary effects on privacy and physical safety interests. The Court of Appeal unanimously allowed the appeal and lifted the sealing orders. It concluded that the privacy interest advanced lacked a public interest quality, and that there was no evidence of a real risk to anyone's physical safety.

Held: The appeal should be dismissed.

The estate trustees have failed to establish a serious risk to an important public interest under the test for discretionary limits on court openness. As such, the sealing orders should not have been issued. Open courts can be a source of inconvenience and embarrassment, but this discomfort is not, as a general matter, enough to overturn the strong presumption of openness. That said, personal information disseminated in open court can be more than a source of discomfort and may result in an affront to a person's dignity. Insofar as privacy serves to protect individuals from this affront, it is an important public interest and a court can make an exception to the open court principle if it is at serious risk. In this case, the risks to privacy and physical safety cannot be said to be sufficiently serious.

Court proceedings are presumptively open to the public. Court openness is protected by the constitutional guarantee of freedom of expression and is essential to the proper functioning of Canadian democracy. Reporting on court proceedings by a free press is often said to be inseparable from the principle of open justice. The open court principle is engaged by all judicial proceedings, whatever their nature. Matters in a probate file are not quintessentially private or fundamentally administrative. Obtaining a certificate of appointment of estate trustee in Ontario is a court proceeding engaging the fundamental rationale for openness — discouraging mischief and ensuring confidence in the administration of justice through transparency — such that the strong presumption of openness applies.

The test for discretionary limits on court openness is directed at maintaining the presumption while offering sufficient flexibility for courts to protect other public interests where they arise. In order to succeed, the person asking a court to exercise discretion in a way that limits the open court presumption must establish that (1) court openness poses a serious risk to an important public interest; (2) the order sought is necessary to prevent this serious risk to the identified interest because reasonably alternative measures will not prevent this risk; and (3) as a matter of proportionality, the benefits of the order outweigh its negative effects.

The recognized scope of what interests might justify a discretionary exception to open courts has broadened over time and now extends generally to important public interests. The breadth of this category transcends the interests of the parties to the dispute and provides significant flexibility to address harm to fundamental values in our society that unqualified openness could cause. While there is no closed list of important public interests, courts must be cautious and alive to the fundamental importance of the open court rule when they are identifying them. Determining what is an important public interest can be done in the abstract at the level of general principles that extend beyond the parties to the particular dispute. By contrast, whether that interest is at serious risk is a fact-based finding that is necessarily made in context. The identification of an important interest and the seriousness of the risk to that interest are thus theoretically separate and qualitatively distinct operations.

Privacy has been championed as a fundamental consideration in a free society, and its public importance has been recognized in various settings. Though an individual's privacy will be pre-eminently important to that individual, the protection of privacy is also in the interest of society as a whole. Privacy therefore cannot be rejected as a mere personal concern: some personal concerns relating to privacy overlap with public interests.

However, cast too broadly, the recognition of a public interest in privacy could threaten the strong presumption of openness. The privacy of individuals will be at risk in many court proceedings. Furthermore, privacy is a complex and contextual concept, making it difficult for courts to measure. Recognizing an important interest in privacy generally would accordingly be unworkable.

Instead, the public character of the privacy interest involves protecting individuals from the threat to their dignity. Dignity in this sense involves the right to present core aspects of oneself to others in a considered and controlled manner; it is an expression of an individual's unique personality or personhood. This interest is consistent with the Court's emphasis on the importance of privacy, but is tailored to preserve the strong presumption of openness.

Privacy as predicated on dignity will be at serious risk in limited circumstances. Neither the sensibilities of individuals nor the fact that openness is disadvantageous, embarrassing or distressing to certain individuals will generally on their own warrant interference with court openness. Dignity will be at serious risk only

where the information that would be disseminated as a result of court openness is sufficiently sensitive or private such that openness can be shown to meaningfully strike at the individual's biographical core in a manner that threatens their integrity. The question is whether the information reveals something intimate and personal about the individual, their lifestyle or their experiences.

In cases where the information is sufficiently sensitive to strike at an individual's biographical core, a court must then ask whether a serious risk to the interest is made out in the full factual context of the case. The seriousness of the risk may be affected by the extent to which information is disseminated and already in the public domain, and the probability of the dissemination actually occurring. The burden is on the applicant to show that privacy, understood in reference to dignity, is at serious risk; this erects a fact-specific threshold consistent with the presumption of openness.

There is also an important public interest in protecting individuals from physical harm, but a discretionary order limiting court openness can only be made where there is a serious risk to this important public interest. Direct evidence is not necessarily required to establish a serious risk to an important public interest, as objectively discernable harm may be identified on the basis of logical inferences. But this process of inferential reasoning is not a licence to engage in impermissible speculation. It is not just the probability of the feared harm, but also the gravity of the harm itself that is relevant to the assessment of serious risk. Where the feared harm is particularly serious, the probability that this harm materialize need not be shown to be

likely, but must still be more than negligible, fanciful or speculative. Mere assertions of grave physical harm are therefore insufficient.

In addition to a serious risk to an important interest, it must be shown that the particular order sought is necessary to address the risk and that the benefits of the order outweigh its negative effects as a matter of proportionality. This contextual balancing, informed by the importance of the open court principle, presents a final barrier to those seeking a discretionary limit on court openness for the purposes of privacy protection.

In the present case, the risk to the important public interest in privacy, defined in reference to dignity, is not serious. The information contained in the probate files does not reveal anything particularly private or highly sensitive. It has not been shown that it would strike at the biographical core of the affected individuals in a way that would undermine their control over the expression of their identities. Furthermore, the record does not show a serious risk of physical harm. The estate trustees asked the application judge to infer not only the fact that harm would befall the affected individuals, but also that a person or persons exist who wish to harm them. To infer all this on the basis of the deaths and the association of the affected individuals with the deceased is not a reasonable inference but is speculation.

Even if the estate trustees had succeeded in showing a serious risk to privacy, a publication ban — less constraining on openness than the sealing orders — would have likely been sufficient as a reasonable alternative to prevent this risk. As a

final barrier, the estate trustees would have had to show that the benefits of any order necessary to protect from a serious risk to the important public interest outweighed the harmful effects of the order.

Cases Cited

By Kasirer J.

Applied: *Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)*, 2002 SCC 41, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522; **referred to:** *Canadian Broadcasting Corp. v. New Brunswick (Attorney General)*, [1996] 3 S.C.R. 480; *Vancouver Sun (Re)*, 2004 SCC 43, [2004] 2 S.C.R. 332; *Khuja v. Times Newspapers Ltd.*, [2017] UKSC 49, [2019] A.C. 161; *Edmonton Journal v. Alberta (Attorney General)*, [1989] 2 S.C.R. 1326; *Dagenais v. Canadian Broadcasting Corp.*, [1994] 3 S.C.R. 835; *R. v. Mentuck*, 2001 SCC 76, [2001] 3 S.C.R. 442; *Lavigne v. Canada (Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages)*, 2002 SCC 53, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 773; *Dagg v. Canada (Minister of Finance)*, [1997] 2 S.C.R. 403; *R. v. Henry*, 2009 BCCA 86, 270 B.C.A.C. 5; *Attorney General of Nova Scotia v. MacIntyre*, [1982] 1 S.C.R. 175; *A.B. v. Bragg Communications Inc.*, 2012 SCC 46, [2012] 2 S.C.R. 567; *Toronto Star Newspapers Ltd. v. Ontario*, 2005 SCC 41, [2005] 2 S.C.R. 188; *Re Southam Inc. and The Queen (No.1)* (1983), 41 O.R. (2d) 11; *R. v. Oakes*, [1986] 1 S.C.R. 103; *Otis v. Otis* (2004), 7 E.T.R. (3d) 221; *H. (M.E.) v. Williams*, 2012 ONCA 35, 108 O.R. (3d) 321; *F.N. (Re)*, 2000 SCC 35, [2000] 1 S.C.R. 880; *R. v. Dyment*, [1988] 2 S.C.R. 417; *Alberta (Information and Privacy Commissioner) v. United Food and Commercial*

Workers, Local 401, 2013 SCC 62, [2013] 3 S.C.R. 733; *Toronto Star Newspaper Ltd. v. Ontario*, 2012 ONCJ 27, 289 C.C.C. (3d) 549; *Douez v. Facebook, Inc.*, 2017 SCC 33, [2017] 1 S.C.R. 751; *R. v. Paterson* (1998), 102 B.C.A.C. 200; *S. v. Lamontagne*, 2020 QCCA 663; *Himel v. Greenberg*, 2010 ONSC 2325, 93 R.F.L. (6th) 357; *A.B. v. Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2017 FC 629; *R. v. Pickton*, 2010 BCSC 1198; *Lac d'Amiante du Québec Ltée v. 2858-0702 Québec Inc.*, 2001 SCC 51, [2001] 2 S.C.R. 743; 3834310 *Canada inc. v. Chamberland*, 2004 CanLII 4122; *R. v. Spencer*, 2014 SCC 43, [2014] 2 S.C.R. 212; *Coltsfoot Publishing Ltd. v. Foster-Jacques*, 2012 NSCA 83, 320 N.S.R. (2d) 166; *Goulet v. Transamerica Life Insurance Co. of Canada*, 2002 SCC 21, [2002] 1 S.C.R. 719; *Godbout v. Longueuil (Ville de)*, [1995] R.J.Q. 2561, aff'd [1997] 3 S.C.R. 844; *A. v. B.*, 1990 CanLII 3132; *R. v. Plant*, [1993] 3 S.C.R. 281; *R. v. Tessling*, 2004 SCC 67, [2004] 3 S.C.R. 432; *R. v. Cole*, 2012 SCC 53, [2012] 3 S.C.R. 34; *Work Safe Twerk Safe v. Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Ontario*, 2021 ONSC 1100; *Fedeli v. Brown*, 2020 ONSC 994; *R. v. Marakah*, 2017 SCC 59, [2017] 2 S.C.R. 608; *R. v. Quesnelle*, 2014 SCC 46, [2014] 2 S.C.R. 390; *R. v. Mabior*, 2012 SCC 47, [2012] 2 S.C.R. 584; *R. v. Chanmany*, 2016 ONCA 576, 352 O.A.C. 121; *X. v. Y.*, 2011 BCSC 943, 21 B.C.L.R. (5th) 410; *R. v. Esseghaier*, 2017 ONCA 970, 356 C.C.C. (3d) 455.

Statutes and Regulations Cited

Bill C-11, *An Act to enact the Consumer Privacy Protection Act and the Personal Information and Data Protection Tribunal Act and to make consequential and related amendments to other Acts*, 2nd Sess., 43rd Parl., 2020.

Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, ss. 2(b), 8.

Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms, CQLR, c. C-12, s. 5.

Civil Code of Québec, arts. 35 to 41.

Code of Civil Procedure, CQLR, c. C-25.01, art. 12.

Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. F.31.

Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act, S.C. 2000, c. 5.

Privacy Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. P-21.

Authors Cited

Ardia, David S. “Privacy and Court Records: Online Access and the Loss of Practical Obscurity” (2017), 4 *U. Ill. L. Rev.* 1385.

Austin, Lisa M. “Re-reading Westin” (2019), 20 *Theor. Inq. L.* 53.

Bailey, Jane, and Jacquelyn Burkell. “Revisiting the Open Court Principle in an Era of Online Publication: Questioning Presumptive Public Access to Parties’ and Witnesses’ Personal Information” (2016), 48 *Ott. L. Rev.* 143.

Cockfield, Arthur J. “Protecting the Social Value of Privacy in the Context of State Investigations Using New Technologies” (2007), 40 *U.B.C. L. Rev.* 41.

Eltis, Karen. *Courts, Litigants and the Digital Age*, 2nd ed. Toronto: Irwin Law, 2016.

Eltis, Karen. “The Judicial System in the Digital Age: Revisiting the Relationship between Privacy and Accessibility in the Cyber Context” (2011), 56 *McGill L.J.* 289.

Ferland, Denis, et Benoît Emery. *Précis de procédure civile du Québec*, vol. 1, 6^e éd. Montréal: Yvon Blais, 2020.

Gewirtz, Paul. “Privacy and Speech”, [2001] *Sup. Ct. Rev.* 139.

Guillemard, Sylvette, et Séverine Menétrey. *Comprendre la procédure civile québécoise*, 2^e éd. Montréal: Yvon Blais, 2017.

Hughes, Kirsty. “A Behavioural Understanding of Privacy and its Implications for Privacy Law” (2012), 75 *Modern L. Rev.* 806.

Matheson, David. “Dignity and Selective Self-Presentation”, in Ian Kerr, Valerie Steeves and Carole Lucock, eds., *Lessons from the Identity Trail: Anonymity, Privacy and Identity in a Networked Society*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009, 319.

McIsaac, Barbara, Kris Klein, and Shaun Brown. *The Law of Privacy in Canada*, vol. 1. Toronto: Thomson Reuters, 2000 (loose-leaf updated 2020, release 11).

McLachlin, Beverley. “Courts, Transparency and Public Confidence: To the Better Administration of Justice” (2003), 8 *Deakin L. Rev.* 1.

Paton-Simpson, Elizabeth. “Privacy and the Reasonable Paranoid: The Protection of Privacy in Public Places” (2000), 50 *U.T.L.J.* 305.

Perell, Paul M., and John W. Morden. *The Law of Civil Procedure in Ontario*, 4th ed. Toronto: LexisNexis, 2020.

Québec. Ministère de la Justice. *Commentaires de la ministre de la Justice: Code de procédure civile, chapitre C-25.01*. Montréal: SOQUIJ, 2015.

Rochette, Sébastien, et Jean-François Côté. “Article 12”, dans Luc Chamberland, dir. *Le grand collectif: Code de procédure civile — Commentaires et annotations*, vol. 1, 5^e éd. Montréal: Yvon Blais, 2020.

Rossiter, James. *Law of Publication Bans, Private Hearings and Sealing Orders*. Toronto: Thomson Reuters, 2006 (loose-leaf updated 2020, release 2).

Solove, Daniel J. “Conceptualizing Privacy” (2002), 90 *Cal. L. Rev.* 1087.

APPEAL from a judgment of the Ontario Court of Appeal (Doherty, Rouleau and Hourigan JJ.A.), 2019 ONCA 376, 47 E.T.R. (4th) 1, [2019] O.J. No. 2373 (QL), 2019 CarswellOnt 6867 (WL Can.), setting aside a decision of Dunphy J., 2018 ONSC 4706, 417 C.R.R. (2d) 321, 41 E.T.R. (4th) 126, 28 C.P.C. (8th) 102, [2018] O.J. No. 4121 (QL), 2018 CarswellOnt 13017 (WL Can.). Appeal dismissed.

Chantelle Cseh and Timothy Youdan, for the appellants.

Iris Fischer and Skye A. Sepp, for the respondents.

Peter Scrutton, for the intervener the Attorney General of Ontario.

Jacqueline Hughes, for the intervener the Attorney General of British Columbia.

Ryder Gilliland, for the intervener the Canadian Civil Liberties Association.

Ewa Krajewska, for the intervener the Income Security Advocacy Centre.

Robert S. Anderson, Q.C., for the interveners Ad IDEM/Canadian Media Lawyers Association, Postmedia Network Inc., CTV, a Division of Bell Media Inc., Global News, a division of Corus Television Limited Partnership, The Globe and Mail Inc. and Citytv, a division of Rogers Media Inc.

Adam Goldenberg, for the intervener the British Columbia Civil Liberties Association.

Khalid Janmohamed, for the interveners the HIV & AIDS Legal Clinic Ontario, the HIV Legal Network and the Mental Health Legal Committee.

The judgment of the Court was delivered by

I. Overview

[1] This Court has been resolute in recognizing that the open court principle is protected by the constitutionally-entrenched right of freedom of expression and, as such, it represents a central feature of a liberal democracy. As a general rule, the public can attend hearings and consult court files and the press — the eyes and ears of the public — is left free to inquire and comment on the workings of the courts, all of which helps make the justice system fair and accountable.

[2] Accordingly, there is a strong presumption in favour of open courts. It is understood that this allows for public scrutiny which can be the source of inconvenience and even embarrassment to those who feel that their engagement in the justice system brings intrusion into their private lives. But this discomfort is not, as a general matter, enough to overturn the strong presumption that the public can attend hearings and that court files can be consulted and reported upon by the free press.

[3] Notwithstanding this presumption, exceptional circumstances do arise where competing interests justify a restriction on the open court principle. Where a discretionary court order limiting constitutionally-protected openness is sought — for example, a sealing order, a publication ban, an order excluding the public from a hearing, or a redaction order — the applicant must demonstrate, as a threshold requirement, that openness presents a serious risk to a competing interest of public

importance. That this requirement is considered a high bar serves to maintain the strong presumption of open courts. Moreover, the protection of open courts does not stop there. The applicant must still show that the order is necessary to prevent the risk and that, as a matter of proportionality, the benefits of that order restricting openness outweigh its negative effects.

[4] This appeal turns on whether concerns advanced by persons seeking an exception to the ordinarily open court file in probate proceedings — the concerns for privacy of the affected individuals and their physical safety — amount to important public interests that are at such serious risk that the files should be sealed. The parties to this appeal agree that physical safety is an important public interest that could justify a sealing order but disagree as to whether that interest would be at serious risk, in the circumstances of this case, should the files be unsealed. They further disagree whether privacy is in itself an important interest that could justify a sealing order. The appellants say that privacy is a public interest of sufficient import that can justify limits on openness, especially in light of the threats individuals face as technology facilitates widespread dissemination of personally sensitive information. They argue that the Court of Appeal was mistaken to say that personal concerns for privacy, without more, lack the public interest component that is properly the subject-matter of a sealing order.

[5] This Court has, in different settings, consistently championed privacy as a fundamental consideration in a free society. Pointing to cases decided in other contexts, the appellants contend that privacy should be recognized here as a public interest that,

on the facts of this case, substantiates their plea for orders sealing the probate files. The respondents resist, recalling that privacy has generally been seen as a poor justification for an exception to openness. After all, they say, virtually every court proceeding entails some disquiet for the lives of those concerned and these intrusions on privacy must be tolerated because open courts are essential to a healthy democracy.

[6] This appeal offers, then, an occasion to decide whether privacy can amount to a public interest in the open court jurisprudence and, if so, whether openness puts privacy at serious risk here so as to justify the kind of orders sought by the appellants.

[7] For the reasons that follow, I propose to recognize an aspect of privacy as an important public interest for the purposes of the relevant test from *Sierra Club of Canada v. Canada (Minister of Finance)*, 2002 SCC 41, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 522. Proceedings in open court can lead to the dissemination of highly sensitive personal information that would result not just in discomfort or embarrassment, but in an affront to the affected person's dignity. Where this narrower dimension of privacy, rooted in what I see as the public interest in protecting human dignity, is shown to be at serious risk, an exception to the open court principle may be justified.

[8] In this case, and with this interest in mind, it cannot be said that the risk to privacy is sufficiently serious to overcome the strong presumption of openness. The same is true of the risk to physical safety here. The Court of Appeal was right in the circumstances to set aside the sealing orders and I would therefore dismiss the appeal.

II. Background

[9] Prominent in business and philanthropic circles, Bernard Sherman and Honey Sherman were found dead in their Toronto home in December of 2017. Their deaths had no apparent explanation and generated intense public interest and press scrutiny. In January of the following year, the Toronto Police Service announced that the deaths were being investigated as homicides. As the present matter came before the courts, the identity and motive of those responsible remained unknown.

[10] The couple's estates and estate trustees (collectively the "Trustees")¹ sought to stem the intense press scrutiny prompted by the events. The Trustees hoped to see to the orderly transfer of the couple's property, at arm's length from what they saw as the public's morbid interest in the unexplained deaths and the curiosity around apparently great sums of money involved.

[11] When the time came to obtain certificates of appointment of estate trustee from the Superior Court of Justice, the Trustees sought a sealing order so that the estate trustees and beneficiaries ("affected individuals") might be spared any further intrusions into their privacy and be protected from what was alleged to be a risk to their safety. The Trustees argued that if the information in the court files was revealed to the public, the safety of the affected individuals would be at risk and their privacy

¹ As noted in the title of proceedings, the appellants in this matter have been referred to consistently as the "Estate of Bernard Sherman and Trustees of the Estate and Estate of Honey Sherman and Trustees of the Estate." In these reasons the appellants are referred to throughout as the "Trustees" for convenience.

compromised as long as the deaths were unexplained and those responsible for the tragedy remained at large. In support of their request, they argued that there was a real and substantial risk that the affected individuals would suffer serious harm from the public exposure of the materials in the circumstances.

[12] Initially granted, the sealing orders were challenged by Kevin Donovan, a journalist who had written a series of articles on the couple’s deaths, and Toronto Star Newspapers Ltd., for which he wrote (collectively the “Toronto Star”).² The Toronto Star said the orders violated its constitutional rights of freedom of expression and freedom of the press, as well as the attending principle that the workings of the courts should be open to the public as a means of guaranteeing the fair and transparent administration of justice.

III. Proceedings Below

A. *Ontario Superior Court of Justice, 2018 ONSC 4706, 41 E.T.R. (4th) 126 (Dunphy J.)*

[13] In addressing whether the circumstances warranted interference with the open court principle, the application judge relied on this Court’s judgment in *Sierra Club*. He noted that a confidentiality order should only be granted when: “(1) such an

² The use of “Toronto Star” as a collective term referring to both respondents should not be taken to suggest that only Toronto Star Newspapers Ltd. is participating in this appeal. Mr. Donovan is the only respondent to have been a party throughout. Toronto Star Newspapers Ltd. was a party in first instance, but was removed as a party on consent at the Court of Appeal. By order of Karakatsanis J. dated March 25, 2020, Toronto Star Newspapers Ltd. was added as a respondent in this Court.

order is necessary . . . to prevent a serious risk to an important interest because reasonable alternative measures will not prevent the risk; and (2) the salutary effects of the confidentiality order outweigh its deleterious effects, including the effects on the right to free expression and the public interest in open and accessible court proceedings” (para. 13(d)).

[14] The application judge considered whether the Trustees’ interests would be served by granting the sealing orders. In his view, the Trustees had correctly identified two legitimate interests in support of making an exception to the open court principle: “protecting the privacy and dignity of victims of crime and their loved ones” and “a reasonable apprehension of risk on behalf of those known to have an interest in receiving or administering the assets of the deceased” (paras. 22-25). With respect to the first interest, the application judge found that “[t]he degree of intrusion on that privacy and dignity has already been extreme and . . . excruciating” (para. 23). For the second interest, although he noted that “it would have been preferable to include objective evidence of the gravity of that risk from, for example, the police responsible for the investigation”, he concluded that “the lack of such evidence is not fatal” (para. 24). Rather, the necessary inferences could be drawn from the circumstances notably the “willingness of the perpetrator(s) of the crimes to resort to extreme violence to pursue whatever motive existed” (*ibid.*). He concluded that the “current uncertainty” was the source of a reasonable apprehension of the risk of harm and, further, that the foreseeable harm was “grave” (*ibid.*).

[15] The application judge ultimately accepted the Trustees' submission that these interests "very strongly outweigh" what he called the proportionately narrow public interest in the "essentially administrative files" at issue (paras. 31 and 33). He therefore concluded that the harmful effects of the sealing orders were substantially outweighed by the salutary effects on the rights and interests of the affected individuals.

[16] Finally, the application judge considered what order would protect the affected individuals while infringing upon the open court principle to the minimum extent possible. He decided no meaningful part of either file could be disclosed if one were to make the redactions necessary to protect the interests he had identified. Open-ended sealing orders did not, however, sit well with him. The application judge therefore sealed the files for an initial period of two years, with the possibility of renewal.

B. *Court of Appeal for Ontario, 2019 ONCA 376, 47 E.T.R. (4th) 1 (Doherty, Rouleau and Hourigan JJA.)*

[17] The Toronto Star's appeal was allowed, unanimously, and the sealing orders were lifted.

[18] The Court of Appeal considered the two interests advanced before the application judge in support of the orders to seal the probate files. As to the need to protect the privacy and dignity of the victims of violent crime and their loved ones, it recalled that the kind of interest that is properly protected by a sealing order must have

a public interest component. Citing *Sierra Club*, the Court of Appeal wrote that “[p]ersonal concerns cannot, without more, justify an order sealing material that would normally be available to the public under the open court principle” (para. 10). It concluded that the privacy interest for which the Trustees sought protection lacked this quality of public interest.

[19] While it recognized the personal safety of individuals as an important public interest generally, the Court of Appeal wrote that there was no evidence in this case that could warrant a finding that disclosure of the contents of the estate files posed a real risk to anyone’s physical safety. The application judge had erred on this point: “the suggestion that the beneficiaries and trustees are somehow at risk because the Shermans were murdered is not an inference, but is speculation. It provides no basis for a sealing order” (para. 16).

[20] The Court of Appeal concluded that the Trustees had failed the first stage of the test for obtaining orders sealing the probate files. It therefore allowed the appeal and set aside the orders.

C. *Subsequent Proceedings*

[21] The Court of Appeal’s order setting aside the sealing orders has been stayed pending the disposition of this appeal. The *Toronto Star* brought a motion to adduce new evidence on this appeal, comprised of land titles documents, transcripts of the cross-examination of a detective on the murder investigation, and various news articles.

This evidence, it says, supports the conclusion that the sealing orders should be lifted. The motion was referred to this panel.

IV. Submissions

[22] The Trustees have appealed to this Court seeking to restore the sealing orders made by the application judge. In addition to contesting the motion for new evidence, they maintain that the orders are necessary to prevent a serious risk to the privacy and physical safety of the affected individuals and that the salutary effects of sealing the court probate files outweigh the harmful effects of limiting court openness. The Trustees argue that two legal errors led the Court of Appeal to conclude otherwise.

[23] First, they submit the Court of Appeal erred in holding that privacy is a personal concern that cannot, without more, constitute an important interest under *Sierra Club*. The Trustees say the application judge was right to characterize privacy and dignity as an important public interest which, as it was subject to a serious risk, justified the orders. They ask this Court to recognize that privacy in itself is an important public interest for the purposes of the analysis.

[24] Second, the Trustees submit that the Court of Appeal erred in overturning the application judge's conclusion that there was a serious risk of physical harm. They argue that the Court of Appeal failed to recognize that courts have the ability to draw reasonable inferences by applying reason and logic even in the absence of specific evidence of the alleged risk.

[25] The Trustees say that these errors led the Court of Appeal to mistakenly set aside the sealing orders. In answer to questions at the hearing, the Trustees acknowledged that an order redacting certain documents in the file or a publication ban could assist in addressing some of their concerns, but maintained neither is a reasonable alternative to the sealing orders in the circumstances.

[26] The Trustees submit further that the protection of these interests outweighs the deleterious effects of the orders. They argue that the importance of the open court principle is attenuated by the nature of these probate proceedings. Given that it is non-contentious and not strictly speaking necessary for the transfer of property at death, probate is a court proceeding of an “administrative” character, which diminishes the imperative of applying the open court principle here (paras. 113-14).

[27] The Toronto Star takes the position that the Court of Appeal made no mistake in setting aside the sealing orders and that the appeal should be dismissed. In the Toronto Star’s view, while privacy can be an important interest where it evinces a public component, the Trustees have only identified a subjective desire for the affected individuals in this case to avoid further publicity, which is not inherently harmful. According to the Toronto Star and some of the interveners, the Trustees’ position would allow that measure of inconvenience and embarrassment that arises in every court proceeding to take precedence over the interest in court openness protected by the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* in which all of society has a stake. The Toronto Star argues further that the information in the court files is not highly sensitive.

On the issue of whether the sealing orders were necessary to protect the affected individuals from physical harm, the Toronto Star submits that the Court of Appeal was right to conclude that the Trustees had failed to establish a serious risk to this interest.

[28] In the alternative, even if there were a serious risk to one or another important interest, the Toronto Star says the sealing orders are not necessary because the risk could be addressed by an alternative, less onerous order. Furthermore, it says the orders are not proportionate. In seeking to minimize the importance of openness in probate proceedings, the Trustees invite an inflexible approach to balancing the effects of the order that is incompatible with the principle that openness applies to all court proceedings. In any event, there is a public interest in openness specifically here, given that the certificates sought can affect the rights of third parties and that openness ensures the fairness of the proceedings, whether they are contested or not.

V. Analysis

[29] The outcome of the appeal turns on whether the application judge should have made the sealing orders pursuant to the test for discretionary limits on court openness from this Court's decision in *Sierra Club*.

[30] Court openness is protected by the constitutional guarantee of freedom of expression and is essential to the proper functioning of our democracy (*Canadian Broadcasting Corp. v. New Brunswick (Attorney General)*, [1996] 3 S.C.R. 480, at para. 23; *Vancouver Sun (Re)*, 2004 SCC 43, [2004] 2 S.C.R. 332, at paras. 23-26).

Reporting on court proceedings by a free press is often said to be inseparable from the principle of open justice. “In reporting what has been said and done at a public trial, the media serve as the eyes and ears of a wider public which would be absolutely entitled to attend but for purely practical reasons cannot do so” (*Khuja v. Times Newspapers Limited*, [2017] UKSC 49, [2019] A.C. 161, at para. 16, citing *Edmonton Journal v. Alberta (Attorney General)*, [1989] 2 S.C.R. 1326, at pp. 1326-39, per Cory J.). Limits on openness in service of other public interests have been recognized, but sparingly and always with an eye to preserving a strong presumption that justice should proceed in public view (*Dagenais v. Canadian Broadcasting Corp.*, [1994] 3 S.C.R. 835, at p. 878; *R. v. Mentuck*, 2001 SCC 76, [2001] 3 S.C.R. 442, at paras. 32-39; *Sierra Club*, at para. 56). The test for discretionary limits on court openness is directed at maintaining this presumption while offering sufficient flexibility for courts to protect these other public interests where they arise (*Mentuck*, at para. 33). The parties agree that this is the appropriate framework of analysis for resolving this appeal.

[31] The parties and the courts below disagree, however, about how this test applies to the facts of this case and this calls for clarification of certain points of the *Sierra Club* analysis. Most centrally, there is disagreement about how an important interest in the protection of privacy could be recognized such that it would justify limits on openness, and in particular when privacy can be a matter of public concern. The parties bring two settled principles of this Court’s jurisprudence to bear in support of their respective positions. First, this Court has often observed that privacy is a

fundamental value necessary to the preservation of a free and democratic society (*Lavigne v. Canada (Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages)*, 2002 SCC 53, [2002] 2 S.C.R. 773, at para. 25; *Dagg v. Canada (Minister of Finance)*, [1997] 2 S.C.R. 403, at paras. 65-66, per La Forest J. (dissenting but not on this point); *New Brunswick*, at para. 40). Courts have invoked privacy, in some instances, as the basis for an exception to openness under the *Sierra Club* test (see, e.g., *R. v. Henry*, 2009 BCCA 86, 270 B.C.A.C. 5, at paras. 11 and 17). At the same time, the jurisprudence acknowledges that some degree of privacy loss — resulting in inconvenience, even in upset or embarrassment — is inherent in any court proceeding open to the public (*New Brunswick*, at para. 40). Accordingly, upholding the presumption of openness has meant recognizing that neither individual sensibilities nor mere personal discomfort associated with participating in judicial proceedings are likely to justify the exclusion of the public from court (*Attorney General of Nova Scotia v. MacIntyre*, [1982] 1 S.C.R. 175, at p. 185; *New Brunswick*, at para. 41). Determining the role of privacy in the *Sierra Club* analysis requires reconciling these two ideas, which is the nub of the disagreement between the parties. The right of privacy is not absolute; the open court principle is not without exceptions.

[32] For the reasons that follow, I disagree with the Trustees that the ostensibly unbounded privacy interest they invoke qualifies as an important public interest within the meaning of *Sierra Club*. Their broad claim fails to focus on the elements of privacy that are deserving of public protection in the open court context. That is not to say, however, that privacy can never ground an exceptional measure such as the sealing

orders sought in this case. While the mere embarrassment caused by the dissemination of personal information through the open court process does not rise to the level justifying a limit on court openness, circumstances do exist where an aspect of a person's private life has a plain public interest dimension.

[33] Personal information disseminated in open court can be more than a source of discomfort and may result in an affront to a person's dignity. Insofar as privacy serves to protect individuals from this affront, it is an important public interest relevant under *Sierra Club*. Dignity in this sense is a related but narrower concern than privacy generally; it transcends the interests of the individual and, like other important public interests, is a matter that concerns the society at large. A court can make an exception to the open court principle, notwithstanding the strong presumption in its favour, if the interest in protecting core aspects of individuals' personal lives that bear on their dignity is at serious risk by reason of the dissemination of sufficiently sensitive information. The question is not whether the information is "personal" to the individual concerned, but whether, because of its highly sensitive character, its dissemination would occasion an affront to their dignity that society as a whole has a stake in protecting.

[34] This public interest in privacy appropriately focuses the analysis on the impact of the dissemination of sensitive personal information, rather than the mere fact of this dissemination, which is frequently risked in court proceedings and is necessary in a system that privileges court openness. It is a high bar — higher and more precise

than the sweeping privacy interest relied upon here by the Trustees. This public interest will only be seriously at risk where the information in question strikes at what is sometimes said to be the core identity of the individual concerned: information so sensitive that its dissemination could be an affront to dignity that the public would not tolerate, even in service of open proceedings.

[35] I hasten to say that applicants for an order making exception to the open court principle cannot content themselves with an unsubstantiated claim that this public interest in dignity is compromised any more than they could by an unsubstantiated claim that their physical integrity is endangered. Under *Sierra Club*, the applicant must show on the facts of the case that, as an important interest, this dignity dimension of their privacy is at “serious risk”. For the purposes of the test for discretionary limits on court openness, this requires the applicant to show that the information in the court file is sufficiently sensitive such that it can be said to strike at the biographical core of the individual and, in the broader circumstances, that there is a serious risk that, without an exceptional order, the affected individual will suffer an affront to their dignity.

[36] In the present case, the information in the court files was not of this highly sensitive character that it could be said to strike at the core identity of the affected persons; the Trustees have failed to show how the lifting of the sealing orders engages the dignity of the affected individuals. I am therefore not convinced that the intrusion on their privacy raises a serious risk to an important public interest as required by *Sierra Club*. Moreover, as I shall endeavour to explain, there was no serious risk of

physical harm to the affected individuals by lifting the sealing orders. Accordingly, this is not an appropriate case in which to make sealing orders, or any order limiting access to these court files. In the circumstances, the admissibility of the Toronto Star's new evidence is moot. I propose to dismiss the appeal.

A. *The Test for Discretionary Limits on Court Openness*

[37] Court proceedings are presumptively open to the public (*MacIntyre*, at p. 189; *A.B. v. Bragg Communications Inc.*, 2012 SCC 46, [2012] 2 S.C.R. 567, at para. 11).

[38] The test for discretionary limits on presumptive court openness has been expressed as a two-step inquiry involving the necessity and proportionality of the proposed order (*Sierra Club*, at para. 53). Upon examination, however, this test rests upon three core prerequisites that a person seeking such a limit must show. Recasting the test around these three prerequisites, without altering its essence, helps to clarify the burden on an applicant seeking an exception to the open court principle. In order to succeed, the person asking a court to exercise discretion in a way that limits the open court presumption must establish that:

- (1) court openness poses a serious risk to an important public interest;
- (2) the order sought is necessary to prevent this serious risk to the identified interest because reasonably alternative measures will not prevent this risk; and,

(3) as a matter of proportionality, the benefits of the order outweigh its negative effects.

Only where all three of these prerequisites have been met can a discretionary limit on openness — for example, a sealing order, a publication ban, an order excluding the public from a hearing, or a redaction order — properly be ordered. This test applies to all discretionary limits on court openness, subject only to valid legislative enactments (*Toronto Star Newspapers Ltd. v. Ontario*, 2005 SCC 41, [2005] 2 S.C.R. 188, at paras. 7 and 22).

[39] The discretion is structured and controlled in this way to protect the open court principle, which is understood to be constitutionalized under the right to freedom of expression at s. 2(b) of the Charter (*New Brunswick*, at para. 23). Sustained by freedom of expression, the open court principle is one of the foundations of a free press given that access to courts is fundamental to newsgathering. This Court has often highlighted the importance of open judicial proceedings to maintaining the independence and impartiality of the courts, public confidence and understanding of their work and ultimately the legitimacy of the process (see, e.g., *Vancouver Sun*, at paras. 23-26). In *New Brunswick*, La Forest J. explained the presumption in favour of court openness had become ““one of the hallmarks of a democratic society”” (citing *Re Southam Inc. and The Queen (No.1)* (1983), 41 O.R. (2d) 113 (C.A.), at p. 119), that “acts as a guarantee that justice is administered in a non-arbitrary manner, according to the rule of law . . . thereby fostering public confidence in the integrity of the court system and

understanding of the administration of justice” (para. 22). The centrality of this principle to the court system underlies the strong presumption — albeit one that is rebuttable — in favour of court openness (para. 40; *Mentuck*, at para. 39).

[40] The test ensures that discretionary orders are subject to no lower standard than a legislative enactment limiting court openness would be (*Mentuck*, at para. 27; *Sierra Club*, at para. 45). To that end, this Court developed a scheme of analysis by analogy to the *Oakes* test, which courts use to understand whether a legislative limit on a right guaranteed under the *Charter* is reasonable and demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society (*Sierra Club*, at para. 40, citing *R. v. Oakes*, [1986] 1 S.C.R. 103; see also *Dagenais*, at p. 878; *Vancouver Sun*, at para. 30).

[41] The recognized scope of what interests might justify a discretionary exception to open courts has broadened over time. In *Dagenais*, Lamer C.J. spoke of a requisite risk to the “fairness of the trial” (p. 878). In *Mentuck*, Iacobucci J. extended this to a risk affecting the “proper administration of justice” (para. 32). Finally, in *Sierra Club*, Iacobucci J., again writing for a unanimous Court, restated the test to capture any serious risk to an “important interest, including a commercial interest, in the context of litigation” (para. 53). He simultaneously clarified that the important interest must be expressed as a public interest. For example, on the facts of that case, a harm to a particular business interest would not have been sufficient, but the “general commercial interest of preserving confidential information” was an important interest because of its public character (para. 55). This is consistent with the fact that this test

was developed in reference to the *Oakes* jurisprudence that focuses on the “pressing and substantial” objective of legislation of general application (*Oakes*, at pp. 138-39; see also *Mentuck*, at para. 31). The term “important interest” therefore captures a broad array of public objectives.

[42] While there is no closed list of important public interests for the purposes of this test, I share Iacobucci J.’s sense, explained in *Sierra Club*, that courts must be “cautious” and “alive to the fundamental importance of the open court rule” even at the earliest stage when they are identifying important public interests (para. 56). Determining what is an important public interest can be done in the abstract at the level of general principles that extend beyond the parties to the particular dispute (para. 55). By contrast, whether that interest is at “serious risk” is a fact-based finding that, for the judge considering the appropriateness of an order, is necessarily made in context. In this sense, the identification of, on the one hand, an important interest and, on the other, the seriousness of the risk to that interest are, theoretically at least, separate and qualitatively distinct operations. An order may therefore be refused simply because a valid important public interest is not at serious risk on the facts of a given case or, conversely, that the identified interests, regardless of whether they are at serious risk, do not have the requisite important public character as a matter of general principle.

[43] The test laid out in *Sierra Club* continues to be an appropriate guide for judicial discretion in cases like this one. The breadth of the category of “important interest” transcends the interests of the parties to the dispute and provides significant

flexibility to address harm to fundamental values in our society that unqualified openness could cause (see, e.g., P. M. Perell and J. W. Morden, *The Law of Civil Procedure in Ontario* (4th ed. 2020), at para. 3.185; J. Bailey and J. Burkell, “Revisiting the Open Court Principle in an Era of Online Publication: Questioning Presumptive Public Access to Parties’ and Witnesses’ Personal Information” (2016), 48 *Ottawa L. Rev.* 143, at pp. 154-55). At the same time, however, the requirement that a serious risk to an important interest be demonstrated imposes a meaningful threshold necessary to maintain the presumption of openness. Were it merely a matter of weighing the benefits of the limit on court openness against its negative effects, decision-makers confronted with concrete impacts on the individuals appearing before them may struggle to put adequate weight on the less immediate negative effects on the open court principle. Such balancing could be evasive of effective appellate review. To my mind, the structure provided by *Dagenais*, *Mentuck*, and *Sierra Club* remains appropriate and should be affirmed.

[44] Finally, I recall that the open court principle is engaged by all judicial proceedings, whatever their nature (*MacIntyre* at pp. 185-86; *Vancouver Sun*, at para. 31). To the extent the Trustees suggested, in their arguments about the negative effects of the sealing orders, that probate in Ontario does not engage the open court principle or that the openness of these proceedings has no public value, I disagree. The certificates the Trustees sought from the court are issued under the seal of that court, thereby bearing the imprimatur of the court’s authority. The court’s decision, even if rendered in a non-contentious setting, will have an impact on third parties, for example

by establishing the testamentary paper that constitutes a valid will (see *Otis v. Otis* (2004), 7 E.T.R. (3d) 221 (Ont. S.C.), at paras. 23-24). Contrary to what the Trustees argue, the matters in a probate file are not quintessentially private or fundamentally administrative. Obtaining a certificate of appointment of estate trustee in Ontario is a court proceeding and the fundamental rationale for openness — discouraging mischief and ensuring confidence in the administration of justice through transparency — applies to probate proceedings and thus to the transfer of property under court authority and other matters affected by that court action.

[45] It is true that other non-probate estate planning mechanisms may allow for the transfer of wealth outside the ordinary avenues of testate or intestate succession — that is the case, for instance, for certain insurance and pension benefits, and for certain property held in co-ownership. But this does not change the necessarily open court character of probate proceedings. That non-probate transfers keep certain information related to the administration of an estate out of public view does not mean that the Trustees here, by seeking certificates from the court, somehow do not engage this principle. The Trustees seek the benefits that flow from the public judicial probate process: transparency ensures that the probate court’s authority is administered fairly and efficiently (*Vancouver Sun*, at para. 25; *New Brunswick*, at para. 22). The strong presumption in favour of openness plainly applies to probate proceedings and the Trustees must satisfy the test for discretionary limits on court openness.

B. *The Public Importance of Privacy*

[46] As mentioned, I disagree with the Trustees that an unbounded interest in privacy qualifies as an important public interest under the test for discretionary limits on court openness. Yet in some of its manifestations, privacy does have social importance beyond the person most immediately concerned. On that basis, it cannot be excluded as an interest that could justify, in the right circumstances, a limit to court openness. Indeed, the public importance of privacy has been recognized by this Court in various settings, and this sheds light on why the narrower aspect of privacy related to the protection of dignity is an important public interest.

[47] I respectfully disagree with the manner in which the Court of Appeal disposed of the claim by the Trustees that there is a serious risk to the interest in protecting personal privacy in this case. For the appellate judges, the privacy concerns raised by the Trustees amounted to “[p]ersonal concerns” which cannot, “without more”, satisfy the requirement from *Sierra Club* that an important interest be framed as a public interest (para. 10). The Court of Appeal in our case relied, at para. 10, on *H. (M.E.) v. Williams*, 2012 ONCA 35, 108 O.R. (3d) 321, in which it was held that “[p]urely personal interests cannot justify non-publication or sealing orders” (para. 25). Citing as authority judgments of this Court in *MacIntyre* and *Sierra Club*, the court continued by observing that “personal concerns of a litigant, including concerns about the very real emotional distress and embarrassment that can be occasioned to litigants when justice is done in public, will not, standing alone, satisfy the necessity branch of the test” (para. 25). Respectfully stated, the emphasis that the Court of Appeal placed on personal concerns as a means of deciding that the sealing orders failed to meet the

necessity requirement in this case and in *Williams* is, I think, mistaken. Personal concerns that relate to aspects of the privacy of an individual who is before the courts can coincide with a public interest in confidentiality.

[48] Like the Court of Appeal, I do agree with the view expressed particularly in the pre-*Charter* case of *MacIntyre*, that where court openness results in an intrusion on privacy which disturbs the “sensibilities of the individuals involved” (p. 185), that concern is generally insufficient to justify a sealing or like order and does not amount to an important public interest under *Sierra Club*. But I disagree with the Court of Appeal in this case and in *Williams* that this is because the intrusion only occasions “personal concerns”. Certain personal concerns — even “without more” — can coincide with important public interests within the meaning of *Sierra Club*. To invoke the expression of Binnie J. in *F.N. (Re)*, 2000 SCC 35, [2000] 1 S.C.R. 880, at para. 10, there is a “public interest in confidentiality” that is felt, first and foremost, by the person involved and is most certainly a personal concern. Even in *Williams*, the Court of Appeal was careful to note that where, without privacy protection, an individual would face “a substantial risk of serious debilitating emotional . . . harm”, an exception to openness should be available (paras. 29-30). The means of discerning whether a privacy interest reflects a “public interest in confidentiality” is therefore not whether the interest reflects or is rooted in “personal concerns” for the privacy of the individuals involved. Some personal concerns relating to privacy overlap with public interests in confidentiality. These interests in privacy can be, in my view, important public interests within the meaning of *Sierra Club*. It is true that an individual’s privacy is

pre-eminently important to that individual. But this Court has also long recognized that the protection of privacy is, in a variety of settings, in the interest of society as a whole.

[49] The proposition that privacy is important, not only to the affected individual but to our society, has deep roots in the jurisprudence of this Court outside the context of the test for discretionary limits on court openness. This background helps explain why privacy cannot be rejected as a mere personal concern. However, the key differences in these contexts are such that the public importance of privacy cannot be transposed to open courts without adaptation. Only specific aspects of privacy interests can qualify as important public interests under *Sierra Club*.

[50] In the context of s. 8 of the *Charter* and public sector privacy legislation, La Forest J. cited American privacy scholar Alan F. Westin for the proposition that privacy is a fundamental value of the modern state, first in *R. v. Dyment*, [1988] 2 S.C.R. 417, at pp. 427-28 (concurring), and then in *Dagg*, at para. 65 (dissenting but not on this point). In the latter case, La Forest J. wrote: “The protection of privacy is a fundamental value in modern, democratic states. An expression of an individual’s unique personality or personhood, privacy is grounded on physical and moral autonomy — the freedom to engage in one’s own thoughts, actions and decisions” (para. 65 (citations omitted)). That statement was endorsed unanimously by this Court in *Lavigne*, at para. 25.

[51] Further, in *Alberta (Information and Privacy Commissioner) v. United Food and Commercial Workers, Local 401*, 2013 SCC 62, [2013] 3 S.C.R. 733

(“*UFCW*”), decided in the context of a statute regulating the use of information by organizations, the objective of providing an individual with some control over their information was recognized as “intimately connected to individual autonomy, dignity and privacy, self-evidently significant social values” (para. 24). The importance of privacy, its “quasi-constitutional status” and its role in protecting moral autonomy continues to find expression in our recent jurisprudence (see, e.g., *Lavigne*, at para. 24; *Bragg*, at para. 18, per Abella J., citing *Toronto Star Newspaper Ltd. v. Ontario*, 2012 ONCJ 27, 289 C.C.C. (3d) 549, at paras. 40-41 and 44; *Douez v. Facebook, Inc.*, 2017 SCC 33, [2017] 1 S.C.R. 751, at para. 59). In *Douez*, Karakatsanis, Wagner (as he then was) and Gascon JJ. underscored this same point, adding that “the growth of the Internet, virtually timeless with pervasive reach, has exacerbated the potential harm that may flow from incursions to a person’s privacy interests” (para. 59).

[52] Privacy as a public interest is underlined by specific aspects of privacy protection present in legislation at the federal and provincial levels (see, e.g., *Privacy Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. P-21; *Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act*, S.C. 2000, c. 5 (“PIPEDA”); *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. F.31; *Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms*, CQLR, c. C-12, s. 5; *Civil Code of Québec*, arts. 35 to 41).³ Further, in assessing the constitutionality of a legislative exception to the open court principle, this Court has recognized that the protection of individual privacy can be a pressing and substantial objective

³ At the time of writing the House of Commons is considering a bill that would replace part one of PIPEDA: Bill C-11, *An Act to enact the Consumer Privacy Protection Act and the Personal Information and Data Protection Tribunal Act and to make consequential and related amendments to other Acts*, 2nd Sess., 43rd Parl., 2020.

(*Edmonton Journal*, at p. 1345, per Cory J.; see also the concurring reasons of Wilson J., at p. 1354, in which “the public interest in protecting the privacy of litigants generally in matrimonial cases against the public interest in an open court process” was explicitly noted). There is also continued support for the social and public importance of individual privacy in the academic literature (see, e.g., A. J. Cockfield, “Protecting the Social Value of Privacy in the Context of State Investigations Using New Technologies” (2007), 40 *U.B.C. L. Rev.* 41, at p. 41; K. Hughes, “A Behavioural Understanding of Privacy and its Implications for Privacy Law” (2012), 75 *Modern L. Rev.* 806, at p. 823; P. Gewirtz, “Privacy and Speech” (2001), *Sup. Ct. Rev.* 139, at p. 139). It is therefore inappropriate, in my respectful view, to dismiss the public interest in protecting privacy as merely a personal concern. This does not mean, however, that privacy generally is an important public interest in the context of limits on court openness.

[53] The fact that the case before the application judge concerned individuals who were advancing their own privacy interests, which were undeniably important to them as individuals, does not mean that there is no public interest at stake. In *F.N. (Re)*, this was the personal interest that young offenders had in remaining anonymous in court proceedings as a means of encouraging their personal rehabilitation (para. 11). All of society had a stake, according to Binnie J., in the young person’s personal prospect for rehabilitation. This same idea from *F.N. (Re)* was cited in support of finding the interest in *Sierra Club* to be a public interest. That interest, rooted first in an agreement of personal concern to the contracting parties involved, was a private matter that evinced,

alongside its personal interest to the parties, a “public interest in confidentiality” (*Sierra Club*, at para. 55). Similarly, while the Trustees have a personal interest in preserving their privacy, this does not mean that the public has no stake in this same interest because — as this Court has made clear — it is related to moral autonomy and dignity which are pressing and substantial concerns.

[54] In this appeal, the *Toronto Star* suggests that legitimate privacy concerns would be effectively protected by a discretionary order where there is “something more” to elevate them beyond personal concerns and sensibilities (*R.F.*, at para. 73). The Income Security Advocacy Centre, by way of example, submits that privacy serves the public interests of preventing harm and of ensuring individuals are not dissuaded from accessing the courts. I agree that these concepts are related, but in my view care must be taken not to conflate the public importance of privacy with that of other interests; aspects of privacy, such as dignity, may constitute important public interests in and of themselves. A risk to personal privacy may be tied to a risk to psychological harm, as it was in *Bragg* (para. 14; see also J. Rossiter, *Law of Publication Bans, Private Hearings and Sealing Orders* (loose-leaf), s. 2.4.1). But concerns for privacy may not always coincide with a desire to avoid psychological harm, and may focus instead, for example, on protecting one’s professional standing (see, e.g., *R. v. Paterson* (1998), 102 B.C.A.C. 200, at paras. 76, 78 and 87-88). Similarly, there may be circumstances where the prospect of surrendering the personal information necessary to pursue a legal claim may deter an individual from bringing that claim (see *S. v. Lamontagne*, 2020 QCCA 663, at paras. 34-35 (CanLII)). In the same way, the prospect

of surrendering sensitive commercial information would have impaired the conduct of the party's defence in *Sierra Club* (at para. 71), or could pressure an individual into settling a dispute prematurely (K. Eltis, *Courts, Litigants and the Digital Age* (2nd ed. 2016), at p. 86). But this does not necessarily mean that a public interest in privacy is wholly subsumed by such concerns. I note, for example, that access to justice concerns do not apply where the privacy interest to be protected is that of a third party to the litigation, such as a witness, whose access to the courts is not at stake and who has no choice available to terminate the litigation and avoid any privacy impacts (see, e.g., *Himel v. Greenberg*, 2010 ONSC 2325, 93 R.F.L. (6th) 357, at para. 58; see also Rossiter, s. 2.4.2(2)). In any event, the recognition of these related and valid important public interests does not answer the question as to whether aspects of privacy in and of themselves are important public interests and does not diminish the distinctive public character of privacy, considered above.

[55] Indeed, the specific harms to privacy occasioned by open courts have not gone unnoticed nor been discounted as merely personal concerns. Courts have exercised their discretion to limit court openness in order to protect personal information from publicity, including to prevent the disclosure of sexual orientation (see, e.g., *Paterson*, at paras. 76, 78 and 87-88), HIV status (see, e.g., *A.B. v. Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2017 FC 629, at para. 9 (CanLII)) and a history of substance abuse and criminality (see, e.g., *R. v. Pickton*, 2010 BCSC 1198, at paras. 11 and 20 (CanLII)). This need to reconcile the public interest in privacy with the open court principle has been highlighted by this Court (see, e.g., *Edmonton Journal*, at

p. 1353, per Wilson J.). Writing extra-judicially, McLachlin C.J. explained that “[i]f we are serious about peoples’ private lives, we must preserve a modicum of privacy. Equally, if we are serious about our justice system, we must have open courts. The question is how to reconcile these dual imperatives in a fair and principled way” (“Courts, Transparency and Public Confidence: To the Better Administration of Justice” (2003), 8 *Deakin L. Rev.* 1, at p. 4). In seeking that reconciliation, the question becomes whether the relevant dimension of privacy amounts to an important public interest that, when seriously at risk, would justify rebutting the strong presumption favouring open courts.

C. *The Important Public Interest in Privacy Bears on the Protection of Individual Dignity*

[56] While the public importance of privacy has clearly been recognized by this Court in various settings, caution is required in deploying this concept in the test for discretionary limits on court openness. It is a matter of settled law that open court proceedings by their nature can be a source of discomfort and embarrassment and these intrusions on privacy are generally seen as of insufficient importance to overcome the presumption of openness. The *Toronto Star* has raised the concern that recognizing privacy as an important public interest will lower the burden for applicants because the privacy of litigants will, in some respects, always be at risk in court proceedings. I agree that the requirement to show a serious risk to an important interest is a key threshold component of the analysis that must be preserved in order to protect the open court principle. The recognition of a public interest in privacy could threaten the strong

presumption of openness if privacy is cast too broadly without a view to its public character.

[57] Privacy poses challenges in the test for discretionary limits on court openness because of the necessary dissemination of information that openness implies. It bears recalling that when Dickson J., as he then was, wrote in *MacIntyre* that “covertness is the exception and openness the rule”, he was explicitly treating a privacy argument, returning to and dismissing the view, urged many times before, “that the ‘privacy’ of litigants requires that the public be excluded from court proceedings” (p. 185 (emphasis added)). Dickson J. rejected the view that personal privacy concerns require closed courtroom doors, explaining that “[a]s a general rule the sensibilities of the individuals involved are no basis for exclusion of the public from judicial proceedings” (p. 185).

[58] Though writing before *Dagenais*, and therefore not commenting on the specific steps of the analysis as we now understand them, to my mind, Dickson J. was right to recognize that the open court principle brings necessary limits to the right to privacy. While individuals may have an expectation that information about them will not be revealed in judicial proceedings, the open court principle stands presumptively in opposition to that expectation. For example, in *Lac d’Amiante du Québec Ltée v. 2858-0702 Québec Inc.*, 2001 SCC 51, [2001] 2 S.C.R. 743, LeBel J. held that “a party who institutes a legal proceeding waives his or her right to privacy, at least in part” (para. 42). *MacIntyre* and cases like it recognize — in stating that openness is the rule

and covertness the exception — that the right to privacy, however defined, in some measure gives way to the open court ideal. I share the view that the open court principle presumes that this limit on the right to privacy is justified.

[59] The Toronto Star is therefore right to say that the privacy of individuals will very often be at some risk in court proceedings. Disputes between and concerning individuals that play out in open court necessarily reveal information that may have otherwise remained out of public view. Indeed, much like the Court of Appeal in this case, courts have explicitly adverted to this concern when concluding that mere inconvenience is insufficient to cross the initial threshold of the test (see, e.g., 3834310 *Canada inc. v. Chamberland*, 2004 CanLII 4122 (Que. C.A.), at para. 30). Saying that any impact on individual privacy is sufficient to establish a serious risk to an important public interest for the purposes of the test for discretionary limits on court openness could render this initial requirement moot. Many cases would turn on the balancing at the proportionality stage. Such a development would amount to a departure from *Sierra Club*, which is the appropriate framework and one which must be preserved.

[60] Further, recognizing an important interest in privacy generally could prove to be too open-ended and difficult to apply. Privacy is a complex and contextual concept (*Dagg*, at para. 67; see also B. McIsaac, K. Klein and S. Brown, *The Law of Privacy in Canada* (loose-leaf), vol. 1, at pp. 1-4; D. J. Solove, “Conceptualizing Privacy” (2002), 90 *Cal. L. Rev.* 1087, at p. 1090). Indeed, this Court has described the nature of limits of privacy as being in a state of “theoretical disarray” (*R. v. Spencer*,

2014 SCC 43, [2014] 2 S.C.R. 212, at para. 35). Much turns on the context in which privacy is invoked. I agree with the *Toronto Star* that a bald recognition of privacy as an important interest in the context of the test for discretionary limits on court openness, as the Trustees advance here, would invite considerable confusion. It would be difficult for courts to measure a serious risk to such an interest because of its multi-faceted nature.

[61] While I acknowledge these concerns have merit, I disagree that they require that privacy never be considered in determining whether there is a serious risk to an important public interest. I reach this conclusion for two reasons. First, the problem of privacy's complexity can be attenuated by focusing on the purpose underlying the public protection of privacy as it is relevant to the judicial process, in order to fix precisely on that aspect which transcends the interests of the parties in this context. That narrower dimension of privacy is the protection of dignity, an important public interest that can be threatened by open courts. Indeed, rather than attempting to apply a single unwieldy concept of privacy in all contexts, this Court has generally fixed on more specific privacy interests tailored to the particular situation (*Spencer*, at para. 35; *Edmonton Journal*, at p. 1362, per Wilson J.). That is what must be done here, with a view to identifying the public aspect of privacy that openness might inappropriately undermine.

[62] Second, I recall that in order to pass the first stage of the analysis one must not simply invoke an important interest, but must also overcome the presumption of

openness by showing a serious risk to this interest. The burden of showing a risk to such an interest on the facts of a given case constitutes the true initial threshold on the person seeking to restrict openness. It is never sufficient to plead a recognized important public interest on its own. The demonstration of a serious risk to this interest is still required. What is important is that the interest be accurately defined to capture only those aspects of privacy that engage legitimate public objectives such that showing a serious risk to that interest remains a high bar. In this way, courts can effectively maintain the guarantee of presumptive openness.

[63] Specifically, in order to preserve the integrity of the open court principle, an important public interest concerned with the protection of dignity should be understood to be seriously at risk only in limited cases. Nothing here displaces the principle that covertness in court proceedings must be exceptional. Neither the sensibilities of individuals nor the fact that openness is disadvantageous, embarrassing or distressing to certain individuals will generally on their own warrant interference with court openness (*MacIntyre*, at p. 185; *New Brunswick*, at para. 40; *Williams*, at para. 30; *Coltsfoot Publishing Ltd. v. Foster-Jacques*, 2012 NSCA 83, 320 N.S.R. (2d) 166, at para. 97). These principles do not preclude recognizing the public character of a privacy interest as important when it is related to the protection of dignity. They merely require that a serious risk be shown to exist in respect of this interest in order to justify, exceptionally, a limit on openness, as is the case with any important public interest under *Sierra Club*. As Professors Sylvette Guillemard and Séverine Menétrey explain, [TRANSLATION] “[t]he confidentiality of the proceedings may be justified, in

particular, in order to protect the parties' privacy However, the jurisprudence indicates that embarrassment or shame is not a sufficient reason to order that proceedings be held *in camera* or to impose a publication ban" (*Comprendre la procédure civile québécoise* (2nd ed. 2017), at p. 57).

[64] How should the privacy interest at issue be understood as raising an important public interest relevant to the test for discretionary limits on court openness in this context? It is helpful to recall that the orders below were sought to limit access to documents and information in the court files. The Trustees' argument on this point focused squarely on the risk of immediate and widespread dissemination of the personally identifying and other sensitive information contained in the sealed materials by the *Toronto Star*. The Trustees submit that this dissemination would constitute an unwarranted intrusion into the privacy of the affected individuals beyond the upset they have already suffered as a result of the publicity associated with the death of the Shermans.

[65] In my view, there is value in leaving individuals free to restrict when, how and to what extent highly sensitive information about them is communicated to others in the public sphere, because choosing how we present ourselves in public preserves our moral autonomy and dignity as individuals. This Court has had occasion to underscore the connection between the privacy interest engaged by open courts and the protection of dignity specifically. For example, in *Edmonton Journal*, Wilson J. noted that the impugned provision which would limit publication about matrimonial

proceedings addressed “a somewhat different aspect of privacy, one more closely related to the protection of one’s dignity . . . namely the personal anguish and loss of dignity that may result from having embarrassing details of one’s private life printed in the newspapers” (pp. 1363-64). In *Bragg*, as a further example, the protection of a young person’s ability to control sensitive information was said to foster respect for “dignity, personal integrity and autonomy” (para. 18, citing *Toronto Star Newspaper Ltd.*, at para. 44).

[66] Consistent with this jurisprudence, I note by way of example that the Quebec legislature expressly highlighted the preservation of dignity when the *Sierra Club* test was codified in the *Code of Civil Procedure*, CQLR, c. C-25.01 (“C.C.P.”), art. 12 (see also Ministère de la Justice, *Commentaires de la ministre de la Justice: Code de procédure civile, chapitre C-25.01* (2015), art. 12). Under art. 12 C.C.P., a discretionary exception to the open court principle can be made by the court if “public order, in particular the preservation of the dignity of the persons involved or the protection of substantial and legitimate interests”, requires it.

[67] The concept of public order evidences flexibility analogous to the concept of an important public interest under *Sierra Club* yet it recalls that the interest invoked transcends, in importance and consequence, the purely subjective sensibilities of the persons affected. Like the “important public interest” that must be at serious risk to justify the sealing orders in the present appeal, public order encompasses a wide array of general principles and imperative norms identified by a legislature and the courts as

fundamental to a given society (see *Goulet v. Transamerica Life Insurance Co. of Canada*, 2002 SCC 21, [2002] 1 S.C.R. 719, at paras. 42-44, citing *Godbout v. Longueuil (Ville de)*, [1995] R.J.Q. 2561 (C.A.), at p. 2570, aff'd [1997] 3 S.C.R. 844). As one Quebec judge wrote, referring to *Sierra Club* prior to the enactment of art. 12 C.C.P., the interest must be understood as defined [TRANSLATION] “in terms of a public interest in confidentiality” (see 3834310 *Canada inc.*, at para. 24, per Gendreau J.A. for the court of appeal). From among the various considerations that make up the concept of public order and other legitimate interests to which art. 12 C.C.P. alludes, it is significant that dignity, and not an untailored reference to either privacy, harm or access to justice, was given pride of place. Indeed, it is that narrow aspect of privacy considered to be a fundamental right that courts had fixed upon before the enactment of art. 12 C.C.P. — [TRANSLATION] “what is part of one’s personal life, in short, what constitutes a minimum personal sphere” (*Godbout*, at p. 2569, per Baudouin J.A.; see also *A. v. B.*, 1990 CanLII 3132 (Que. C.A.), at para. 20, per Rothman J.A.).

[68] The “preservation of the dignity of the persons involved” is now consecrated as the archetypal public order interest in art. 12 C.C.P. It is the exemplar of the *Sierra Club* important public interest in confidentiality that stands as justification for an exception to openness (S. Rochette and J.-F. Côté, “Article 12”, in L. Chamberland, ed., *Le grand collectif: Code de procédure civile — Commentaires et annotations* (5th ed. 2020), vol. 1, at p. 102; D. Ferland and B. Emery, *Précis de procédure civile du Québec* (6th ed. 2020), vol. 1, at para. 1-111). Dignity gives concrete expression to this public order interest because all of society has a stake in its

preservation, notwithstanding its personal connections to the individuals concerned. This codification of *Sierra Club*'s notion of important public interest highlights the superordinate importance of human dignity and the appropriateness of limiting court openness on this basis as against an overbroad understanding of privacy that might be otherwise unsuitable to the open court context.

[69] Consistent with this idea, understanding privacy as predicated on dignity has been advanced as useful in connection with challenges brought by digital communications (K. Eltis, "The Judicial System in the Digital Age: Revisiting the Relationship between Privacy and Accessibility in the Cyber Context" (2011), 56 *McGill L.J.* 289, at p. 314).

[70] It is also significant, in my view, that the application judge in this case explicitly recognized, in response to the relevant arguments from the Trustees, an interest in "protecting the privacy and dignity of victims of crime and their loved ones" (para. 23 (emphasis added)). This elucidates that the central concern for the affected individuals on this point is not merely protecting their privacy for its own sake but privacy where it coincides with the public character of the dignity interests of these individuals.

[71] Violations of privacy that cause a loss of control over fundamental personal information about oneself are damaging to dignity because they erode one's ability to present aspects of oneself to others in a selective manner (D. Matheson, "Dignity and Selective Self-Presentation", in I. Kerr, V. Steeves and C. Lucock, eds., *Lessons from*

the Identity Trail: Anonymity, Privacy and Identity in a Networked Society (2009), 319, at pp. 327-28; L. M. Austin, “Re-reading Westin” (2019), 20 *Theor. Inq. L.* 53, at pp. 66-68; Eltis (2016), at p. 13). Dignity, used in this context, is a social concept that involves presenting core aspects of oneself to others in a considered and controlled manner (see generally Matheson, at pp. 327-28; Austin, at pp. 66-68). Dignity is eroded where individuals lose control over this core identity-giving information about themselves, because a highly sensitive aspect of who they are that they did not consciously decide to share is now available to others and may shape how they are seen in public. This was even alluded to by La Forest J., dissenting but not on this point, in *Dagg*, where he referred to privacy as “[a]n expression of an individual’s unique personality or personhood” (para. 65).

[72] Where dignity is impaired, the impact on the individual is not theoretical but could engender real human consequences, including psychological distress (see generally *Bragg*, at para. 23). La Forest J., concurring, observed in *Dyment* that privacy is essential to the well-being of individuals (p. 427). Viewed in this way, a privacy interest, where it shields the core information associated with dignity necessary to individual well-being, begins to look much like the physical safety interest also raised in this case, the important and public nature of which is neither debated, nor, in my view, seriously debatable. The administration of justice suffers when the operation of courts threatens physical well-being because a responsible court system is attuned to the physical harm it inflicts on individuals and works to avoid such effects. Similarly, in my view, a responsible court must be attuned and responsive to the harm it causes to

other core elements of individual well-being, including individual dignity. This parallel helps to understand dignity as a more limited dimension of privacy relevant as an important public interest in the open court context.

[73] I am accordingly of the view that protecting individuals from the threat to their dignity that arises when information revealing core aspects of their private lives is disseminated through open court proceedings is an important public interest for the purposes of the test.

[74] Focusing on the underlying value of privacy in protecting individual dignity from the exposure of private information in open court overcomes the criticisms that privacy will always be at risk in open court proceedings and is theoretically complex. Openness brings intrusions on personal privacy in virtually all cases, but dignity as a public interest in protecting an individual's core sensibility is more rarely in play. Specifically, and consistent with the cautious approach to the recognition of important public interests, this privacy interest, while determined in reference to the broader factual setting, will be at serious risk only where the sensitivity of the information strikes at the subject's more intimate self.

[75] If the interest is ultimately about safeguarding a person's dignity, that interest will be undermined when the information reveals something sensitive about them as an individual, as opposed to generic information that reveals little if anything about who they are as a person. Therefore the information that will be revealed by court openness must consist of intimate or personal details about an individual — what this

Court has described in its jurisprudence on s. 8 of the *Charter* as the “biographical core” — if a serious risk to an important public interest is to be recognized in this context (*R. v. Plant*, [1993] 3 S.C.R. 281, at p. 293; *R. v. Tessling*, 2004 SCC 67, [2004] 3 S.C.R. 432, at para. 60; *R. v. Cole*, 2012 SCC 53, [2012] 3 S.C.R. 34, at para. 46). Dignity transcends personal inconvenience by reason of the highly sensitive nature of the information that might be revealed. This Court in *Cole* drew a similar line between the sensitivity of personal information and the public interest in protecting that information in reference to the biographical core. It held that “reasonable and informed Canadians” would be more willing to recognize the existence of a privacy interest where the relevant information cuts to the “biographical core” or, “[p]ut another way, the more personal and confidential the information” (para. 46). The presumption of openness means that mere discomfort associated with lesser intrusions of privacy will generally be tolerated. But there is a public interest in ensuring that openness does not unduly entail the dissemination of this core information that threatens dignity — even if it is “personal” to the affected person.

[76] The test for discretionary limits on court openness imposes on the applicant the burden to show that the important public interest is at serious risk. Recognizing that privacy, understood in reference to dignity, is only at serious risk where the information in the court file is sufficiently sensitive erects a threshold consistent with the presumption of openness. This threshold is fact specific. It addresses the concern, noted above, that personal information can frequently be found in court files and yet finding this sufficient to pass the serious risk threshold in every case would undermine the

structure of the test. By requiring the applicant to demonstrate the sensitivity of the information as a necessary condition to the finding of a serious risk to this interest, the scope of the interest is limited to only those cases where the rationale for not revealing core aspects of a person's private life, namely protecting individual dignity, is most actively engaged.

[77] There is no need here to provide an exhaustive catalogue of the range of sensitive personal information that, if exposed, could give rise to a serious risk. It is enough to say that courts have demonstrated a willingness to recognize the sensitivity of information related to stigmatized medical conditions (see, e.g., *A.B.*, at para. 9), stigmatized work (see, e.g., *Work Safe Twerk Safe v. Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Ontario*, 2021 ONSC 1100, at para. 28 (CanLII)), sexual orientation (see, e.g., *Paterson*, at paras. 76, 78 and 87-88), and subjection to sexual assault or harassment (see, e.g., *Fedeli v. Brown*, 2020 ONSC 994, at para. 9 (CanLII)). I would also note the submission of the intervener the Income Security Advocacy Centre, that detailed information about family structure and work history could in some circumstances constitute sensitive information. The question in every case is whether the information reveals something intimate and personal about the individual, their lifestyle or their experiences.

[78] I pause here to note that I refer to cases on s. 8 of the *Charter* above for the limited purpose of providing insight into types of information that are more or less personal and therefore deserving of public protection. If the impact on dignity as a

result of disclosure is to be accurately measured, it is critical that the analysis differentiate between information in this way. Helpfully, one factor in determining whether an applicant's subjective expectation of privacy is objectively reasonable in the s. 8 jurisprudence focuses on the degree to which information is private (see, e.g., *R. v. Marakah*, 2017 SCC 59, [2017] 2 S.C.R. 608, at para. 31; *Cole*, at paras. 44-46). But while these decisions may assist for this limited purpose, this is not to say that the remainder of the s. 8 analysis has any relevance to the application of the test for discretionary limits on court openness. For example, asking what the Trustees' reasonable expectation of privacy was here could invite a circular analysis of whether they reasonably expected their court files to be open to the public or whether they reasonably expected to be successful in having them sealed. Therefore, it is only for the limited purpose described above that the s. 8 jurisprudence is useful.

[79] In cases where the information is sufficiently sensitive to strike at an individual's biographical core, a court must then ask whether a serious risk to the interest is made out in the full factual context of the case. While this is obviously a fact-specific determination, some general observations may be made here to guide this assessment.

[80] I note that the seriousness of the risk may be affected by the extent to which information would be disseminated without an exception to the open court principle. If the applicant raises a risk that the personal information will come to be known by a large segment of the public in the absence of an order, this is a plainly more serious

risk than if the result will be that a handful of people become aware of the same information, all else being equal. In the past, the requirement that one be physically present to acquire information in open court or from a court record meant that information was, to some extent, protected because it was “practically obscure” (D. S. Ardia, “Privacy and Court Records: Online Access and the Loss of Practical Obscurity” (2017), 4 *U. Ill. L. Rev.* 1385, at p. 1396). However, today, courts should be sensitive to the information technology context, which has increased the ease with which information can be communicated and cross-referenced (see Bailey and Burkell, at pp. 169-70; Ardia, at pp. 1450-51). In this context, it may well be difficult for courts to be sure that information will not be broadly disseminated in the absence of an order.

[81] It will be appropriate, of course, to consider the extent to which information is already in the public domain. If court openness will simply make available what is already broadly and easily accessible, it will be difficult to show that revealing the information in open court will actually result in a meaningful loss of that aspect of privacy relating to the dignity interest to which I refer here. However, just because information is already accessible to some segment of the public does not mean that making it available through the court process will not exacerbate the risk to privacy. Privacy is not a binary concept, that is, information is not simply either private or public, especially because, by reason of technology in particular, absolute confidentiality is best thought of as elusive (see generally *R. v. Quesnelle*, 2014 SCC 46, [2014] 2 S.C.R. 390, at para. 37; *UFCW*, at para. 27). The fact that certain information is already available somewhere in the public sphere does not preclude

further harm to the privacy interest by additional dissemination, particularly if the feared dissemination of highly sensitive information is broader or more easily accessible (see generally Solove, at p. 1152; Ardia, at p. 1393-94; E. Paton-Simpson, “Privacy and the Reasonable Paranoid: The Protection of Privacy in Public Places” (2000), 50 *U.T.L.J.* 305, at p. 346).

[82] Further, the seriousness of the risk is also affected by the probability that the dissemination the applicant suggests will occur actually occurs. I hasten to say that implicit in the notion of risk is that the applicant need not establish that the feared dissemination will certainly occur. However, the risk to the privacy interest related to the protection of dignity will be more serious the more likely it is that the information will be disseminated. While decided in a different context, this Court has held that the magnitude of risk is a product of both the gravity of the feared harm and its probability (*R. v. Mabior*, 2012 SCC 47, [2012] 2 S.C.R. 584, at para. 86).

[83] That said, the likelihood that an individual’s highly sensitive personal information will be disseminated in the absence of privacy protection will be difficult to quantify precisely. It is best to note as well that probability in this context need not be identified in mathematical or numerical terms. Rather, courts may merely discern probability in light of the totality of the circumstances and balance this one factor alongside other relevant factors.

[84] Finally, and as discussed above, individual sensitivities alone, even if they can be notionally associated with “privacy”, are generally insufficient to justify a

restriction on court openness where they do not rise above those inconveniences and discomforts that are inherent to court openness (*MacIntyre*, at p. 185). An applicant will only be able to establish that the risk is sufficient to justify a limit on openness in exceptional cases, where the threatened loss of control over information about oneself is so fundamental that it strikes meaningfully at individual dignity. These circumstances engage “social values of superordinate importance” beyond the more ordinary intrusions inherent to participating in the judicial process that Dickson J. acknowledged could justify curtailing public openness (pp. 186-87).

[85] To summarize, the important public interest in privacy, as understood in the context of the limits on court openness, is aimed at allowing individuals to preserve control over their core identity in the public sphere to the extent necessary to preserve their dignity. The public has a stake in openness, to be sure, but it also has an interest in the preservation of dignity: the administration of justice requires that where dignity is threatened in this way, measures be taken to accommodate this privacy concern. Although measured by reference to the facts of each case, the risk to this interest will be serious only where the information that would be disseminated as a result of court openness is sufficiently sensitive such that openness can be shown to meaningfully strike at the individual’s biographical core in a manner that threatens their integrity. Recognizing this interest is consistent with this Court’s emphasis on the importance of privacy and the underlying value of individual dignity, but is also tailored to preserve the strong presumption of openness.

D. *The Trustees Have Failed to Establish a Serious Risk to an Important Public Interest*

[86] As *Sierra Club* made plain, a discretionary order limiting court openness can only be made where there is a serious risk to an important public interest. The arguments on this appeal concerned whether privacy is an important public interest and whether the facts here disclose the existence of serious risks to privacy and safety. While the broad privacy interest invoked by the Trustees cannot be relied on to justify a limit on openness, the narrower concept of privacy understood in relation to dignity is an important public interest for the purposes of the test. I also recognize that a risk to physical safety is an important public interest, a point on which there is no dispute here. Accordingly, the relevant question at the first step is whether there is a serious risk to one or both of these interests. For reasons that follow, the Trustees have failed to establish a serious risk to either. This alone is sufficient to conclude that the sealing orders should not have been issued.

(1) The Risk to Privacy Alleged in this Case Is Not Serious

[87] As I have said, the important public interest in privacy must be understood as one tailored to the protection of individual dignity and not the broadly defined interest the Trustees have asked this Court to recognize. In order to establish a serious risk to this interest, the information in the court files about which the Trustees are concerned must be sufficiently sensitive in that it strikes at the biographical core of the affected individuals. If it is not, there is no serious risk that would justify an exception

to openness. If it is, the question becomes whether a serious risk is made out in light of the facts of this case.

[88] The application judge never explicitly identified a serious risk to the privacy interest he identified but, to the extent he implicitly reached this conclusion, I respectfully do not share his view. His finding was limited to the observation that “[t]he degree of intrusion on that privacy and dignity [i.e., that of the victims and their loved ones] has already been extreme and, I am sure, excruciating” (para. 23). But the intense scrutiny faced by the Shermans up to the time of the application is only part of the equation. As the sealing orders can only protect against the disclosure of the information in these court files relating to probate, the application judge was required to consider the sensitivity of the specific information they contained. He made no such measure. His conclusion about the seriousness of the risk then focused entirely on the risk of physical harm, with no indication that he found that the Trustees met their burden as to the serious risk to the privacy interest. Said very respectfully and with the knowledge that the application judge did not have the benefit of the above framework, the failure to assess the sensitivity of the information constituted a failure to consider a required element of the legal test. This warranted intervention on appeal.

[89] Applying the appropriate framework to the facts of this case, I conclude that the risk to the important public interest in the affected individuals’ privacy, as I have defined it above in reference to dignity, is not serious. The information the

Trustees seek to protect is not highly sensitive and this alone is sufficient to conclude that there is no serious risk to the important public interest in privacy so defined.

[90] There is little controversy in this case about the likelihood and extent of dissemination of the information contained in the estate files. There is near certainty that the Toronto Star will publish at least some aspects of the estate files if it is provided access. Given the breadth of the audience of its media organization, and the high-profile nature of the events surrounding the death of the Shermans, I have no difficulty in concluding that the affected individuals would lose control over this information to a significant extent should the files be open.

[91] With regard to the sensitivity of the information, however, the information contained in these files does not reveal anything particularly private about the affected individuals. What would be revealed might well cause inconvenience and perhaps embarrassment, but it has not been shown that it would strike at their biographical core in a way that would undermine their control over the expression of their identities. Their privacy would be troubled, to be sure, but the relevant privacy interest bearing on the dignity of the affected persons has not been shown to be at serious risk. At its highest, the information in these files will reveal something about the relationship between the deceased and the affected individuals, in that it may reveal to whom the deceased entrusted the administration of their estates and those who they wished or were deemed to wish to be beneficiaries of their property at death. It may also reveal some basic personal information, such as addresses. Some of the beneficiaries might

well, it may fairly be presumed, bear family names other than Sherman. I am mindful that the deaths are being investigated as homicides by the Toronto Police Service. However, even in this context, none of this information provides significant insight into who they are as individuals, nor would it provoke a fundamental change in their ability to control how they are perceived by others. The fact of being linked through estate documents to victims of an unsolved murder is not in itself highly sensitive. It may be the source of discomfort but has not been shown to constitute an affront to dignity in that it does not probe deeply into the biographical core of these individuals. As a result, the Trustees have failed to establish a serious risk to an important public interest as required by *Sierra Club*.

[92] The fact that some of the affected individuals may be minors is also insufficient to cross the seriousness threshold. While the law recognizes that minors are especially vulnerable to intrusions of privacy (see *Bragg*, at para. 17), the mere fact that information concerns minors does not displace the generally applicable analysis (see, e.g., *Bragg*, at para. 11). Even taking into account the increased vulnerability of minors who may be affected individuals in the probate files, there is no evidence that they would lose control of information about themselves that reveals something close to the core of their identities. Merely associating the beneficiaries or trustees with the Shermans' unexplained deaths is not enough to constitute a serious risk to the identified important public interest in privacy, defined in reference to dignity.

[93] Further, while the intense media scrutiny on the family following the deaths suggests that the information would likely be widely disseminated, it is not in itself indicative of the sensitivity of the information contained in the probate files.

[94] Showing that the information that would be revealed by court openness is sufficiently sensitive and private such that it goes to the biographical core of the affected individual is a necessary prerequisite to showing a serious risk to the relevant public interest aspect of privacy. The Trustees did not advance any specific reason why the contents of these files are more sensitive than they may seem at first glance. When asserting a privacy risk, it is essential to show not only that information about individuals will escape the control of the person concerned — which will be true in every case — but that this particular information concerns who the individuals are as people in a manner that undermines their dignity. This the Trustees have not done.

[95] Therefore, while some of the material in the court files may well be broadly disseminated, the nature of the information has not been shown to give rise to a serious risk to the important public interest in privacy, as appropriately defined in this context in reference to dignity. For that reason alone, I conclude that the Trustees have failed to show a serious risk to this interest.

(2) The Risk to Physical Safety Alleged in this Case is Not Serious

[96] Unlike the privacy interest raised in this case, there was no controversy that there is an important public interest in protecting individuals from physical harm. It is

worth underscoring that the application judge correctly treated the protection from physical harm as a distinct important interest from that of the protection of privacy and found that this risk of harm was “foreseeable” and “grave” (paras. 22-24). The issue is whether the Trustees have established a serious risk to this interest for the purpose of the test for discretionary limits on court openness. The application judge observed that it would have been preferable to include objective evidence of the seriousness of the risk from the police service conducting the homicide investigation. He nevertheless concluded there was sufficient proof of risk to the physical safety of the affected individuals to meet the test. The Court of Appeal says that was a misreading of the evidence, and the *Toronto Star* agrees that the application judge’s conclusion as to the existence of a serious risk to safety was mere speculation.

[97] At the outset, I note that direct evidence is not necessarily required to establish a serious risk to an important interest. This Court has held that it is possible to identify objectively discernable harm on the basis of logical inferences (*Bragg*, at paras. 15-16). But this process of inferential reasoning is not a licence to engage in impermissible speculation. An inference must still be grounded in objective circumstantial facts that reasonably allow the finding to be made inferentially. Where the inference cannot reasonably be drawn from the circumstances, it amounts to speculation (*R. v. Chanmany*, 2016 ONCA 576, 352 O.A.C. 121, at para. 45).

[98] As the Trustees correctly argue, it is not just the probability of the feared harm, but also the gravity of the harm itself that is relevant to the assessment of serious

risk. Where the feared harm is particularly serious, the probability that this harm materialize need not be shown to be likely, but must still be more than negligible, fanciful or speculative. The question is ultimately whether this record allowed the application judge to objectively discern a serious risk of physical harm.

[99] This conclusion was not open to the application judge on this record. There is no dispute that the feared physical harm is grave. I agree with the Toronto Star, however, that the probability of this harm occurring was speculative. The application judge's conclusion as to the seriousness of the risk of physical harm was grounded on what he called "the degree of mystery that persists regarding both the perpetrator and the motives" associated with the deaths of the Shermans and his supposition that this motive might be "transported" to the trustees and beneficiaries (para. 5; see also paras. 19 and 23). The further step in reasoning that the unsealed estate files would lead to the perpetrator's next crime, to be visited upon someone mentioned in the files, is based on speculation, not the available affidavit evidence, and cannot be said to be a proper inference or some kind of objectively discerned harm or risk thereof. If that were the case, the estate files of every victim of an unsolved murder would pass the initial threshold of the test for a sealing order.

[100] Further, I recall that what is at issue here is not whether the affected individuals face a safety risk in general, but rather whether they face such a risk as a result of the openness of these court files. In light of the contents of these files, the

Trustees had to point to some further reason why the risk posed by this information becoming publicly available was more than negligible.

[101] The speculative character of the chain of reasoning leading to the conclusion that a serious risk of physical harm exists in this case is underlined by differences between these facts and those cases relied on by the Trustees. In *X. v. Y.*, 2011 BCSC 943, 21 B.C.L.R. (5th) 410, the risk of physical harm was inferred on the basis that the plaintiff was a police officer who had investigated “cases involving gang violence and dangerous firearms” and wrote sentencing reports for such offenders which identified him by full name (para. 6). In *R. v. Esseghaier*, 2017 ONCA 970, 356 C.C.C. (3d) 455, Watt J.A. considered it “self-evident” that the disclosure of identifiers of an undercover operative working in counter-terrorism would compromise the safety of the operative (para. 41). In both cases, the danger flowed from facts establishing that the applicants were in antagonistic relationships with alleged criminal or terrorist organizations. But in this case, the Trustees asked the application judge to infer not only the fact that harm would befall the affected individuals, but also that a person or persons exist who wish to harm them. To infer all this on the basis of the Shermans’ deaths and the association of the affected individuals with the deceased is not reasonably possible on this record. It is not a reasonable inference but, as the Court of Appeal noted, a conclusion resting on speculation.

[102] Were the mere assertion of grave physical harm sufficient to show a serious risk to an important interest, there would be no meaningful threshold in the analysis.

Instead, the test requires the serious risk asserted to be well grounded in the record or the circumstances of the particular case (*Sierra Club*, at para. 54; *Bragg*, at para. 15). This contributes to maintaining the strong presumption of openness.

[103] Again, in other cases, circumstantial facts may allow a court to infer the existence of a serious risk of physical harm. Applicants do not necessarily need to retain experts who will attest to the physical or psychological risk related to the disclosure. But on this record, the bare assertion that such a risk exists fails to meet the threshold necessary to establish a serious risk of physical harm. The application judge's conclusion to the contrary was an error warranting the intervention of the Court of Appeal.

E. *There Would Be Additional Barriers to a Sealing Order on the Basis of the Alleged Risk to Privacy*

[104] While not necessary to dispose of the appeal, it bears mention that the Trustees would have faced additional barriers in seeking the sealing orders on the basis of the privacy interest they advanced. I recall that to meet the test for discretionary limits on court openness, a person must show, in addition to a serious risk to an important interest, that the particular order sought is necessary to address the risk and that the benefits of the order outweigh its negative effects as a matter of proportionality (*Sierra Club*, at para. 53).

[105] Even if the Trustees had succeeded in showing a serious risk to the privacy interest they assert, a publication ban — less constraining on openness than the sealing orders — would have likely been sufficient as a reasonable alternative to prevent this risk. The condition that the order be necessary requires the court to consider whether there are alternatives to the order sought and to restrict the order as much as reasonably possible to prevent the serious risk (*Sierra Club*, at para. 57). An order imposing a publication ban could restrict the dissemination of personal information to only those persons consulting the court record for themselves and prohibit those individuals from spreading the information any further. As I have noted, the likelihood and extent of dissemination may be relevant factors in determining the seriousness of a risk to privacy in this context. While the *Toronto Star* would be able to consult the files subject to a publication ban, for example, which may assist it in its investigations, it would not be able to publish and thereby broadly disseminate the contents of the files. A publication ban would seem to protect against this latter harm, which has been the focus of the Trustees' argument, while allowing some access to the file, which is not possible under the sealing orders. Therefore, even if a serious risk to the privacy interest had been made out, it would likely not have justified a sealing order, because a less onerous order would have likely been sufficient to mitigate this risk effectively. I hasten to add, however, that a publication ban is not available here since, as noted, the seriousness of the risk to the privacy interest at play has not been made out.

[106] Further, the Trustees would have had to show that the benefits of any order necessary to protect from a serious risk to the important public interest outweighed the

harmful effects of the order, including the negative impact on the open court principle (*Sierra Club*, at para. 53). In balancing the privacy interests against the open court principle, it is important to consider whether the information the order seeks to protect is peripheral or central to the judicial process (paras. 78 and 86; *Bragg*, at paras. 28-29). There will doubtless be cases where the information that poses a serious risk to privacy, bearing as it does on individual dignity, will be central to the case. But the interest in important and legally relevant information being aired in open court may well overcome any concern for the privacy interests in that same information. This contextual balancing, informed by the importance of the open court principle, presents a final barrier to those seeking a discretionary limit on court openness for the purposes of privacy protection.

VI. Conclusion

[107] The conclusion that the Trustees have failed to establish a serious risk to an important public interest ends the analysis. In such circumstances, the Trustees are not entitled to any discretionary order limiting the open court principle, including the sealing orders they initially obtained. The Court of Appeal rightly concluded that there was no basis for asking for redactions because the Trustees had failed at this stage of the test for discretionary limits on court openness. This is dispositive of the appeal. The decision to set aside the sealing orders rendered by the application judge should be affirmed. Given that I propose to dismiss the appeal on the existing record, I would dismiss the *Toronto Star*'s motion for new evidence as being moot.

[108] For the foregoing reasons, I would dismiss the appeal. The Toronto Star requests no costs given the important public issues in dispute. As such, there will be no order as to costs.

Appeal dismissed.

Solicitors for the appellants: Davies Ward Phillips & Vineberg, Toronto.

Solicitors for the respondents: Blake, Cassels & Graydon, Toronto.

Solicitor for the intervener the Attorney General of Ontario: Attorney General of Ontario, Toronto.

Solicitor for the intervener the Attorney General of British Columbia: Attorney General of British Columbia, Vancouver.

Solicitors for the intervener the Canadian Civil Liberties Association: DMG Advocates, Toronto.

Solicitors for the intervener the Income Security Advocacy Centre: Borden Ladner Gervais, Toronto.

Solicitors for the interveners Ad IDEM/Canadian Media Lawyers Association, Postmedia Network Inc., CTV, a Division of Bell Media Inc., Global News, a division of Corus Television Limited Partnership, The Globe and Mail Inc. and Citytv, a division of Rogers Media Inc.: Farris, Vancouver.

Solicitors for the intervener the British Columbia Civil Liberties Association: McCarthy Tétrault, Toronto.

Solicitors for the interveners the HIV & AIDS Legal Clinic Ontario, the HIV Legal Network and the Mental Health Legal Committee: HIV & AIDS Legal Clinic Ontario, Toronto.

TAB 8

**Atomic Energy of Canada
Limited** *Appellant*

v.

Sierra Club of Canada *Respondent*

and

**The Minister of Finance of Canada, the
Minister of Foreign Affairs of Canada,
the Minister of International Trade of
Canada and the Attorney General of
Canada** *Respondents*

**INDEXED AS: SIERRA CLUB OF CANADA v. CANADA
(MINISTER OF FINANCE)**

Neutral citation: 2002 SCC 41.

File No.: 28020.

2001: November 6; 2002: April 26.

Present: McLachlin C.J. and Gonthier, Iacobucci,
Bastarache, Binnie, Arbour and LeBel JJ.

**ON APPEAL FROM THE FEDERAL COURT OF
APPEAL**

*Practice — Federal Court of Canada — Filing of
confidential material — Environmental organization
seeking judicial review of federal government's decision
to provide financial assistance to Crown corporation
for construction and sale of nuclear reactors — Crown
corporation requesting confidentiality order in respect of
certain documents — Proper analytical approach to be
applied to exercise of judicial discretion where litigant
seeks confidentiality order — Whether confidentiality
order should be granted — Federal Court Rules, 1998,
SOR/98-106, r. 151.*

Sierra Club is an environmental organization seeking judicial review of the federal government's decision to provide financial assistance to Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. ("AECL"), a Crown corporation, for the construction and sale to China of two CANDU reactors. The reactors are currently under construction in China, where AECL is the main contractor and project manager. Sierra Club maintains that the authorization of financial assistance

**Énergie atomique du Canada
Limitée** *Appelante*

c.

Sierra Club du Canada *Intimé*

et

**Le ministre des Finances du Canada, le
ministre des Affaires étrangères du Canada,
le ministre du Commerce international
du Canada et le procureur général du
Canada** *Intimés*

**RÉPERTORIÉ : SIERRA CLUB DU CANADA c. CANADA
(MINISTRE DES FINANCES)**

Référence neutre : 2002 CSC 41.

N° du greffe : 28020.

2001 : 6 novembre; 2002 : 26 avril.

Présents : Le juge en chef McLachlin et les juges
Gonthier, Iacobucci, Bastarache, Binnie, Arbour et
LeBel.

EN APPEL DE LA COUR D'APPEL FÉDÉRALE

*Pratique — Cour fédérale du Canada — Production
de documents confidentiels — Contrôle judiciaire
demandé par un organisme environnemental de la
décision du gouvernement fédéral de donner une aide
financière à une société d'État pour la construction
et la vente de réacteurs nucléaires — Ordonnance de
confidentialité demandée par la société d'État pour
certains documents — Analyse applicable à l'exercice
du pouvoir discrétionnaire judiciaire sur une demande
d'ordonnance de confidentialité — Faut-il accorder
l'ordonnance? — Règles de la Cour fédérale (1998),
DORS/98-106, règle 151.*

Un organisme environnemental, Sierra Club, demande le contrôle judiciaire de la décision du gouvernement fédéral de fournir une aide financière à Énergie atomique du Canada Ltée (« ÉACL »), une société de la Couronne, pour la construction et la vente à la Chine de deux réacteurs CANDU. Les réacteurs sont actuellement en construction en Chine, où ÉACL est l'entrepreneur principal et le gestionnaire de projet. Sierra Club soutient que

by the government triggered s. 5(1)(b) of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act* (“CEAA”), requiring an environmental assessment as a condition of the financial assistance, and that the failure to comply compels a cancellation of the financial arrangements. AECL filed an affidavit in the proceedings which summarized confidential documents containing thousands of pages of technical information concerning the ongoing environmental assessment of the construction site by the Chinese authorities. AECL resisted Sierra Club’s application for production of the confidential documents on the ground, *inter alia*, that the documents were the property of the Chinese authorities and that it did not have the authority to disclose them. The Chinese authorities authorized disclosure of the documents on the condition that they be protected by a confidentiality order, under which they would only be made available to the parties and the court, but with no restriction on public access to the judicial proceedings. AECL’s application for a confidentiality order was rejected by the Federal Court, Trial Division. The Federal Court of Appeal upheld that decision.

Held: The appeal should be allowed and the confidentiality order granted on the terms requested by AECL.

In light of the established link between open courts and freedom of expression, the fundamental question for a court to consider in an application for a confidentiality order is whether the right to freedom of expression should be compromised in the circumstances. The court must ensure that the discretion to grant the order is exercised in accordance with *Charter* principles because a confidentiality order will have a negative effect on the s. 2(b) right to freedom of expression. A confidentiality order should only be granted when (1) such an order is necessary to prevent a serious risk to an important interest, including a commercial interest, in the context of litigation because reasonably alternative measures will not prevent the risk; and (2) the salutary effects of the confidentiality order, including the effects on the right of civil litigants to a fair trial, outweigh its deleterious effects, including the effects on the right to free expression, which in this context includes the public interest in open and accessible court proceedings. Three important elements are subsumed under the first branch of the test. First, the risk must be real and substantial, well grounded in evidence, posing a serious threat to the commercial interest in question. Second, the important commercial interest must be one which can be expressed in terms of a public interest in confidentiality, where there is a general principle at stake. Finally, the judge is required to consider not only whether reasonable alternatives are available to such an order but also to restrict the order as much as is reasonably possible while preserving the commercial interest in question.

l’autorisation d’aide financière du gouvernement déclenche l’application de l’al. 5(1)b) de la *Loi canadienne sur l’évaluation environnementale* (« LCÉE ») exigeant une évaluation environnementale comme condition de l’aide financière, et que le défaut d’évaluation entraîne l’annulation des ententes financières. ÉACL dépose un affidavit qui résume des documents confidentiels contenant des milliers de pages d’information technique concernant l’évaluation environnementale du site de construction qui est faite par les autorités chinoises. ÉACL s’oppose à la communication des documents demandée par Sierra Club pour la raison notamment qu’ils sont la propriété des autorités chinoises et qu’elle n’est pas autorisée à les divulguer. Les autorités chinoises donnent l’autorisation de les communiquer à la condition qu’ils soient protégés par une ordonnance de confidentialité n’y donnant accès qu’aux parties et à la cour, mais n’imposant aucune restriction à l’accès du public aux débats. La demande d’ordonnance de confidentialité est rejetée par la Section de première instance de la Cour fédérale. La Cour d’appel fédérale confirme cette décision.

Arrêt : L’appel est accueilli et l’ordonnance demandée par ÉACL est accordée.

Vu le lien existant entre la publicité des débats judiciaires et la liberté d’expression, la question fondamentale pour la cour saisie d’une demande d’ordonnance de confidentialité est de savoir si, dans les circonstances, il y a lieu de restreindre le droit à la liberté d’expression. La cour doit s’assurer que l’exercice du pouvoir discrétionnaire de l’accorder est conforme aux principes de la *Charte* parce qu’une ordonnance de confidentialité a des effets préjudiciables sur la liberté d’expression garantie à l’al. 2b). On ne doit l’accorder que (1) lorsqu’elle est nécessaire pour écarter un risque sérieux pour un intérêt important, y compris un intérêt commercial, dans le contexte d’un litige, en l’absence d’autres options raisonnables pour écarter ce risque, et (2) lorsque ses effets bénéfiques, y compris ses effets sur le droit des justiciables civils à un procès équitable, l’emportent sur ses effets préjudiciables, y compris ses effets sur la liberté d’expression qui, dans ce contexte, comprend l’intérêt du public dans la publicité des débats judiciaires. Trois éléments importants sont subsumés sous le premier volet de l’analyse. Premièrement, le risque en cause doit être réel et important, être bien étayé par la preuve et menacer gravement l’intérêt commercial en question. Deuxièmement, l’intérêt doit pouvoir se définir en termes d’intérêt public à la confidentialité, mettant en jeu un principe général. Enfin le juge doit non seulement déterminer s’il existe d’autres options raisonnables, il doit aussi restreindre l’ordonnance autant qu’il est raisonnablement possible de le faire tout en préservant l’intérêt commercial en question.

Applying the test to the present circumstances, the commercial interest at stake here relates to the objective of preserving contractual obligations of confidentiality, which is sufficiently important to pass the first branch of the test as long as certain criteria relating to the information are met. The information must have been treated as confidential at all relevant times; on a balance of probabilities, proprietary, commercial and scientific interests could reasonably be harmed by disclosure of the information; and the information must have been accumulated with a reasonable expectation of it being kept confidential. These requirements have been met in this case. Disclosure of the confidential documents would impose a serious risk on an important commercial interest of AECL, and there are no reasonably alternative measures to granting the order.

Under the second branch of the test, the confidentiality order would have significant salutary effects on AECL's right to a fair trial. Disclosure of the confidential documents would cause AECL to breach its contractual obligations and suffer a risk of harm to its competitive position. If a confidentiality order is denied, AECL will be forced to withhold the documents in order to protect its commercial interests, and since that information is relevant to defences available under the *CEAA*, the inability to present this information hinders AECL's capacity to make full answer and defence. Although in the context of a civil proceeding, this does not engage a *Charter* right, the right to a fair trial is a fundamental principle of justice. Further, the confidentiality order would allow all parties and the court access to the confidential documents, and permit cross-examination based on their contents, assisting in the search for truth, a core value underlying freedom of expression. Finally, given the technical nature of the information, there may be a substantial public security interest in maintaining the confidentiality of such information.

The deleterious effects of granting a confidentiality order include a negative effect on the open court principle, and therefore on the right to freedom of expression. The more detrimental the confidentiality order would be to the core values of (1) seeking the truth and the common good, (2) promoting self-fulfilment of individuals by allowing them to develop thoughts and ideas as they see fit, and (3) ensuring that participation in the political process is open to all persons, the harder it will be to justify the confidentiality order. In the hands of the parties and their experts, the confidential documents may be of great assistance in probing the truth of the Chinese environmental assessment process, which would assist the court in reaching accurate factual conclusions. Given the highly technical nature of the documents, the important value of the search for the truth which underlies

En l'espèce, l'intérêt commercial en jeu, la préservation d'obligations contractuelles de confidentialité, est suffisamment important pour satisfaire au premier volet de l'analyse, pourvu que certaines conditions soient remplies : les renseignements ont toujours été traités comme des renseignements confidentiels; il est raisonnable de penser que, selon la prépondérance des probabilités, leur divulgation compromettrait des droits exclusifs, commerciaux et scientifiques; et les renseignements ont été recueillis dans l'expectative raisonnable qu'ils resteraient confidentiels. Ces conditions sont réunies en l'espèce. La divulgation des documents confidentiels ferait courir un risque sérieux à un intérêt commercial important de ÉACL et il n'existe pas d'options raisonnables autres que l'ordonnance de confidentialité.

À la deuxième étape de l'analyse, l'ordonnance de confidentialité aurait des effets bénéfiques considérables sur le droit de ÉACL à un procès équitable. Si ÉACL divulguait les documents confidentiels, elle manquerait à ses obligations contractuelles et s'exposerait à une détérioration de sa position concurrentielle. Le refus de l'ordonnance obligerait ÉACL à retenir les documents pour protéger ses intérêts commerciaux et comme ils sont pertinents pour l'exercice des moyens de défense prévus par la *LCÉE*, l'impossibilité de les produire empêcherait ÉACL de présenter une défense pleine et entière. Même si en matière civile cela n'engage pas de droit protégé par la *Charte*, le droit à un procès équitable est un principe de justice fondamentale. L'ordonnance permettrait aux parties et au tribunal d'avoir accès aux documents confidentiels, et permettrait la tenue d'un contre-interrogatoire fondé sur leur contenu, favorisant ainsi la recherche de la vérité, une valeur fondamentale sous-tendant la liberté d'expression. Il peut enfin y avoir un important intérêt de sécurité publique à préserver la confidentialité de ce type de renseignements techniques.

Une ordonnance de confidentialité aurait un effet préjudiciable sur le principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires et donc sur la liberté d'expression. Plus l'ordonnance porte atteinte aux valeurs fondamentales que sont (1) la recherche de la vérité et du bien commun, (2) l'épanouissement personnel par le libre développement des pensées et des idées et (3) la participation de tous au processus politique, plus il est difficile de justifier l'ordonnance. Dans les mains des parties et de leurs experts, les documents peuvent être très utiles pour apprécier la conformité du processus d'évaluation environnementale chinois, et donc pour aider la cour à parvenir à des conclusions de fait exactes. Compte tenu de leur nature hautement technique, la production des documents confidentiels en vertu de l'ordonnance demandée favoriserait mieux l'importante valeur de la recherche de la vérité, qui

both freedom of expression and open justice would be promoted to a greater extent by submitting the confidential documents under the order sought than it would by denying the order.

Under the terms of the order sought, the only restrictions relate to the public distribution of the documents, which is a fairly minimal intrusion into the open court rule. Although the confidentiality order would restrict individual access to certain information which may be of interest to that individual, the second core value of promoting individual self-fulfilment would not be significantly affected by the confidentiality order. The third core value figures prominently in this appeal as open justice is a fundamental aspect of a democratic society. By their very nature, environmental matters carry significant public import, and openness in judicial proceedings involving environmental issues will generally attract a high degree of protection, so that the public interest is engaged here more than if this were an action between private parties involving private interests. However, the narrow scope of the order coupled with the highly technical nature of the confidential documents significantly temper the deleterious effects the confidentiality order would have on the public interest in open courts. The core freedom of expression values of seeking the truth and promoting an open political process are most closely linked to the principle of open courts, and most affected by an order restricting that openness. However, in the context of this case, the confidentiality order would only marginally impede, and in some respects would even promote, the pursuit of these values. The salutary effects of the order outweigh its deleterious effects and the order should be granted. A balancing of the various rights and obligations engaged indicates that the confidentiality order would have substantial salutary effects on AECL's right to a fair trial and freedom of expression, while the deleterious effects on the principle of open courts and freedom of expression would be minimal.

Cases Cited

Applied: *Edmonton Journal v. Alberta (Attorney General)*, [1989] 2 S.C.R. 1326; *Canadian Broadcasting Corp. v. New Brunswick (Attorney General)*, [1996] 3 S.C.R. 480; *Dagenais v. Canadian Broadcasting Corp.*, [1994] 3 S.C.R. 835; *R. v. Mentuck*, [2001] 3 S.C.R. 442, 2001 SCC 76; *M. (A.) v. Ryan*, [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157; *Irwin Toy Ltd. v. Quebec (Attorney General)*, [1989] 1 S.C.R. 927; *R. v. Keegstra*, [1990] 3 S.C.R. 697; **referred to:** *AB Hassle v. Canada (Minister of National Health and*

sous-tend à la fois la liberté d'expression et la publicité des débats judiciaires, que ne le ferait le refus de l'ordonnance.

Aux termes de l'ordonnance demandée, les seules restrictions ont trait à la distribution publique des documents, une atteinte relativement minime à la règle de la publicité des débats judiciaires. Même si l'ordonnance de confidentialité devait restreindre l'accès individuel à certains renseignements susceptibles d'intéresser quelqu'un, la deuxième valeur fondamentale, l'épanouissement personnel, ne serait pas touchée de manière significative. La troisième valeur joue un rôle primordial dans le pourvoi puisque la publicité des débats judiciaires est un aspect fondamental de la société démocratique. Par leur nature même, les questions environnementales ont une portée publique considérable, et la transparence des débats judiciaires sur les questions environnementales mérite généralement un degré élevé de protection, de sorte que l'intérêt public est en l'espèce plus engagé que s'il s'agissait d'un litige entre personnes privées à l'égard d'intérêts purement privés. Toutefois la portée étroite de l'ordonnance associée à la nature hautement technique des documents confidentiels tempère considérablement les effets préjudiciables que l'ordonnance de confidentialité pourrait avoir sur l'intérêt du public à la publicité des débats judiciaires. Les valeurs centrales de la liberté d'expression que sont la recherche de la vérité et la promotion d'un processus politique ouvert sont très étroitement liées au principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires, et sont les plus touchées par une ordonnance limitant cette publicité. Toutefois, en l'espèce, l'ordonnance de confidentialité n'entraverait que légèrement la poursuite de ces valeurs, et pourrait même les favoriser à certains égards. Ses effets bénéfiques l'emportent sur ses effets préjudiciables, et il y a lieu de l'accorder. Selon la pondération des divers droits et intérêts en jeu, l'ordonnance de confidentialité aurait des effets bénéfiques importants sur le droit de ÉACL à un procès équitable et à la liberté d'expression, et ses effets préjudiciables sur le principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires et la liberté d'expression seraient minimes.

Jurisprudence

Arrêts appliqués : *Edmonton Journal c. Alberta (Procureur général)*, [1989] 2 R.C.S. 1326; *Société Radio-Canada c. Nouveau-Brunswick (Procureur général)*, [1996] 3 R.C.S. 480; *Dagenais c. Société Radio-Canada*, [1994] 3 R.C.S. 835; *R. c. Mentuck*, [2001] 3 R.C.S. 442, 2001 CSC 76; *M. (A.) c. Ryan*, [1997] 1 R.C.S. 157; *Irwin Toy Ltd. c. Québec (Procureur général)*, [1989] 1 R.C.S. 927; *R. c. Keegstra*, [1990] 3 R.C.S. 697; **arrêts mentionnés :** *AB Hassle c.*

Welfare), [2000] 3 F.C. 360, aff'g (1998), 83 C.P.R. (3d) 428; *Ethyl Canada Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General)* (1998), 17 C.P.C. (4th) 278; *R. v. Oakes*, [1986] 1 S.C.R. 103; *R. v. O.N.E.*, [2001] 3 S.C.R. 478, 2001 SCC 77; *F.N. (Re)*, [2000] 1 S.C.R. 880, 2000 SCC 35; *Eli Lilly and Co. v. Novopharm Ltd.* (1994), 56 C.P.R. (3d) 437.

Statutes and Regulations Cited

Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, ss. 1, 2(b).
Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, S.C. 1992, c. 37, ss. 5(1)(b), 8, 54, 54(2)(b).
Federal Court Rules, 1998, SOR/98-106, rr. 151, 312.

APPEAL from a judgment of the Federal Court of Appeal, [2000] 4 F.C. 426, 187 D.L.R. (4th) 231, 256 N.R. 1, 24 Admin. L.R. (3d) 1, [2000] F.C.J. No. 732 (QL), affirming a decision of the Trial Division, [2000] 2 F.C. 400, 178 F.T.R. 283, [1999] F.C.J. No. 1633 (QL). Appeal allowed.

J. Brett Ledger and Peter Chapin, for the appellant.

Timothy J. Howard and Franklin S. Gertler, for the respondent Sierra Club of Canada.

Graham Garton, Q.C., and *J. Sanderson Graham*, for the respondents the Minister of Finance of Canada, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Canada, the Minister of International Trade of Canada and the Attorney General of Canada.

The judgment of the Court was delivered by

IACOBUCCI J. —

I. Introduction

In our country, courts are the institutions generally chosen to resolve legal disputes as best they can through the application of legal principles to the facts of the case involved. One of the underlying principles of the judicial process is public openness, both in the proceedings of the dispute, and in the material that is relevant to its resolution. However, some material can be made the subject of a confidentiality order. This appeal raises the important

Canada (Ministre de la Santé nationale et du Bien-être social), [2000] 3 C.F. 360, conf. [1998] A.C.F. n° 1850 (QL); *Ethyl Canada Inc. c. Canada (Attorney General)* (1998), 17 C.P.C. (4th) 278; *R. c. Oakes*, [1986] 1 R.C.S. 103; *R. c. O.N.E.*, [2001] 3 R.C.S. 478, 2001 CSC 77; *F.N. (Re)*, [2000] 1 R.C.S. 880, 2000 CSC 35; *Eli Lilly and Co. c. Novopharm Ltd.* (1994), 56 C.P.R. (3d) 437.

Lois et règlements cités

Charte canadienne des droits et libertés, art. 1, 2b).
Loi canadienne sur l'évaluation environnementale, L.C. 1992, ch. 37, art. 5(1)b), 8, 54, 54(2) [abr. & rempl. 1993, ch. 34, art. 37].
Règles de la Cour fédérale (1998), DORS/98-106, règles 151, 312.

POURVOI contre un arrêt de la Cour d'appel fédérale, [2000] 4 C.F. 426, 187 D.L.R. (4th) 231, 256 N.R. 1, 24 Admin. L.R. (3d) 1, [2000] A.C.F. n° 732 (QL), qui a confirmé une décision de la Section de première instance, [2000] 2 C.F. 400, 178 F.T.R. 283, [1999] A.C.F. n° 1633 (QL). Pourvoi accueilli.

J. Brett Ledger et Peter Chapin, pour l'appelante.

Timothy J. Howard et Franklin S. Gertler, pour l'intimé Sierra Club du Canada.

Graham Garton, c.r., et *J. Sanderson Graham*, pour les intimés le ministre des Finances du Canada, le ministre des Affaires étrangères du Canada, le ministre du Commerce international du Canada et le procureur général du Canada.

Version française du jugement de la Cour rendu par

LE JUGE IACOBUCCI —

I. Introduction

Dans notre pays, les tribunaux sont les institutions généralement choisies pour résoudre au mieux les différends juridiques par l'application de principes juridiques aux faits de chaque espèce. Un des principes sous-jacents au processus judiciaire est la transparence, tant dans la procédure suivie que dans les éléments pertinents à la solution du litige. Certains de ces éléments peuvent toutefois faire l'objet d'une ordonnance de confidentialité. Le

issues of when, and under what circumstances, a confidentiality order should be granted.

For the following reasons, I would issue the confidentiality order sought and accordingly would allow the appeal.

II. Facts

The appellant, Atomic Energy of Canada Limited (“AECL”) is a Crown corporation that owns and markets CANDU nuclear technology, and is an intervenor with the rights of a party in the application for judicial review by the respondent, the Sierra Club of Canada (“Sierra Club”). Sierra Club is an environmental organization seeking judicial review of the federal government’s decision to provide financial assistance in the form of a \$1.5 billion guaranteed loan relating to the construction and sale of two CANDU nuclear reactors to China by the appellant. The reactors are currently under construction in China, where the appellant is the main contractor and project manager.

The respondent maintains that the authorization of financial assistance by the government triggered s. 5(1)(b) of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*, S.C. 1992, c. 37 (“CEAA”), which requires that an environmental assessment be undertaken before a federal authority grants financial assistance to a project. Failure to undertake such an assessment compels cancellation of the financial arrangements.

The appellant and the respondent Ministers argue that the CEAA does not apply to the loan transaction, and that if it does, the statutory defences available under ss. 8 and 54 apply. Section 8 describes the circumstances where Crown corporations are required to conduct environmental assessments. Section 54(2)(b) recognizes the validity of an environmental assessment carried out by a foreign authority provided that it is consistent with the provisions of the CEAA.

In the course of the application by Sierra Club to set aside the funding arrangements, the appellant

pourvoi soulève les importantes questions de savoir à quel moment et dans quelles circonstances il y a lieu de rendre une ordonnance de confidentialité.

Pour les motifs qui suivent, je suis d’avis de rendre l’ordonnance de confidentialité demandée et par conséquent d’accueillir le pourvoi.

II. Les faits

L’appelante, Énergie atomique du Canada Limitée (« ÉACL »), société d’État propriétaire et vendeuse de la technologie nucléaire CANDU, est une intervenante ayant reçu les droits de partie dans la demande de contrôle judiciaire présentée par l’intimé, Sierra Club du Canada (« Sierra Club »), un organisme environnemental. Sierra Club demande le contrôle judiciaire de la décision du gouvernement fédéral de fournir une aide financière, sous forme de garantie d’emprunt de 1,5 milliard de dollars, pour la construction et la vente à la Chine de deux réacteurs nucléaires CANDU par l’appelante. Les réacteurs sont actuellement en construction en Chine, où l’appelante est entrepreneur principal et gestionnaire de projet.

L’intimé soutient que l’autorisation d’aide financière du gouvernement déclenche l’application de l’al. 5(1)(b) de la *Loi canadienne sur l’évaluation environnementale*, L.C. 1992, ch. 37 (« LCÉE »), qui exige une évaluation environnementale avant qu’une autorité fédérale puisse fournir une aide financière à un projet. Le défaut d’évaluation entraîne l’annulation des ententes financières.

Selon l’appelante et les ministres intimés, la LCÉE ne s’applique pas à la convention de prêt et si elle s’y applique, ils peuvent invoquer les défenses prévues aux art. 8 et 54 de cette loi. L’article 8 prévoit les circonstances dans lesquelles les sociétés d’État sont tenues de procéder à des évaluations environnementales. Le paragraphe 54(2) reconnaît la validité des évaluations environnementales effectuées par des autorités étrangères pourvu qu’elles soient compatibles avec les dispositions de la LCÉE.

Dans le cadre de la requête de Sierra Club en annulation des ententes financières, l’appelante a

2

3

4

5

6

filed an affidavit of Dr. Simon Pang, a senior manager of the appellant. In the affidavit, Dr. Pang referred to and summarized certain documents (the “Confidential Documents”). The Confidential Documents are also referred to in an affidavit prepared by Mr. Feng, one of AECL’s experts. Prior to cross-examining Dr. Pang on his affidavit, Sierra Club made an application for the production of the Confidential Documents, arguing that it could not test Dr. Pang’s evidence without access to the underlying documents. The appellant resisted production on various grounds, including the fact that the documents were the property of the Chinese authorities and that it did not have authority to disclose them. After receiving authorization by the Chinese authorities to disclose the documents on the condition that they be protected by a confidentiality order, the appellant sought to introduce the Confidential Documents under Rule 312 of the *Federal Court Rules, 1998*, SOR/98-106, and requested a confidentiality order in respect of the documents.

7 Under the terms of the order requested, the Confidential Documents would only be made available to the parties and the court; however, there would be no restriction on public access to the proceedings. In essence, what is being sought is an order preventing the dissemination of the Confidential Documents to the public.

8 The Confidential Documents comprise two Environmental Impact Reports on Siting and Construction Design (the “EIRs”), a Preliminary Safety Analysis Report (the “PSAR”), and the supplementary affidavit of Dr. Pang which summarizes the contents of the EIRs and the PSAR. If admitted, the EIRs and the PSAR would be attached as exhibits to the supplementary affidavit of Dr. Pang. The EIRs were prepared by the Chinese authorities in the Chinese language, and the PSAR was prepared by the appellant with assistance from the Chinese participants in the project. The documents contain a mass of technical information and comprise thousands of pages. They describe the ongoing environmental assessment of the construction site by the Chinese authorities under Chinese law.

déposé un affidavit de M. Simon Pang, un de ses cadres supérieurs. Dans l’affidavit, M. Pang mentionne et résume certains documents (les « documents confidentiels ») qui sont également mentionnés dans un affidavit de M. Feng, un expert d’ÉACL. Avant de contre-interroger M. Pang sur son affidavit, Sierra Club a demandé par requête la production des documents confidentiels, au motif qu’il ne pouvait vérifier la validité de sa déposition sans consulter les documents de base. L’appelante s’oppose pour plusieurs raisons à la production des documents, dont le fait qu’ils sont la propriété des autorités chinoises et qu’elle n’est pas autorisée à les divulguer. Après avoir obtenu des autorités chinoises l’autorisation de communiquer les documents à la condition qu’ils soient protégés par une ordonnance de confidentialité, l’appelante a cherché à les produire en invoquant la règle 312 des *Règles de la Cour fédérale (1998)*, DORS/98-106, et a demandé une ordonnance de confidentialité à leur égard.

Aux termes de l’ordonnance demandée, seules les parties et la cour auraient accès aux documents confidentiels. Aucune restriction ne serait imposée à l’accès du public aux débats. On demande essentiellement d’empêcher la diffusion des documents confidentiels au public.

Les documents confidentiels comprennent deux Rapports d’impact environnemental (« RIE ») sur le site et la construction, un Rapport préliminaire d’analyse sur la sécurité (« RPAS ») ainsi que l’affidavit supplémentaire de M. Pang qui résume le contenu des RIE et du RPAS. S’ils étaient admis, les rapports seraient joints en annexe de l’affidavit supplémentaire de M. Pang. Les RIE ont été préparés en chinois par les autorités chinoises, et le RPAS a été préparé par l’appelante en collaboration avec les responsables chinois du projet. Les documents contiennent une quantité considérable de renseignements techniques et comprennent des milliers de pages. Ils décrivent l’évaluation environnementale du site de construction qui est faite par les autorités chinoises en vertu des lois chinoises.

As noted, the appellant argues that it cannot introduce the Confidential Documents into evidence without a confidentiality order, otherwise it would be in breach of its obligations to the Chinese authorities. The respondent's position is that its right to cross-examine Dr. Pang and Mr. Feng on their affidavits would be effectively rendered nugatory in the absence of the supporting documents to which the affidavits referred. Sierra Club proposes to take the position that the affidavits should therefore be afforded very little weight by the judge hearing the application for judicial review.

The Federal Court of Canada, Trial Division refused to grant the confidentiality order and the majority of the Federal Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal. In his dissenting opinion, Robertson J.A. would have granted the confidentiality order.

III. Relevant Statutory Provisions

Federal Court Rules, 1998, SOR/98-106

151. (1) On motion, the Court may order that material to be filed shall be treated as confidential.

(2) Before making an order under subsection (1), the Court must be satisfied that the material should be treated as confidential, notwithstanding the public interest in open and accessible court proceedings.

IV. Judgments Below

A. *Federal Court, Trial Division, [2000] 2 F.C. 400*

Pelletier J. first considered whether leave should be granted pursuant to Rule 312 to introduce the supplementary affidavit of Dr. Pang to which the Confidential Documents were filed as exhibits. In his view, the underlying question was that of relevance, and he concluded that the documents were relevant to the issue of the appropriate remedy. Thus, in the absence of prejudice to the respondent, the affidavit should be permitted to be served and filed. He noted that the respondent would be prejudiced by delay, but since both parties had brought

Comme je le note plus haut, l'appelante prétend ne pas pouvoir produire les documents confidentiels en preuve sans qu'ils soient protégés par une ordonnance de confidentialité, parce que ce serait un manquement à ses obligations envers les autorités chinoises. L'intimé soutient pour sa part que son droit de contre-interroger M. Pang et M. Feng sur leurs affidavits serait pratiquement futile en l'absence des documents auxquels ils se réfèrent. Sierra Club entend soutenir que le juge saisi de la demande de contrôle judiciaire devrait donc leur accorder peu de poids.

La Section de première instance de la Cour fédérale du Canada a rejeté la demande d'ordonnance de confidentialité et la Cour d'appel fédérale, à la majorité, a rejeté l'appel. Le juge Robertson, dissident, était d'avis d'accorder l'ordonnance.

III. Dispositions législatives

Règles de la Cour fédérale (1998), DORS/98-106

151. (1) La Cour peut, sur requête, ordonner que des documents ou éléments matériels qui seront déposés soient considérés comme confidentiels.

(2) Avant de rendre une ordonnance en application du paragraphe (1), la Cour doit être convaincue de la nécessité de considérer les documents ou éléments matériels comme confidentiels, étant donné l'intérêt du public à la publicité des débats judiciaires.

IV. Les décisions antérieures

A. *Cour fédérale, Section de première instance, [2000] 2 C.F. 400*

Le juge Pelletier examine d'abord s'il y a lieu, en vertu de la règle 312, d'autoriser la production de l'affidavit supplémentaire de M. Pang auquel sont annexés les documents confidentiels. À son avis, il s'agit d'une question de pertinence et il conclut que les documents se rapportent à la question de la réparation. En l'absence de préjudice pour l'intimé, il y a donc lieu d'autoriser la signification et le dépôt de l'affidavit. Il note que des retards seraient préjudiciables à l'intimé mais que, puisque les deux parties ont présenté des requêtes

9

10

11

12

interlocutory motions which had contributed to the delay, the desirability of having the entire record before the court outweighed the prejudice arising from the delay associated with the introduction of the documents.

interlocutoires qui ont entraîné les délais, les avantages de soumettre le dossier au complet à la cour compensent l'inconvénient du retard causé par la présentation de ces documents.

13 On the issue of confidentiality, Pelletier J. concluded that he must be satisfied that the need for confidentiality was greater than the public interest in open court proceedings, and observed that the argument for open proceedings in this case was significant given the public interest in Canada's role as a vendor of nuclear technology. As well, he noted that a confidentiality order was an exception to the rule of open access to the courts, and that such an order should be granted only where absolutely necessary.

Sur la confidentialité, le juge Pelletier conclut qu'il doit être convaincu que la nécessité de protéger la confidentialité l'emporte sur l'intérêt du public à la publicité des débats judiciaires. Il note que les arguments en faveur de la publicité des débats judiciaires en l'espèce sont importants vu l'intérêt du public envers le rôle du Canada comme vendeur de technologie nucléaire. Il fait aussi remarquer que les ordonnances de confidentialité sont une exception au principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires et ne devraient être accordées que dans des cas de nécessité absolue.

14 Pelletier J. applied the same test as that used in patent litigation for the issue of a protective order, which is essentially a confidentiality order. The granting of such an order requires the appellant to show a subjective belief that the information is confidential and that its interests would be harmed by disclosure. In addition, if the order is challenged, then the person claiming the benefit of the order must demonstrate objectively that the order is required. This objective element requires the party to show that the information has been treated as confidential, and that it is reasonable to believe that its proprietary, commercial and scientific interests could be harmed by the disclosure of the information.

Le juge Pelletier applique le même critère que pour une ordonnance conservatoire en matière de brevets, qui est essentiellement une ordonnance de confidentialité. Pour obtenir l'ordonnance, le requérant doit démontrer qu'il croit subjectivement que les renseignements sont confidentiels et que leur divulgation nuirait à ses intérêts. De plus, si l'ordonnance est contestée, le requérant doit démontrer objectivement qu'elle est nécessaire. Cet élément objectif l'oblige à démontrer que les renseignements ont toujours été traités comme étant confidentiels et qu'il est raisonnable de croire que leur divulgation risque de compromettre ses droits exclusifs, commerciaux et scientifiques.

15 Concluding that both the subjective part and both elements of the objective part of the test had been satisfied, he nevertheless stated: "However, I am also of the view that in public law cases, the objective test has, or should have, a third component which is whether the public interest in disclosure exceeds the risk of harm to a party arising from disclosure" (para. 23).

Ayant conclu qu'il est satisfait à l'élément subjectif et aux deux volets de l'élément objectif du critère, il ajoute : « J'estime toutefois aussi que, dans les affaires de droit public, le critère objectif comporte, ou devrait comporter, un troisième volet, en l'occurrence la question de savoir si l'intérêt du public à l'égard de la divulgation l'emporte sur le préjudice que la divulgation risque de causer à une personne » (par. 23).

16 A very significant factor, in his view, was the fact that mandatory production of documents was not in issue here. The fact that the application involved a voluntary tendering of documents to advance the

Il estime très important le fait qu'il ne s'agit pas en l'espèce de production obligatoire de documents. Le fait que la demande vise le dépôt volontaire de documents en vue d'étayer la thèse de l'appelante,

appellant's own cause as opposed to mandatory production weighed against granting the confidentiality order.

In weighing the public interest in disclosure against the risk of harm to AECL arising from disclosure, Pelletier J. noted that the documents the appellant wished to put before the court were prepared by others for other purposes, and recognized that the appellant was bound to protect the confidentiality of the information. At this stage, he again considered the issue of materiality. If the documents were shown to be very material to a critical issue, "the requirements of justice militate in favour of a confidentiality order. If the documents are marginally relevant, then the voluntary nature of the production argues against a confidentiality order" (para. 29). He then decided that the documents were material to a question of the appropriate remedy, a significant issue in the event that the appellant failed on the main issue.

Pelletier J. also considered the context of the case and held that since the issue of Canada's role as a vendor of nuclear technology was one of significant public interest, the burden of justifying a confidentiality order was very onerous. He found that AECL could expunge the sensitive material from the documents, or put the evidence before the court in some other form, and thus maintain its full right of defence while preserving the open access to court proceedings.

Pelletier J. observed that his order was being made without having perused the Confidential Documents because they had not been put before him. Although he noted the line of cases which holds that a judge ought not to deal with the issue of a confidentiality order without reviewing the documents themselves, in his view, given their voluminous nature and technical content as well as his lack of information as to what information was already in the public domain, he found that an examination of these documents would not have been useful.

par opposition à une production obligatoire, joue contre l'ordonnance de confidentialité.

En soupesant l'intérêt du public dans la divulgation et le préjudice que la divulgation risque de causer à ÉACL, le juge Pelletier note que les documents que l'appelante veut soumettre à la cour ont été rédigés par d'autres personnes à d'autres fins, et il reconnaît que l'appelante est tenue de protéger la confidentialité des renseignements. À cette étape, il examine de nouveau la question de la pertinence. Si on réussit à démontrer que les documents sont très importants sur une question cruciale, « les exigences de la justice militent en faveur du prononcé d'une ordonnance de confidentialité. Si les documents ne sont pertinents que d'une façon accessoire, le caractère facultatif de la production milite contre le prononcé de l'ordonnance de confidentialité » (par. 29). Il conclut alors que les documents sont importants pour résoudre la question de la réparation à accorder, elle-même un point important si l'appelante échoue sur la question principale.

Le juge Pelletier considère aussi le contexte de l'affaire et conclut que, puisque la question du rôle du Canada comme vendeur de technologies nucléaires est une importante question d'intérêt public, la charge de justifier une ordonnance de confidentialité est très onéreuse. Il conclut qu'ÉACL pourrait retrancher les éléments délicats des documents ou soumettre à la cour la même preuve sous une autre forme, et maintenir ainsi son droit à une défense complète tout en préservant la publicité des débats judiciaires.

Le juge Pelletier signale qu'il prononce l'ordonnance sans avoir examiné les documents confidentiels puisqu'ils n'ont pas été portés à sa connaissance. Bien qu'il mentionne la jurisprudence indiquant qu'un juge ne devrait pas se prononcer sur une demande d'ordonnance de confidentialité sans avoir examiné les documents eux-mêmes, il estime qu'il n'aurait pas été utile d'examiner les documents, vu leur volume et leur caractère technique, et sans savoir quelle part d'information était déjà dans le domaine public.

17

18

19

20 Pelletier J. ordered that the appellant could file the documents in current form, or in an edited version if it chose to do so. He also granted leave to file material dealing with the Chinese regulatory process in general and as applied to this project, provided it did so within 60 days.

B. *Federal Court of Appeal*, [2000] 4 F.C. 426

(1) Evans J.A. (Sharlow J.A. concurring)

21 At the Federal Court of Appeal, AECL appealed the ruling under Rule 151 of the *Federal Court Rules, 1998*, and Sierra Club cross-appealed the ruling under Rule 312.

22 With respect to Rule 312, Evans J.A. held that the documents were clearly relevant to a defence under s. 54(2)(b) which the appellant proposed to raise if s. 5(1)(b) of the *CEAA* was held to apply, and were also potentially relevant to the exercise of the court's discretion to refuse a remedy even if the Ministers were in breach of the *CEAA*. Evans J.A. agreed with Pelletier J. that the benefit to the appellant and the court of being granted leave to file the documents outweighed any prejudice to the respondent owing to delay and thus concluded that the motions judge was correct in granting leave under Rule 312.

23 On the issue of the confidentiality order, Evans J.A. considered Rule 151, and all the factors that the motions judge had weighed, including the commercial sensitivity of the documents, the fact that the appellant had received them in confidence from the Chinese authorities, and the appellant's argument that without the documents it could not mount a full answer and defence to the application. These factors had to be weighed against the principle of open access to court documents. Evans J.A. agreed with Pelletier J. that the weight to be attached to the public interest in open proceedings varied with context and held that, where a case raises issues of public significance, the principle of openness of judicial process carries greater weight as a factor in

Dans son ordonnance, le juge Pelletier autorise l'appelante à déposer les documents sous leur forme actuelle ou sous une version révisée, à son gré. Il autorise aussi l'appelante à déposer des documents concernant le processus réglementaire chinois en général et son application au projet, à condition qu'elle le fasse sous 60 jours.

B. *Cour d'appel fédérale*, [2000] 4 C.F. 426

(1) Le juge Evans (avec l'appui du juge Sharlow)

ÉACL fait appel en Cour d'appel fédérale, en vertu de la règle 151 des *Règles de la Cour fédérale (1998)*, et Sierra Club forme un appel incident en vertu de la règle 312.

Sur la règle 312, le juge Evans conclut que les documents en cause sont clairement pertinents dans une défense que l'appelante a l'intention d'invoquer en vertu du par. 54(2) si la cour conclut que l'al. 5(1)(b) de la *LCÉE* doit s'appliquer, et pourraient l'être aussi pour l'exercice du pouvoir discrétionnaire de la cour de refuser d'accorder une réparation dans le cas où les ministres auraient enfreint la *LCÉE*. Comme le juge Pelletier, le juge Evans est d'avis que l'avantage pour l'appelante et pour la cour d'une autorisation de déposer les documents l'emporte sur tout préjudice que le retard pourrait causer à l'intimé, et conclut par conséquent que le juge des requêtes a eu raison d'accorder l'autorisation en vertu de la règle 312.

Sur l'ordonnance de confidentialité, le juge Evans examine la règle 151 et tous les facteurs que le juge des requêtes a appréciés, y compris le secret commercial attaché aux documents, le fait que l'appelante les a reçus à titre confidentiel des autorités chinoises, et l'argument de l'appelante selon lequel, sans les documents, elle ne pourrait assurer effectivement sa défense. Ces facteurs doivent être pondérés avec le principe de la publicité des documents soumis aux tribunaux. Le juge Evans convient avec le juge Pelletier que le poids à accorder à l'intérêt du public à la publicité des débats varie selon le contexte, et il conclut que lorsqu'une affaire soulève des questions de grande importance pour le public, le principe de la publicité des débats a plus de poids

the balancing process. Evans J.A. noted the public interest in the subject matter of the litigation, as well as the considerable media attention it had attracted.

In support of his conclusion that the weight assigned to the principle of openness may vary with context, Evans J.A. relied upon the decisions in *AB Hassle v. Canada (Minister of National Health and Welfare)*, [2000] 3 F.C. 360 (C.A.), where the court took into consideration the relatively small public interest at stake, and *Ethyl Canada Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General)* (1998), 17 C.P.C. (4th) 278 (Ont. Ct. (Gen. Div.)), at p. 283, where the court ordered disclosure after determining that the case was a significant constitutional case where it was important for the public to understand the issues at stake. Evans J.A. observed that openness and public participation in the assessment process are fundamental to the CEAA, and concluded that the motions judge could not be said to have given the principle of openness undue weight even though confidentiality was claimed for a relatively small number of highly technical documents.

Evans J.A. held that the motions judge had placed undue emphasis on the fact that the introduction of the documents was voluntary; however, it did not follow that his decision on the confidentiality order must therefore be set aside. Evans J.A. was of the view that this error did not affect the ultimate conclusion for three reasons. First, like the motions judge, he attached great weight to the principle of openness. Secondly, he held that the inclusion in the affidavits of a summary of the reports could go a long way to compensate for the absence of the originals, should the appellant choose not to put them in without a confidentiality order. Finally, if AECL submitted the documents in an expunged fashion, the claim for confidentiality would rest upon a relatively unimportant factor, i.e., the appellant's claim that it would suffer a loss of business if it breached its undertaking with the Chinese authorities.

Evans J.A. rejected the argument that the motions judge had erred in deciding the motion without

comme facteur à prendre en compte dans le processus de pondération. Le juge Evans note l'intérêt du public à l'égard de la question en litige ainsi que la couverture médiatique considérable qu'elle a suscitée.

À l'appui de sa conclusion que le poids accordé au principe de la publicité des débats peut varier selon le contexte, le juge Evans invoque les décisions *AB Hassle c. Canada (Ministre de la Santé nationale et du Bien-être social)*, [2000] 3 C.F. 360 (C.A.), où la cour a tenu compte du peu d'intérêt du public, et *Ethyl Canada Inc. c. Canada (Attorney General)* (1998), 17 C.P.C. (4th) 278 (C. Ont. (Div. gén.)), p. 283, où la cour a ordonné la divulgation après avoir déterminé qu'il s'agissait d'une affaire constitutionnelle importante et qu'il importait que le public comprenne ce qui était en cause. Le juge Evans fait remarquer que la transparence du processus d'évaluation et la participation du public ont une importance fondamentale pour la LCÉE, et il conclut qu'on ne peut prétendre que le juge des requêtes a accordé trop de poids au principe de la publicité des débats, même si la confidentialité n'est demandée que pour un nombre relativement restreint de documents hautement techniques.

Le juge Evans conclut que le juge des requêtes a donné trop de poids au fait que la production des documents était volontaire mais qu'il ne s'ensuit pas que sa décision au sujet de la confidentialité doive être écartée. Le juge Evans est d'avis que l'erreur n'entache pas sa conclusion finale, pour trois motifs. Premièrement, comme le juge des requêtes, il attache une grande importance à la publicité du débat judiciaire. Deuxièmement, il conclut que l'inclusion dans les affidavits d'un résumé des rapports peut, dans une large mesure, compenser l'absence des rapports, si l'appelante décide de ne pas les déposer sans ordonnance de confidentialité. Enfin, si ÉACL déposait une version modifiée des documents, la demande de confidentialité reposerait sur un facteur relativement peu important, savoir l'argument que l'appelante perdrait des occasions d'affaires si elle violait son engagement envers les autorités chinoises.

Le juge Evans rejette l'argument selon lequel le juge des requêtes a commis une erreur en statuant

24

25

26

reference to the actual documents, stating that it was not necessary for him to inspect them, given that summaries were available and that the documents were highly technical and incompletely translated. Thus the appeal and cross-appeal were both dismissed.

(2) Robertson J.A. (dissenting)

27 Robertson J.A. disagreed with the majority for three reasons. First, in his view, the level of public interest in the case, the degree of media coverage, and the identities of the parties should not be taken into consideration in assessing an application for a confidentiality order. Instead, he held that it was the nature of the evidence for which the order is sought that must be examined.

28 In addition, he found that without a confidentiality order, the appellant had to choose between two unacceptable options: either suffering irreparable financial harm if the confidential information was introduced into evidence, or being denied the right to a fair trial because it could not mount a full defence if the evidence was not introduced.

29 Finally, he stated that the analytical framework employed by the majority in reaching its decision was fundamentally flawed as it was based largely on the subjective views of the motions judge. He rejected the contextual approach to the question of whether a confidentiality order should issue, emphasizing the need for an objective framework to combat the perception that justice is a relative concept, and to promote consistency and certainty in the law.

30 To establish this more objective framework for regulating the issuance of confidentiality orders pertaining to commercial and scientific information, he turned to the legal rationale underlying the commitment to the principle of open justice, referring to *Edmonton Journal v. Alberta (Attorney General)*, [1989] 2 S.C.R. 1326. There, the Supreme Court of Canada held that open proceedings foster the search for the truth, and reflect the importance of public scrutiny of the courts.

sans avoir examiné les documents réels, affirmant que cela n'était pas nécessaire puisqu'il y avait des précis et que la documentation était hautement technique et partiellement traduite. L'appel et l'appel incident sont donc rejetés.

(2) Le juge Robertson (dissident)

Le juge Robertson se dissocie de la majorité pour trois raisons. En premier lieu, il estime que le degré d'intérêt du public dans une affaire, l'importance de la couverture médiatique et l'identité des parties ne devraient pas être pris en considération pour statuer sur une demande d'ordonnance de confidentialité. Selon lui, il faut plutôt examiner la nature de la preuve que protégerait l'ordonnance de confidentialité.

Il estime aussi qu'à défaut d'ordonnance de confidentialité, l'appelante doit choisir entre deux options inacceptables : subir un préjudice financier irréparable si les renseignements confidentiels sont produits en preuve, ou être privée de son droit à un procès équitable parce qu'elle ne peut se défendre pleinement si la preuve n'est pas produite.

Finalement, il dit que le cadre analytique utilisé par les juges majoritaires pour arriver à leur décision est fondamentalement défectueux en ce qu'il est fondé en grande partie sur le point de vue subjectif du juge des requêtes. Il rejette l'approche contextuelle sur la question de l'ordonnance de confidentialité, soulignant la nécessité d'un cadre d'analyse objectif pour combattre la perception que la justice est un concept relatif et pour promouvoir la cohérence et la certitude en droit.

Pour établir ce cadre plus objectif appelé à régir la délivrance d'ordonnances de confidentialité en matière de renseignements commerciaux et scientifiques, il examine le fondement juridique du principe de la publicité du processus judiciaire, en citant l'arrêt de notre Cour, *Edmonton Journal c. Alberta (Procureur général)*, [1989] 2 R.C.S. 1326, qui conclut que la publicité des débats favorise la recherche de la vérité et témoigne de l'importance de soumettre le travail des tribunaux à l'examen public.

Robertson J.A. stated that although the principle of open justice is a reflection of the basic democratic value of accountability in the exercise of judicial power, in his view, the principle that justice itself must be secured is paramount. He concluded that justice as an overarching principle means that exceptions occasionally must be made to rules or principles.

He observed that, in the area of commercial law, when the information sought to be protected concerns “trade secrets”, this information will not be disclosed during a trial if to do so would destroy the owner’s proprietary rights and expose him or her to irreparable harm in the form of financial loss. Although the case before him did not involve a trade secret, he nevertheless held that the same treatment could be extended to commercial or scientific information which was acquired on a confidential basis and attached the following criteria as conditions precedent to the issuance of a confidentiality order (at para. 13):

(1) the information is of a confidential nature as opposed to facts which one would like to keep confidential; (2) the information for which confidentiality is sought is not already in the public domain; (3) on a balance of probabilities the party seeking the confidentiality order would suffer irreparable harm if the information were made public; (4) the information is relevant to the legal issues raised in the case; (5) correlatively, the information is “necessary” to the resolution of those issues; (6) the granting of a confidentiality order does not unduly prejudice the opposing party; and (7) the public interest in open court proceedings does not override the private interests of the party seeking the confidentiality order. The onus in establishing that criteria one to six are met is on the party seeking the confidentiality order. Under the seventh criterion, it is for the opposing party to show that a *prima facie* right to a protective order has been overtaken by the need to preserve the openness of the court proceedings. In addressing these criteria one must bear in mind two of the threads woven into the fabric of the principle of open justice: the search for truth and the preservation of the rule of law. As stated at the outset, I do not believe that the perceived degree of public importance of a case is a relevant consideration.

Selon le juge Robertson, même si le principe de la publicité du processus judiciaire reflète la valeur fondamentale que constitue dans une démocratie l’imputabilité dans l’exercice du pouvoir judiciaire, le principe selon lequel il faut que justice soit faite doit, à son avis, l’emporter. Il conclut que la justice vue comme principe universel signifie que les règles ou les principes doivent parfois souffrir des exceptions.

Il fait observer qu’en droit commercial, lorsque les renseignements qu’on cherche à protéger ont trait à des « secrets industriels », ils ne sont pas divulgués au procès lorsque cela aurait pour effet d’annihiler les droits du propriétaire et l’exposerait à un préjudice financier irréparable. Il conclut que, même si l’espèce ne porte pas sur des secrets industriels, on peut traiter de la même façon des renseignements commerciaux et scientifiques acquis sur une base confidentielle, et il établit les critères suivants comme conditions à la délivrance d’une ordonnance de confidentialité (au par. 13) :

1) les renseignements sont de nature confidentielle et non seulement des faits qu’une personne désire ne pas divulguer; 2) les renseignements qu’on veut protéger ne sont pas du domaine public; 3) selon la prépondérance des probabilités, la partie qui veut obtenir une ordonnance de confidentialité subirait un préjudice irréparable si les renseignements étaient rendus publics; 4) les renseignements sont pertinents dans le cadre de la résolution des questions juridiques soulevées dans le litige; 5) en même temps, les renseignements sont « nécessaires » à la résolution de ces questions; 6) l’octroi d’une ordonnance de confidentialité ne cause pas un préjudice grave à la partie adverse; 7) l’intérêt du public à la publicité des débats judiciaires ne prime pas les intérêts privés de la partie qui sollicite l’ordonnance de confidentialité. Le fardeau de démontrer que les critères un à six sont respectés incombe à la partie qui cherche à obtenir l’ordonnance de confidentialité. Pour le septième critère, c’est la partie adverse qui doit démontrer que le droit *prima facie* à une ordonnance de non-divulgaration doit céder le pas au besoin de maintenir la publicité des débats judiciaires. En utilisant ces critères, il y a lieu de tenir compte de deux des fils conducteurs qui sous-tendent le principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires : la recherche de la vérité et la sauvegarde de la primauté du droit. Comme je l’ai dit au tout début, je ne crois pas que le degré d’importance qu’on croit que le public accorde à une affaire soit une considération pertinente.

33 In applying these criteria to the circumstances of the case, Robertson J.A. concluded that the confidentiality order should be granted. In his view, the public interest in open court proceedings did not override the interests of AECL in maintaining the confidentiality of these highly technical documents.

34 Robertson J.A. also considered the public interest in the need to ensure that site plans for nuclear installations were not, for example, posted on a Web site. He concluded that a confidentiality order would not undermine the two primary objectives underlying the principle of open justice: truth and the rule of law. As such, he would have allowed the appeal and dismissed the cross-appeal.

V. Issues

- 35 A. What is the proper analytical approach to be applied to the exercise of judicial discretion where a litigant seeks a confidentiality order under Rule 151 of the *Federal Court Rules, 1998*?
- B. Should the confidentiality order be granted in this case?

VI. Analysis

A. *The Analytical Approach to the Granting of a Confidentiality Order*

(1) The General Framework: Herein the Dagenais Principles

36 The link between openness in judicial proceedings and freedom of expression has been firmly established by this Court. In *Canadian Broadcasting Corp. v. New Brunswick (Attorney General)*, [1996] 3 S.C.R. 480, at para. 23, La Forest J. expressed the relationship as follows:

The principle of open courts is inextricably tied to the rights guaranteed by s. 2(b). Openness permits public access to information about the courts, which in turn permits the public to discuss and put forward opinions and criticisms of court practices and proceedings. While the freedom to express ideas and opinions about the operation of the courts is clearly within the ambit of the

Appliquant ces critères aux circonstances de l'espèce, le juge Robertson conclut qu'il y a lieu de rendre l'ordonnance de confidentialité. Selon lui, l'intérêt du public dans la publicité des débats judiciaires ne prime pas l'intérêt de ÉACL à préserver le caractère confidentiel de ces documents hautement techniques.

Le juge Robertson traite aussi de l'intérêt du public à ce qu'il soit garanti que les plans de site d'installations nucléaires ne seront pas, par exemple, affichés sur un site Web. Il conclut qu'une ordonnance de confidentialité n'aurait aucun impact négatif sur les deux objectifs primordiaux du principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires, savoir la vérité et la primauté du droit. Il aurait par conséquent accueilli l'appel et rejeté l'appel incident.

V. Questions en litige

- A. Quelle méthode d'analyse faut-il appliquer à l'exercice du pouvoir judiciaire discrétionnaire lorsqu'une partie demande une ordonnance de confidentialité en vertu de la règle 151 des *Règles de la Cour fédérale (1998)*?
- B. Y a-t-il lieu d'accorder l'ordonnance de confidentialité en l'espèce?

VI. Analyse

A. *Méthode d'analyse applicable aux ordonnances de confidentialité*

(1) Le cadre général : les principes de l'arrêt Dagenais

Le lien entre la publicité des procédures judiciaires et la liberté d'expression est solidement établi dans *Société Radio-Canada c. Nouveau-Brunswick (Procureur général)*, [1996] 3 R.C.S. 480. Le juge La Forest l'exprime en ces termes au par. 23 :

Le principe de la publicité des débats en justice est inextricablement lié aux droits garantis à l'al. 2b). Grâce à ce principe, le public a accès à l'information concernant les tribunaux, ce qui lui permet ensuite de discuter des pratiques des tribunaux et des procédures qui s'y déroulent, et d'émettre des opinions et des critiques à cet égard. La liberté d'exprimer des idées et des opinions sur

freedom guaranteed by s. 2(b), so too is the right of members of the public to obtain information about the courts in the first place.

Under the order sought, public access and public scrutiny of the Confidential Documents would be restricted; this would clearly infringe the public's freedom of expression guarantee.

A discussion of the general approach to be taken in the exercise of judicial discretion to grant a confidentiality order should begin with the principles set out by this Court in *Dagenais v. Canadian Broadcasting Corp.*, [1994] 3 S.C.R. 835. Although that case dealt with the common law jurisdiction of the court to order a publication ban in the criminal law context, there are strong similarities between publication bans and confidentiality orders in the context of judicial proceedings. In both cases a restriction on freedom of expression is sought in order to preserve or promote an interest engaged by those proceedings. As such, the fundamental question for a court to consider in an application for a publication ban or a confidentiality order is whether, in the circumstances, the right to freedom of expression should be compromised.

Although in each case freedom of expression will be engaged in a different context, the *Dagenais* framework utilizes overarching *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* principles in order to balance freedom of expression with other rights and interests, and thus can be adapted and applied to various circumstances. As a result, the analytical approach to the exercise of discretion under Rule 151 should echo the underlying principles laid out in *Dagenais*, although it must be tailored to the specific rights and interests engaged in this case.

Dagenais dealt with an application by four accused persons under the court's common law jurisdiction requesting an order prohibiting the broadcast of a television programme dealing with the physical and sexual abuse of young boys at

le fonctionnement des tribunaux relève clairement de la liberté garantie à l'al. 2b), mais en relève également le droit du public d'obtenir au préalable de l'information sur les tribunaux.

L'ordonnance sollicitée aurait pour effet de limiter l'accès du public aux documents confidentiels et leur examen public; cela porterait clairement atteinte à la garantie de la liberté d'expression du public.

L'examen de la méthode générale à suivre dans l'exercice du pouvoir discrétionnaire d'accorder une ordonnance de confidentialité devrait commencer par les principes établis par la Cour dans *Dagenais c. Société Radio-Canada*, [1994] 3 R.C.S. 835. Cette affaire portait sur le pouvoir discrétionnaire judiciaire, issu de la common law, de rendre des ordonnances de non-publication dans le cadre de procédures criminelles, mais il y a de fortes ressemblances entre les interdictions de publication et les ordonnances de confidentialité dans le contexte des procédures judiciaires. Dans les deux cas, on cherche à restreindre la liberté d'expression afin de préserver ou de promouvoir un intérêt en jeu dans les procédures. En ce sens, la question fondamentale que doit résoudre le tribunal auquel on demande une interdiction de publication ou une ordonnance de confidentialité est de savoir si, dans les circonstances, il y a lieu de restreindre le droit à la liberté d'expression.

Même si, dans chaque cas, la liberté d'expression entre en jeu dans un contexte différent, le cadre établi dans *Dagenais* fait appel aux principes déterminants de la *Charte canadienne des droits et libertés* afin de pondérer la liberté d'expression avec d'autres droits et intérêts, et peut donc être adapté et appliqué à diverses circonstances. L'analyse de l'exercice du pouvoir discrétionnaire sous le régime de la règle 151 devrait par conséquent refléter les principes sous-jacents établis par *Dagenais*, même s'il faut pour cela l'ajuster aux droits et intérêts précis qui sont en jeu en l'espèce.

L'affaire *Dagenais* porte sur une requête par laquelle quatre accusés demandaient à la cour de rendre, en vertu de sa compétence de common law, une ordonnance interdisant la diffusion d'une émission de télévision décrivant des abus physiques et

37

38

39

religious institutions. The applicants argued that because the factual circumstances of the programme were very similar to the facts at issue in their trials, the ban was necessary to preserve the accused's right to a fair trial.

sexuels infligés à de jeunes garçons dans des établissements religieux. Les requérants soutenaient que l'interdiction était nécessaire pour préserver leur droit à un procès équitable, parce que les faits racontés dans l'émission ressemblaient beaucoup aux faits en cause dans leurs procès.

40 Lamer C.J. found that the common law discretion to order a publication ban must be exercised within the boundaries set by the principles of the *Charter*. Since publication bans necessarily curtail the freedom of expression of third parties, he adapted the pre-*Charter* common law rule such that it balanced the right to freedom of expression with the right to a fair trial of the accused in a way which reflected the substance of the test from *R. v. Oakes*, [1986] 1 S.C.R. 103. At p. 878 of *Dagenais*, Lamer C.J. set out his reformulated test:

Le juge en chef Lamer conclut que le pouvoir discrétionnaire de common law d'ordonner l'interdiction de publication doit être exercé dans les limites prescrites par les principes de la *Charte*. Puisque les ordonnances de non-publication restreignent nécessairement la liberté d'expression de tiers, il adapte la règle de common law qui s'appliquait avant l'entrée en vigueur de la *Charte* de façon à établir un juste équilibre entre le droit à la liberté d'expression et le droit de l'accusé à un procès équitable, d'une façon qui reflète l'essence du critère énoncé dans *R. c. Oakes*, [1986] 1 R.C.S. 103. À la page 878 de *Dagenais*, le juge en chef Lamer énonce le critère reformulé :

A publication ban should only be ordered when:

Une ordonnance de non-publication ne doit être rendue que si :

(a) Such a ban is necessary in order to prevent a real and substantial risk to the fairness of the trial, because reasonably available alternative measures will not prevent the risk; and

a) elle est nécessaire pour écarter le risque réel et important que le procès soit inéquitable, vu l'absence d'autres mesures raisonnables pouvant écarter ce risque;

(b) The salutary effects of the publication ban outweigh the deleterious effects to the free expression of those affected by the ban. [Emphasis in original.]

b) ses effets bénéfiques sont plus importants que ses effets préjudiciables sur la libre expression de ceux qui sont touchés par l'ordonnance. [Souligné dans l'original.]

41 In *New Brunswick*, *supra*, this Court modified the *Dagenais* test in the context of the related issue of how the discretionary power under s. 486(1) of the *Criminal Code*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-46, to exclude the public from a trial should be exercised. That case dealt with an appeal from the trial judge's order excluding the public from the portion of a sentencing proceeding for sexual assault and sexual interference dealing with the specific acts committed by the accused on the basis that it would avoid "undue hardship" to both the victims and the accused.

Dans *Nouveau-Brunswick*, précité, la Cour modifie le critère de l'arrêt *Dagenais* dans le contexte de la question voisine de l'exercice du pouvoir discrétionnaire d'ordonner l'exclusion du public d'un procès en vertu du par. 486(1) du *Code criminel*, L.R.C. 1985, ch. C-46. Il s'agissait d'un appel d'une décision du juge du procès d'ordonner l'exclusion du public de la partie des procédures de détermination de la peine pour agression sexuelle et contacts sexuels portant sur les actes précis commis par l'accusé, au motif que cela éviterait un « préjudice indu » aux victimes et à l'accusé.

42 La Forest J. found that s. 486(1) was a restriction on the s. 2(b) right to freedom of expression in that it provided a "discretionary bar on public and media access to the courts": *New Brunswick*, at para. 33;

Le juge La Forest conclut que le par. 486(1) limite la liberté d'expression garantie à l'al. 2b) en créant un « pouvoir discrétionnaire permettant d'interdire au public et aux médias l'accès aux

however he found this infringement to be justified under s. 1 provided that the discretion was exercised in accordance with the *Charter*. Thus, the approach taken by La Forest J. at para. 69 to the exercise of discretion under s. 486(1) of the *Criminal Code*, closely mirrors the *Dagenais* common law test:

(a) the judge must consider the available options and consider whether there are any other reasonable and effective alternatives available;

(b) the judge must consider whether the order is limited as much as possible; and

(c) the judge must weigh the importance of the objectives of the particular order and its probable effects against the importance of openness and the particular expression that will be limited in order to ensure that the positive and negative effects of the order are proportionate.

In applying this test to the facts of the case, La Forest J. found that the evidence of the potential undue hardship consisted mainly in the Crown's submission that the evidence was of a "delicate nature" and that this was insufficient to override the infringement on freedom of expression.

This Court has recently revisited the granting of a publication ban under the court's common law jurisdiction in *R. v. Mentuck*, [2001] 3 S.C.R. 442, 2001 SCC 76, and its companion case *R. v. O.N.E.*, [2001] 3 S.C.R. 478, 2001 SCC 77. In *Mentuck*, the Crown moved for a publication ban to protect the identity of undercover police officers and operational methods employed by the officers in their investigation of the accused. The accused opposed the motion as an infringement of his right to a fair and public hearing under s. 11(d) of the *Charter*. The order was also opposed by two intervening newspapers as an infringement of their right to freedom of expression.

The Court noted that, while *Dagenais* dealt with the balancing of freedom of expression on the one hand, and the right to a fair trial of the accused on the other, in the case before it, both the right of the

tribunaux » (*Nouveau-Brunswick*, par. 33). Il considère toutefois que l'atteinte peut être justifiée en vertu de l'article premier pourvu que le pouvoir discrétionnaire soit exercé conformément à la *Charte*. Donc l'analyse de l'exercice du pouvoir discrétionnaire en vertu du par. 486(1) du *Code criminel*, décrite par le juge La Forest au par. 69, concorde étroitement avec le critère de common law établi par *Dagenais* :

a) le juge doit envisager les solutions disponibles et se demander s'il existe d'autres mesures de rechange raisonnables et efficaces;

b) il doit se demander si l'ordonnance a une portée aussi limitée que possible; et

c) il doit comparer l'importance des objectifs de l'ordonnance et de ses effets probables avec l'importance de la publicité des procédures et l'activité d'expression qui sera restreinte, afin de veiller à ce que les effets positifs et négatifs de l'ordonnance soient proportionnels.

Appliquant cette analyse aux faits de l'espèce, le juge La Forest conclut que la preuve du risque de préjudice indu consiste principalement en la prétention de l'avocat du ministère public quant à la « nature délicate » des faits relatifs aux infractions et que cela ne suffit pas pour justifier l'atteinte à la liberté d'expression.

La Cour a récemment réexaminé la question des interdictions de publication prononcées par un tribunal en vertu de sa compétence de common law dans *R. c. Mentuck*, [2001] 3 R.C.S. 442, 2001 CSC 76, et l'arrêt connexe *R. c. O.N.E.*, [2001] 3 R.C.S. 478, 2001 CSC 77. Dans *Mentuck*, le ministère public demandait l'interdiction de publication en vue de protéger l'identité de policiers banalisés et leurs méthodes d'enquête. L'accusé s'opposait à la demande en soutenant que l'interdiction porterait atteinte à son droit à un procès public et équitable protégé par l'al. 11d) de la *Charte*. Deux journaux intervenants s'opposaient aussi à la requête, en faisant valoir qu'elle porterait atteinte à leur droit à la liberté d'expression.

La Cour fait remarquer que *Dagenais* traite de la pondération de la liberté d'expression, d'une part, et du droit de l'accusé à un procès équitable, d'autre part, tandis que dans l'affaire dont elle est saisie, le

accused to a fair and public hearing, and freedom of expression weighed in favour of denying the publication ban. These rights were balanced against interests relating to the proper administration of justice, in particular, protecting the safety of police officers and preserving the efficacy of undercover police operations.

45 In spite of this distinction, the Court noted that underlying the approach taken in both *Dagenais* and *New Brunswick* was the goal of ensuring that the judicial discretion to order publication bans is subject to no lower a standard of compliance with the *Charter* than legislative enactment. This goal is furthered by incorporating the essence of s. 1 of the *Charter* and the *Oakes* test into the publication ban test. Since this same goal applied in the case before it, the Court adopted a similar approach to that taken in *Dagenais*, but broadened the *Dagenais* test (which dealt specifically with the right of an accused to a fair trial) such that it could guide the exercise of judicial discretion where a publication ban is requested in order to preserve any important aspect of the proper administration of justice. At para. 32, the Court reformulated the test as follows:

A publication ban should only be ordered when:

(a) such an order is necessary in order to prevent a serious risk to the proper administration of justice because reasonably alternative measures will not prevent the risk; and

(b) the salutary effects of the publication ban outweigh the deleterious effects on the rights and interests of the parties and the public, including the effects on the right to free expression, the right of the accused to a fair and public trial, and the efficacy of the administration of justice.

46 The Court emphasized that under the first branch of the test, three important elements were subsumed under the “necessity” branch. First, the risk in question must be a serious risk well grounded in the evidence. Second, the phrase “proper administration of justice” must be carefully interpreted so as not to

droit de l’accusé à un procès public et équitable tout autant que la liberté d’expression militent en faveur du rejet de la requête en interdiction de publication. Ces droits ont été soupesés avec l’intérêt de la bonne administration de la justice, en particulier la protection de la sécurité des policiers et le maintien de l’efficacité des opérations policières secrètes.

Malgré cette distinction, la Cour note que la méthode retenue dans *Dagenais* et *Nouveau-Brunswick* a pour objectif de garantir que le pouvoir discrétionnaire des tribunaux d’ordonner des interdictions de publication n’est pas assujéti à une norme de conformité à la *Charte* moins exigeante que la norme applicable aux dispositions législatives. Elle vise cet objectif en incorporant l’essence de l’article premier de la *Charte* et le critère *Oakes* dans l’analyse applicable aux interdictions de publication. Comme le même objectif s’applique à l’affaire dont elle est saisie, la Cour adopte une méthode semblable à celle de *Dagenais*, mais en élargissant le critère énoncé dans cet arrêt (qui portait spécifiquement sur le droit de l’accusé à un procès équitable) de manière à fournir un guide à l’exercice du pouvoir discrétionnaire des tribunaux dans les requêtes en interdiction de publication, afin de protéger tout aspect important de la bonne administration de la justice. La Cour reformule le critère en ces termes (au par. 32) :

Une ordonnance de non-publication ne doit être rendue que si :

a) elle est nécessaire pour écarter le risque sérieux pour la bonne administration de la justice, vu l’absence d’autres mesures raisonnables pouvant écarter ce risque;

b) ses effets bénéfiques sont plus importants que ses effets préjudiciables sur les droits et les intérêts des parties et du public, notamment ses effets sur le droit à la libre expression, sur le droit de l’accusé à un procès public et équitable, et sur l’efficacité de l’administration de la justice.

La Cour souligne que dans le premier volet de l’analyse, trois éléments importants sont subsumés sous la notion de « nécessité ». En premier lieu, le risque en question doit être sérieux et bien étayé par la preuve. En deuxième lieu, l’expression « bonne administration de la justice » doit être interprétée

allow the concealment of an excessive amount of information. Third, the test requires the judge ordering the ban to consider not only whether reasonable alternatives are available, but also to restrict the ban as far as possible without sacrificing the prevention of the risk.

At para. 31, the Court also made the important observation that the proper administration of justice will not necessarily involve *Charter* rights, and that the ability to invoke the *Charter* is not a necessary condition for a publication ban to be granted:

The [common law publication ban] rule can accommodate orders that must occasionally be made in the interests of the administration of justice, which encompass more than fair trial rights. As the test is intended to “reflec[t] the substance of the *Oakes* test”, we cannot require that *Charter* rights be the only legitimate objective of such orders any more than we require that government action or legislation in violation of the *Charter* be justified exclusively by the pursuit of another *Charter* right. [Emphasis added.]

The Court also anticipated that, in appropriate circumstances, the *Dagenais* framework could be expanded even further in order to address requests for publication bans where interests other than the administration of justice were involved.

Mentuck is illustrative of the flexibility of the *Dagenais* approach. Since its basic purpose is to ensure that the judicial discretion to deny public access to the courts is exercised in accordance with *Charter* principles, in my view, the *Dagenais* model can and should be adapted to the situation in the case at bar where the central issue is whether judicial discretion should be exercised so as to exclude confidential information from a public proceeding. As in *Dagenais*, *New Brunswick* and *Mentuck*, granting the confidentiality order will have a negative effect on the *Charter* right to freedom of expression, as well as the principle of open and accessible court proceedings, and, as in those cases, courts must ensure that the discretion to grant the order is exercised in accordance with *Charter* principles.

judicieusement de façon à ne pas empêcher la divulgation d'un nombre excessif de renseignements. En troisième lieu, le critère exige non seulement que le juge qui prononce l'ordonnance détermine s'il existe des mesures de rechange raisonnables, mais aussi qu'il limite l'ordonnance autant que possible sans pour autant sacrifier la prévention du risque.

Au paragraphe 31, la Cour fait aussi l'importante observation que la bonne administration de la justice n'implique pas nécessairement des droits protégés par la *Charte*, et que la possibilité d'invoquer la *Charte* n'est pas une condition nécessaire à l'obtention d'une interdiction de publication :

Elle [la règle de common law] peut s'appliquer aux ordonnances qui doivent parfois être rendues dans l'intérêt de l'administration de la justice, qui englobe davantage que le droit à un procès équitable. Comme on veut que le critère « reflète [...] l'essence du critère énoncé dans l'arrêt *Oakes* », nous ne pouvons pas exiger que ces ordonnances aient pour seul objectif légitime les droits garantis par la *Charte*, pas plus que nous exigeons que les actes gouvernementaux et les dispositions législatives contrevenant à la *Charte* soient justifiés exclusivement par la recherche d'un autre droit garanti par la *Charte*. [Je souligne.]

La Cour prévoit aussi que, dans les cas voulus, le critère de *Dagenais* pourrait être élargi encore davantage pour régir des requêtes en interdiction de publication mettant en jeu des questions autres que l'administration de la justice.

Mentuck illustre bien la souplesse de la méthode *Dagenais*. Comme elle a pour objet fondamental de garantir que le pouvoir discrétionnaire d'interdire l'accès du public aux tribunaux est exercé conformément aux principes de la *Charte*, à mon avis, le modèle *Dagenais* peut et devrait être adapté à la situation de la présente espèce, où la question centrale est l'exercice du pouvoir discrétionnaire du tribunal d'exclure des renseignements confidentiels au cours d'une procédure publique. Comme dans *Dagenais*, *Nouveau-Brunswick* et *Mentuck*, une ordonnance de confidentialité aura un effet négatif sur le droit à la liberté d'expression garanti par la *Charte*, de même que sur le principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires et, comme dans ces affaires, les tribunaux doivent veiller à ce que le

However, in order to adapt the test to the context of this case, it is first necessary to determine the particular rights and interests engaged by this application.

(2) The Rights and Interests of the Parties

49

The immediate purpose for AECL's confidentiality request relates to its commercial interests. The information in question is the property of the Chinese authorities. If the appellant were to disclose the Confidential Documents, it would be in breach of its contractual obligations and suffer a risk of harm to its competitive position. This is clear from the findings of fact of the motions judge that AECL was bound by its commercial interests and its customer's property rights not to disclose the information (para. 27), and that such disclosure could harm the appellant's commercial interests (para. 23).

50

Aside from this direct commercial interest, if the confidentiality order is denied, then in order to protect its commercial interests, the appellant will have to withhold the documents. This raises the important matter of the litigation context in which the order is sought. As both the motions judge and the Federal Court of Appeal found that the information contained in the Confidential Documents was relevant to defences available under the *CEAA*, the inability to present this information hinders the appellant's capacity to make full answer and defence, or, expressed more generally, the appellant's right, as a civil litigant, to present its case. In that sense, preventing the appellant from disclosing these documents on a confidential basis infringes its right to a fair trial. Although in the context of a civil proceeding this does not engage a *Charter* right, the right to a fair trial generally can be viewed as a fundamental principle of justice: *M. (A.) v. Ryan*, [1997] 1 S.C.R. 157, at para. 84, *per* L'Heureux-Dubé J. (dissenting, but not on that point). Although this fair trial right is directly relevant to the appellant, there is also a general public interest in protecting the right to a fair trial. Indeed, as a general proposition, all disputes in the courts should be decided under a fair trial standard. The legitimacy of the judicial process alone

pouvoir discrétionnaire d'accorder l'ordonnance soit exercé conformément aux principes de la *Charte*. Toutefois, pour adapter le critère au contexte de la présente espèce, il faut d'abord définir les droits et intérêts particuliers qui entrent en jeu.

(2) Les droits et les intérêts des parties

L'objet immédiat de la demande d'ordonnance de confidentialité d'ÉACL a trait à ses intérêts commerciaux. Les renseignements en question appartiennent aux autorités chinoises. Si l'appelante divulguait les documents confidentiels, elle manquerait à ses obligations contractuelles et s'exposerait à une détérioration de sa position concurrentielle. Il ressort clairement des conclusions de fait du juge des requêtes qu'ÉACL est tenue, par ses intérêts commerciaux et par les droits de propriété de son client, de ne pas divulguer ces renseignements (par. 27), et que leur divulgation risque de nuire aux intérêts commerciaux de l'appelante (par. 23).

Indépendamment de cet intérêt commercial direct, en cas de refus de l'ordonnance de confidentialité, l'appelante devra, pour protéger ses intérêts commerciaux, s'abstenir de produire les documents. Cela soulève l'importante question du contexte de la présentation de la demande. Comme le juge des requêtes et la Cour d'appel fédérale concluent tous deux que l'information contenue dans les documents confidentiels est pertinente pour les moyens de défense prévus par la *LCÉE*, le fait de ne pouvoir la produire nuit à la capacité de l'appelante de présenter une défense pleine et entière ou, plus généralement, au droit de l'appelante, en sa qualité de justiciable civile, de défendre sa cause. En ce sens, empêcher l'appelante de divulguer ces documents pour des raisons de confidentialité porte atteinte à son droit à un procès équitable. Même si en matière civile cela n'engage pas de droit protégé par la *Charte*, le droit à un procès équitable peut généralement être considéré comme un principe de justice fondamentale : *M. (A.) c. Ryan*, [1997] 1 R.C.S. 157, par. 84, le juge L'Heureux-Dubé (dissidente, mais non sur ce point). Le droit à un procès équitable intéresse directement l'appelante, mais le public a aussi un intérêt général à la protection du droit à un procès équitable. À vrai dire, le principe

demands as much. Similarly, courts have an interest in having all relevant evidence before them in order to ensure that justice is done.

Thus, the interests which would be promoted by a confidentiality order are the preservation of commercial and contractual relations, as well as the right of civil litigants to a fair trial. Related to the latter are the public and judicial interests in seeking the truth and achieving a just result in civil proceedings.

In opposition to the confidentiality order lies the fundamental principle of open and accessible court proceedings. This principle is inextricably tied to freedom of expression enshrined in s. 2(b) of the *Charter: New Brunswick, supra*, at para. 23. The importance of public and media access to the courts cannot be understated, as this access is the method by which the judicial process is scrutinized and criticized. Because it is essential to the administration of justice that justice is done and is seen to be done, such public scrutiny is fundamental. The open court principle has been described as “the very soul of justice”, guaranteeing that justice is administered in a non-arbitrary manner: *New Brunswick*, at para. 22.

(3) Adapting the *Dagenais* Test to the Rights and Interests of the Parties

Applying the rights and interests engaged in this case to the analytical framework of *Dagenais* and subsequent cases discussed above, the test for whether a confidentiality order ought to be granted in a case such as this one should be framed as follows:

A confidentiality order under Rule 151 should only be granted when:

- (a) such an order is necessary in order to prevent a serious risk to an important interest, including a commercial interest, in the context of litigation because reasonably alternative measures will not prevent the risk; and

général est que tout litige porté devant les tribunaux doit être tranché selon la norme du procès équitable. La légitimité du processus judiciaire n'exige pas moins. De même, les tribunaux ont intérêt à ce que toutes les preuves pertinentes leur soient présentées pour veiller à ce que justice soit faite.

Ainsi, les intérêts que favoriserait l'ordonnance de confidentialité seraient le maintien de relations commerciales et contractuelles, de même que le droit des justiciables civils à un procès équitable. Est lié à ce dernier droit l'intérêt du public et du judiciaire dans la recherche de la vérité et la solution juste des litiges civils.

Milite contre l'ordonnance de confidentialité le principe fondamental de la publicité des débats judiciaires. Ce principe est inextricablement lié à la liberté d'expression constitutionnalisée à l'al. 2b) de la *Charte : Nouveau-Brunswick*, précité, par. 23. L'importance de l'accès du public et des médias aux tribunaux ne peut être sous-estimée puisque l'accès est le moyen grâce auquel le processus judiciaire est soumis à l'examen et à la critique. Comme il est essentiel à l'administration de la justice que justice soit faite et soit perçue comme l'étant, cet examen public est fondamental. Le principe de la publicité des procédures judiciaires a été décrit comme le « souffle même de la justice », la garantie de l'absence d'arbitraire dans l'administration de la justice : *Nouveau-Brunswick*, par. 22.

(3) Adaptation de l'analyse de *Dagenais* aux droits et intérêts des parties

Pour appliquer aux droits et intérêts en jeu en l'espèce l'analyse de *Dagenais* et des arrêts subséquents précités, il convient d'énoncer de la façon suivante les conditions applicables à une ordonnance de confidentialité dans un cas comme l'espèce :

Une ordonnance de confidentialité en vertu de la règle 151 ne doit être rendue que si :

- a) elle est nécessaire pour écarter un risque sérieux pour un intérêt important, y compris un intérêt commercial, dans le contexte d'un litige, en l'absence d'autres options raisonnables pour écarter ce risque;

51

52

53

(b) the salutary effects of the confidentiality order, including the effects on the right of civil litigants to a fair trial, outweigh its deleterious effects, including the effects on the right to free expression, which in this context includes the public interest in open and accessible court proceedings.

b) ses effets bénéfiques, y compris ses effets sur le droit des justiciables civils à un procès équitable, l'emportent sur ses effets préjudiciables, y compris ses effets sur la liberté d'expression qui, dans ce contexte, comprend l'intérêt du public dans la publicité des débats judiciaires.

54 As in *Mentuck*, I would add that three important elements are subsumed under the first branch of this test. First, the risk in question must be real and substantial, in that the risk is well grounded in the evidence, and poses a serious threat to the commercial interest in question.

Comme dans *Mentuck*, j'ajouterais que trois éléments importants sont subsumés sous le premier volet de l'analyse. En premier lieu, le risque en cause doit être réel et important, en ce qu'il est bien étayé par la preuve et menace gravement l'intérêt commercial en question.

55 In addition, the phrase "important commercial interest" is in need of some clarification. In order to qualify as an "important commercial interest", the interest in question cannot merely be specific to the party requesting the order; the interest must be one which can be expressed in terms of a public interest in confidentiality. For example, a private company could not argue simply that the existence of a particular contract should not be made public because to do so would cause the company to lose business, thus harming its commercial interests. However, if, as in this case, exposure of information would cause a breach of a confidentiality agreement, then the commercial interest affected can be characterized more broadly as the general commercial interest of preserving confidential information. Simply put, if there is no general principle at stake, there can be no "important commercial interest" for the purposes of this test. Or, in the words of Binnie J. in *F.N. (Re)*, [2000] 1 S.C.R. 880, 2000 SCC 35, at para. 10, the open court rule only yields "where the public interest in confidentiality outweighs the public interest in openness" (emphasis added).

De plus, l'expression « intérêt commercial important » exige une clarification. Pour être qualifié d'« intérêt commercial important », l'intérêt en question ne doit pas se rapporter uniquement et spécifiquement à la partie qui demande l'ordonnance de confidentialité; il doit s'agir d'un intérêt qui peut se définir en termes d'intérêt public à la confidentialité. Par exemple, une entreprise privée ne pourrait simplement prétendre que l'existence d'un contrat donné ne devrait pas être divulguée parce que cela lui ferait perdre des occasions d'affaires, et que cela nuirait à ses intérêts commerciaux. Si toutefois, comme en l'espèce, la divulgation de renseignements doit entraîner un manquement à une entente de non-divulgence, on peut alors parler plus largement de l'intérêt commercial général dans la protection des renseignements confidentiels. Simplement, si aucun principe général n'entre en jeu, il ne peut y avoir d'« intérêt commercial important » pour les besoins de l'analyse. Ou, pour citer le juge Binnie dans *F.N. (Re)*, [2000] 1 R.C.S. 880, 2000 CSC 35, par. 10, la règle de la publicité des débats judiciaires ne cède le pas que « dans les cas où le droit du public à la confidentialité l'emporte sur le droit du public à l'accessibilité » (je souligne).

56 In addition to the above requirement, courts must be cautious in determining what constitutes an "important commercial interest". It must be remembered that a confidentiality order involves an infringement on freedom of expression. Although the balancing of the commercial interest with freedom of expression takes place under the second

Outre l'exigence susmentionnée, les tribunaux doivent déterminer avec prudence ce qui constitue un « intérêt commercial important ». Il faut rappeler qu'une ordonnance de confidentialité implique une atteinte à la liberté d'expression. Même si la pondération de l'intérêt commercial et de la liberté d'expression intervient à la deuxième étape

branch of the test, courts must be alive to the fundamental importance of the open court rule. See generally Muldoon J. in *Eli Lilly and Co. v. Novopharm Ltd.* (1994), 56 C.P.R. (3d) 437 (F.C.T.D.), at p. 439.

Finally, the phrase “reasonably alternative measures” requires the judge to consider not only whether reasonable alternatives to a confidentiality order are available, but also to restrict the order as much as is reasonably possible while preserving the commercial interest in question.

B. *Application of the Test to this Appeal*

(1) Necessity

At this stage, it must be determined whether disclosure of the Confidential Documents would impose a serious risk on an important commercial interest of the appellant, and whether there are reasonable alternatives, either to the order itself, or to its terms.

The commercial interest at stake here relates to the objective of preserving contractual obligations of confidentiality. The appellant argues that it will suffer irreparable harm to its commercial interests if the Confidential Documents are disclosed. In my view, the preservation of confidential information constitutes a sufficiently important commercial interest to pass the first branch of the test as long as certain criteria relating to the information are met.

Pelletier J. noted that the order sought in this case was similar in nature to an application for a protective order which arises in the context of patent litigation. Such an order requires the applicant to demonstrate that the information in question has been treated at all relevant times as confidential and that on a balance of probabilities its proprietary, commercial and scientific interests could reasonably be harmed by the disclosure of the information: *AB Hassle v. Canada (Minister of National Health and Welfare)* (1998), 83 C.P.R. (3d) 428 (F.C.T.D.), at p. 434. To this I would add the requirement proposed

de l’analyse, les tribunaux doivent avoir pleinement conscience de l’importance fondamentale de la règle de la publicité des débats judiciaires. Voir généralement *Eli Lilly and Co. c. Novopharm Ltd.* (1994), 56 C.P.R. (3d) 437 (C.F. 1^{re} inst.), p. 439, le juge Muldoon.

Enfin, l’expression « autres options raisonnables » oblige le juge non seulement à se demander s’il existe des mesures raisonnables autres que l’ordonnance de confidentialité, mais aussi à restreindre l’ordonnance autant qu’il est raisonnablement possible de le faire tout en préservant l’intérêt commercial en question.

B. *Application de l’analyse en l’espèce*

(1) Nécessité

À cette étape, il faut déterminer si la divulgation des documents confidentiels ferait courir un risque sérieux à un intérêt commercial important de l’appelante, et s’il existe d’autres solutions raisonnables que l’ordonnance elle-même, ou ses modalités.

L’intérêt commercial en jeu en l’espèce a trait à la préservation d’obligations contractuelles de confidentialité. L’appelante fait valoir qu’un préjudice irréparable sera causé à ses intérêts commerciaux si les documents confidentiels sont divulgués. À mon avis, la préservation de renseignements confidentiels est un intérêt commercial suffisamment important pour satisfaire au premier volet de l’analyse dès lors que certaines conditions relatives aux renseignements sont réunies.

Le juge Pelletier souligne que l’ordonnance sollicitée en l’espèce s’apparente à une ordonnance conservatoire en matière de brevets. Pour l’obtenir, le requérant doit démontrer que les renseignements en question ont toujours été traités comme des renseignements confidentiels et que, selon la prépondérance des probabilités, il est raisonnable de penser que leur divulgation risquerait de compromettre ses droits exclusifs, commerciaux et scientifiques : *AB Hassle c. Canada (Ministre de la Santé nationale et du Bien-être social)*, [1998] A.C.F. n° 1850 (QL) (C.F. 1^{re} inst.), par. 29-30. J’ajouterais à cela

57

58

59

60

by Robertson J.A. that the information in question must be of a “confidential nature” in that it has been “accumulated with a reasonable expectation of it being kept confidential” as opposed to “facts which a litigant would like to keep confidential by having the courtroom doors closed” (para. 14).

l'exigence proposée par le juge Robertson que les renseignements soient « de nature confidentielle » en ce qu'ils ont été « recueillis dans l'expectative raisonnable qu'ils resteront confidentiels », par opposition à « des faits qu'une partie à un litige voudrait garder confidentiels en obtenant le huis clos » (par. 14).

61 Pelletier J. found as a fact that the *AB Hassle* test had been satisfied in that the information had clearly been treated as confidential both by the appellant and by the Chinese authorities, and that, on a balance of probabilities, disclosure of the information could harm the appellant's commercial interests (para. 23). As well, Robertson J.A. found that the information in question was clearly of a confidential nature as it was commercial information, consistently treated and regarded as confidential, that would be of interest to AECL's competitors (para. 16). Thus, the order is sought to prevent a serious risk to an important commercial interest.

Le juge Pelletier constate que le critère établi dans *AB Hassle* est respecté puisque tant l'appelante que les autorités chinoises ont toujours considéré les renseignements comme confidentiels et que, selon la prépondérance des probabilités, leur divulgation risque de nuire aux intérêts commerciaux de l'appelante (par. 23). Le juge Robertson conclut lui aussi que les renseignements en question sont clairement confidentiels puisqu'il s'agit de renseignements commerciaux, uniformément reconnus comme étant confidentiels, qui présentent un intérêt pour les concurrents d'ÉACL (par. 16). Par conséquent, l'ordonnance est demandée afin de prévenir un risque sérieux de préjudice à un intérêt commercial important.

62 The first branch of the test also requires the consideration of alternative measures to the confidentiality order, as well as an examination of the scope of the order to ensure that it is not overly broad. Both courts below found that the information contained in the Confidential Documents was relevant to potential defences available to the appellant under the *CEAA* and this finding was not appealed at this Court. Further, I agree with the Court of Appeal's assertion (at para. 99) that, given the importance of the documents to the right to make full answer and defence, the appellant is, practically speaking, compelled to produce the documents. Given that the information is necessary to the appellant's case, it remains only to determine whether there are reasonably alternative means by which the necessary information can be adduced without disclosing the confidential information.

Le premier volet de l'analyse exige aussi l'examen d'options raisonnables autres que l'ordonnance de confidentialité, et de la portée de l'ordonnance pour s'assurer qu'elle n'est pas trop vaste. Les deux jugements antérieurs en l'espèce concluent que les renseignements figurant dans les documents confidentiels sont pertinents pour les moyens de défense offerts à l'appelante en vertu de la *LCÉE*, et cette conclusion n'est pas portée en appel devant notre Cour. De plus, je suis d'accord avec la Cour d'appel lorsqu'elle affirme (au par. 99) que vu l'importance des documents pour le droit de présenter une défense pleine et entière, l'appelante est pratiquement forcée de les produire. Comme les renseignements sont nécessaires à la cause de l'appelante, il ne reste qu'à déterminer s'il existe d'autres options raisonnables pour communiquer les renseignements nécessaires sans divulguer de renseignements confidentiels.

63 Two alternatives to the confidentiality order were put forward by the courts below. The motions judge suggested that the Confidential Documents could be expunged of their commercially sensitive contents, and edited versions of the documents could be

Deux options autres que l'ordonnance de confidentialité sont mentionnées dans les décisions antérieures. Le juge des requêtes suggère de retrancher des documents les passages commercialement délicats et de produire les versions ainsi modifiées.

filed. As well, the majority of the Court of Appeal, in addition to accepting the possibility of expungement, was of the opinion that the summaries of the Confidential Documents included in the affidavits could go a long way to compensate for the absence of the originals. If either of these options is a reasonable alternative to submitting the Confidential Documents under a confidentiality order, then the order is not necessary, and the application does not pass the first branch of the test.

There are two possible options with respect to expungement, and in my view, there are problems with both of these. The first option would be for AECL to expunge the confidential information without disclosing the expunged material to the parties and the court. However, in this situation the filed material would still differ from the material used by the affiants. It must not be forgotten that this motion arose as a result of Sierra Club's position that the summaries contained in the affidavits should be accorded little or no weight without the presence of the underlying documents. Even if the relevant information and the confidential information were mutually exclusive, which would allow for the disclosure of all the information relied on in the affidavits, this relevancy determination could not be tested on cross-examination because the expunged material would not be available. Thus, even in the best case scenario, where only irrelevant information needed to be expunged, the parties would be put in essentially the same position as that which initially generated this appeal, in the sense that, at least some of the material relied on to prepare the affidavits in question would not be available to Sierra Club.

Further, I agree with Robertson J.A. that this best case scenario, where the relevant and the confidential information do not overlap, is an untested assumption (para. 28). Although the documents themselves were not put before the courts on this motion, given that they comprise thousands of pages of detailed information, this assumption is at best optimistic. The expungement alternative would be further complicated by the fact that the Chinese

La majorité en Cour d'appel estime que, outre cette possibilité d'épuration des documents, l'inclusion dans les affidavits d'un résumé des documents confidentiels pourrait, dans une large mesure, compenser l'absence des originaux. Si l'une ou l'autre de ces deux options peut raisonnablement se substituer au dépôt des documents confidentiels aux termes d'une ordonnance de confidentialité, alors l'ordonnance n'est pas nécessaire et la requête ne franchit pas la première étape de l'analyse.

Il existe deux possibilités pour l'épuration des documents et, selon moi, elles comportent toutes deux des problèmes. La première serait que ÉACL retranche les renseignements confidentiels sans divulguer les éléments retranchés ni aux parties ni au tribunal. Toutefois, dans cette situation, la documentation déposée serait encore différente de celle utilisée pour les affidavits. Il ne faut pas perdre de vue que la requête découle de l'argument de Sierra Club selon lequel le tribunal ne devrait accorder que peu ou pas de poids aux résumés sans la présence des documents de base. Même si on pouvait totalement séparer les renseignements pertinents et les renseignements confidentiels, ce qui permettrait la divulgation de tous les renseignements sur lesquels se fondent les affidavits, l'appréciation de leur pertinence ne pourrait pas être mise à l'épreuve en contre-interrogatoire puisque la documentation retranchée ne serait pas disponible. Par conséquent, même dans le meilleur cas de figure, où l'on n'aurait qu'à retrancher les renseignements non pertinents, les parties se retrouveraient essentiellement dans la même situation que celle qui a donné lieu au pourvoi, en ce sens qu'au moins une partie des documents ayant servi à la préparation des affidavits en question ne serait pas mise à la disposition de Sierra Club.

De plus, je partage l'opinion du juge Robertson que ce meilleur cas de figure, où les renseignements pertinents et les renseignements confidentiels ne se recoupent pas, est une hypothèse non confirmée (par. 28). Même si les documents eux-mêmes n'ont pas été produits devant les tribunaux dans le cadre de la présente requête, parce qu'ils comprennent des milliers de pages de renseignements détaillés, cette hypothèse est au mieux optimiste. L'option de

authorities require prior approval for any request by AECL to disclose information.

l'épuration serait en outre compliquée par le fait que les autorités chinoises exigent l'approbation préalable de toute demande de divulgation de renseignements de la part d'ÉACL.

66 The second option is that the expunged material be made available to the court and the parties under a more narrowly drawn confidentiality order. Although this option would allow for slightly broader public access than the current confidentiality request, in my view, this minor restriction to the current confidentiality request is not a viable alternative given the difficulties associated with expungement in these circumstances. The test asks whether there are reasonably alternative measures; it does not require the adoption of the absolutely least restrictive option. With respect, in my view, expungement of the Confidential Documents would be a virtually unworkable and ineffective solution that is not reasonable in the circumstances.

La deuxième possibilité serait de mettre les documents supprimés à la disposition du tribunal et des parties en vertu d'une ordonnance de confidentialité plus restreinte. Bien que cela permettrait un accès public un peu plus large que ne le ferait l'ordonnance de confidentialité sollicitée, selon moi, cette restriction mineure à la requête n'est pas une option viable étant donné les difficultés liées à l'épuration dans les circonstances. Il s'agit de savoir s'il y a d'autres options raisonnables et non d'adopter l'option qui soit absolument la moins restrictive. Avec égards, j'estime que l'épuration des documents confidentiels serait une solution virtuellement impraticable et inefficace qui n'est pas raisonnable dans les circonstances.

67 A second alternative to a confidentiality order was Evans J.A.'s suggestion that the summaries of the Confidential Documents included in the affidavits "may well go a long way to compensate for the absence of the originals" (para. 103). However, he appeared to take this fact into account merely as a factor to be considered when balancing the various interests at stake. I would agree that at this threshold stage to rely on the summaries alone, in light of the intention of Sierra Club to argue that they should be accorded little or no weight, does not appear to be a "reasonably alternative measure" to having the underlying documents available to the parties.

Une deuxième option autre que l'ordonnance de confidentialité serait, selon le juge Evans, l'inclusion dans les affidavits d'un résumé des documents confidentiels pour « dans une large mesure, compenser [leur] absence » (par. 103). Il ne semble toutefois envisager ce fait qu'à titre de facteur à considérer dans la pondération des divers intérêts en cause. Je conviens qu'à cette étape liminaire, se fonder uniquement sur les résumés en connaissant l'intention de Sierra Club de plaider leur faiblesse ou l'absence de valeur probante, ne semble pas être une « autre option raisonnable » à la communication aux parties des documents de base.

68 With the above considerations in mind, I find the confidentiality order necessary in that disclosure of the Confidential Documents would impose a serious risk on an important commercial interest of the appellant, and that there are no reasonably alternative measures to granting the order.

Vu les facteurs susmentionnés, je conclus que l'ordonnance de confidentialité est nécessaire en ce que la divulgation des documents confidentiels ferait courir un risque sérieux à un intérêt commercial important de l'appelante, et qu'il n'existe pas d'autres options raisonnables.

(2) The Proportionality Stage

(2) L'étape de la proportionnalité

69 As stated above, at this stage, the salutary effects of the confidentiality order, including the effects on the appellant's right to a fair trial, must be weighed against the deleterious effects of the confidentiality order, including the effects on the right to free

Comme on le mentionne plus haut, à cette étape, les effets bénéfiques de l'ordonnance de confidentialité, y compris ses effets sur le droit de l'appelante à un procès équitable, doivent être pondérés avec ses effets préjudiciables, y compris ses effets sur le droit

expression, which in turn is connected to the principle of open and accessible court proceedings. This balancing will ultimately determine whether the confidentiality order ought to be granted.

(a) *Salutary Effects of the Confidentiality Order*

As discussed above, the primary interest that would be promoted by the confidentiality order is the public interest in the right of a civil litigant to present its case, or, more generally, the fair trial right. Because the fair trial right is being invoked in this case in order to protect commercial, not liberty, interests of the appellant, the right to a fair trial in this context is not a *Charter* right; however, a fair trial for all litigants has been recognized as a fundamental principle of justice: *Ryan, supra*, at para. 84. It bears repeating that there are circumstances where, in the absence of an affected *Charter* right, the proper administration of justice calls for a confidentiality order: *Mentuck, supra*, at para. 31. In this case, the salutary effects that such an order would have on the administration of justice relate to the ability of the appellant to present its case, as encompassed by the broader fair trial right.

The Confidential Documents have been found to be relevant to defences that will be available to the appellant in the event that the *CEAA* is found to apply to the impugned transaction and, as discussed above, the appellant cannot disclose the documents without putting its commercial interests at serious risk of harm. As such, there is a very real risk that, without the confidentiality order, the ability of the appellant to mount a successful defence will be seriously curtailed. I conclude, therefore, that the confidentiality order would have significant salutary effects on the appellant's right to a fair trial.

Aside from the salutary effects on the fair trial interest, the confidentiality order would also have a beneficial impact on other important rights and interests. First, as I discuss in more detail below, the confidentiality order would allow all parties and the court access to the Confidential Documents, and

à la liberté d'expression, qui à son tour est lié au principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires. Cette pondération déterminera finalement s'il y a lieu d'accorder l'ordonnance de confidentialité.

a) *Les effets bénéfiques de l'ordonnance de confidentialité*

Comme nous l'avons vu, le principal intérêt qui serait promu par l'ordonnance de confidentialité est l'intérêt du public à la protection du droit du justiciable civil de faire valoir sa cause ou, de façon plus générale, du droit à un procès équitable. Puisque l'appelante l'invoque en l'espèce pour protéger ses intérêts commerciaux et non son droit à la liberté, le droit à un procès équitable dans ce contexte n'est pas un droit visé par la *Charte*; toutefois, le droit à un procès équitable pour tous les justiciables a été reconnu comme un principe de justice fondamentale : *Ryan*, précité, par. 84. Il y a lieu de rappeler qu'il y a des circonstances où, en l'absence de violation d'un droit garanti par la *Charte*, la bonne administration de la justice exige une ordonnance de confidentialité : *Mentuck*, précité, par. 31. En l'espèce, les effets bénéfiques d'une telle ordonnance sur l'administration de la justice tiennent à la capacité de l'appelante de soutenir sa cause, dans le cadre du droit plus large à un procès équitable.

Les documents confidentiels ont été jugés pertinents en ce qui a trait aux moyens de défense que l'appelante pourrait invoquer s'il est jugé que la *LCÉE* s'applique à l'opération attaquée et, comme nous l'avons vu, l'appelante ne peut communiquer les documents sans risque sérieux pour ses intérêts commerciaux. De ce fait, il existe un risque bien réel que, sans l'ordonnance de confidentialité, la capacité de l'appelante à mener à bien sa défense soit gravement réduite. Je conclus par conséquent que l'ordonnance de confidentialité aurait d'importants effets bénéfiques pour le droit de l'appelante à un procès équitable.

En plus des effets bénéfiques pour le droit à un procès équitable, l'ordonnance de confidentialité aurait aussi des incidences favorables sur d'autres droits et intérêts importants. En premier lieu, comme je l'exposerai plus en détail ci-après, l'ordonnance de confidentialité permettrait aux parties ainsi qu'au

70

71

72

permit cross-examination based on their contents. By facilitating access to relevant documents in a judicial proceeding, the order sought would assist in the search for truth, a core value underlying freedom of expression.

tribunal d'avoir accès aux documents confidentiels, et permettrait la tenue d'un contre-interrogatoire fondé sur leur contenu. En facilitant l'accès aux documents pertinents dans une procédure judiciaire, l'ordonnance sollicitée favoriserait la recherche de la vérité, qui est une valeur fondamentale sous-tendant la liberté d'expression.

73 Second, I agree with the observation of Robertson J.A. that, as the Confidential Documents contain detailed technical information pertaining to the construction and design of a nuclear installation, it may be in keeping with the public interest to prevent this information from entering the public domain (para. 44). Although the exact contents of the documents remain a mystery, it is apparent that they contain technical details of a nuclear installation, and there may well be a substantial public security interest in maintaining the confidentiality of such information.

En deuxième lieu, je suis d'accord avec l'observation du juge Robertson selon laquelle puisque les documents confidentiels contiennent des renseignements techniques détaillés touchant la construction et la conception d'une installation nucléaire, il peut être nécessaire, dans l'intérêt public, d'empêcher que ces renseignements tombent dans le domaine public (par. 44). Même si le contenu exact des documents demeure un mystère, il est évident qu'ils comprennent des détails techniques d'une installation nucléaire et il peut bien y avoir un important intérêt de sécurité publique à préserver la confidentialité de ces renseignements.

(b) *Deleterious Effects of the Confidentiality Order*

b) *Les effets préjudiciables de l'ordonnance de confidentialité*

74 Granting the confidentiality order would have a negative effect on the open court principle, as the public would be denied access to the contents of the Confidential Documents. As stated above, the principle of open courts is inextricably tied to the s. 2(b) *Charter* right to freedom of expression, and public scrutiny of the courts is a fundamental aspect of the administration of justice: *New Brunswick, supra*, at paras. 22-23. Although as a general principle, the importance of open courts cannot be overstated, it is necessary to examine, in the context of this case, the particular deleterious effects on freedom of expression that the confidentiality order would have.

Une ordonnance de confidentialité aurait un effet préjudiciable sur le principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires, puisqu'elle priverait le public de l'accès au contenu des documents confidentiels. Comme on le dit plus haut, le principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires est inextricablement lié au droit à la liberté d'expression protégé par l'al. 2b) de la *Charte*, et la vigilance du public envers les tribunaux est un aspect fondamental de l'administration de la justice : *Nouveau-Brunswick*, précité, par. 22-23. Même si, à titre de principe général, l'importance de la publicité des débats judiciaires ne peut être sous-estimée, il faut examiner, dans le contexte de l'espèce, les effets préjudiciables particuliers que l'ordonnance de confidentialité aurait sur la liberté d'expression.

75 Underlying freedom of expression are the core values of (1) seeking the truth and the common good; (2) promoting self-fulfilment of individuals by allowing them to develop thoughts and ideas as they see fit; and (3) ensuring that participation in the political process is open to all persons: *Irwin Toy Ltd. v. Quebec (Attorney General)*, [1989] 1 S.C.R.

Les valeurs fondamentales qui sous-tendent la liberté d'expression sont (1) la recherche de la vérité et du bien commun; (2) l'épanouissement personnel par le libre développement des pensées et des idées; et (3) la participation de tous au processus politique : *Irwin Toy Ltd. c. Québec (Procureur général)*, [1989] 1 R.C.S. 927, p. 976; *R. c. Keegstra*, [1990]

927, at p. 976; *R. v. Keegstra*, [1990] 3 S.C.R. 697, at pp. 762-64, *per* Dickson C.J. *Charter* jurisprudence has established that the closer the speech in question lies to these core values, the harder it will be to justify a s. 2(b) infringement of that speech under s. 1 of the *Charter*: *Keegstra*, at pp. 760-61. Since the main goal in this case is to exercise judicial discretion in a way which conforms to *Charter* principles, a discussion of the deleterious effects of the confidentiality order on freedom of expression should include an assessment of the effects such an order would have on the three core values. The more detrimental the order would be to these values, the more difficult it will be to justify the confidentiality order. Similarly, minor effects of the order on the core values will make the confidentiality order easier to justify.

Seeking the truth is not only at the core of freedom of expression, but it has also been recognized as a fundamental purpose behind the open court rule, as the open examination of witnesses promotes an effective evidentiary process: *Edmonton Journal*, *supra*, at pp. 1357-58, *per* Wilson J. Clearly the confidentiality order, by denying public and media access to documents relied on in the proceedings, would impede the search for truth to some extent. Although the order would not exclude the public from the courtroom, the public and the media would be denied access to documents relevant to the evidentiary process.

However, as mentioned above, to some extent the search for truth may actually be promoted by the confidentiality order. This motion arises as a result of Sierra Club's argument that it must have access to the Confidential Documents in order to test the accuracy of Dr. Pang's evidence. If the order is denied, then the most likely scenario is that the appellant will not submit the documents with the unfortunate result that evidence which may be relevant to the proceedings will not be available to Sierra Club or the court. As a result, Sierra Club will not be able to fully test the accuracy of Dr. Pang's evidence on cross-examination. In addition, the court will not have the benefit of this cross-examination or

3 R.C.S. 697, p. 762-764, le juge en chef Dickson. La jurisprudence de la *Charte* établit que plus l'expression en cause est au cœur de ces valeurs fondamentales, plus il est difficile de justifier, en vertu de l'article premier de la *Charte*, une atteinte à l'al. 2b) à son égard : *Keegstra*, p. 760-761. Comme l'objectif principal en l'espèce est d'exercer un pouvoir discrétionnaire dans le respect des principes de la *Charte*, l'examen des effets préjudiciables de l'ordonnance de confidentialité sur la liberté d'expression devrait comprendre une appréciation des effets qu'elle aurait sur les trois valeurs fondamentales. Plus l'ordonnance de confidentialité porte préjudice à ces valeurs, plus il est difficile de la justifier. Inversement, des effets mineurs sur les valeurs fondamentales rendent l'ordonnance de confidentialité plus facile à justifier.

La recherche de la vérité est non seulement au cœur de la liberté d'expression, elle est aussi reconnue comme un objectif fondamental de la règle de la publicité des débats judiciaires, puisque l'examen public des témoins favorise l'efficacité du processus de présentation de la preuve : *Edmonton Journal*, précité, p. 1357-1358, le juge Wilson. À l'évidence, en enlevant au public et aux médias l'accès aux documents invoqués dans les procédures, l'ordonnance de confidentialité nuirait jusqu'à un certain point à la recherche de la vérité. L'ordonnance n'exclurait pas le public de la salle d'audience, mais le public et les médias n'auraient pas accès aux documents pertinents quant à la présentation de la preuve.

Toutefois, comme nous l'avons vu plus haut, la recherche de la vérité peut jusqu'à un certain point être favorisée par l'ordonnance de confidentialité. La présente requête résulte de l'argument de Sierra Club selon lequel il doit avoir accès aux documents confidentiels pour vérifier l'exactitude de la déposition de M. Pang. Si l'ordonnance est refusée, le scénario le plus probable est que l'appellante s'abstiendra de déposer les documents, avec la conséquence fâcheuse que des preuves qui peuvent être pertinentes ne seront pas portées à la connaissance de Sierra Club ou du tribunal. Par conséquent, Sierra Club ne sera pas en mesure de vérifier complètement l'exactitude de la preuve de M. Pang en contre-

documentary evidence, and will be required to draw conclusions based on an incomplete evidentiary record. This would clearly impede the search for truth in this case.

78

As well, it is important to remember that the confidentiality order would restrict access to a relatively small number of highly technical documents. The nature of these documents is such that the general public would be unlikely to understand their contents, and thus they would contribute little to the public interest in the search for truth in this case. However, in the hands of the parties and their respective experts, the documents may be of great assistance in probing the truth of the Chinese environmental assessment process, which would in turn assist the court in reaching accurate factual conclusions. Given the nature of the documents, in my view, the important value of the search for truth which underlies both freedom of expression and open justice would be promoted to a greater extent by submitting the Confidential Documents under the order sought than it would by denying the order, and thereby preventing the parties and the court from relying on the documents in the course of the litigation.

79

In addition, under the terms of the order sought, the only restrictions on these documents relate to their public distribution. The Confidential Documents would be available to the court and the parties, and public access to the proceedings would not be impeded. As such, the order represents a fairly minimal intrusion into the open court rule, and thus would not have significant deleterious effects on this principle.

80

The second core value underlying freedom of speech, namely, the promotion of individual self-fulfilment by allowing open development of thoughts and ideas, focusses on individual expression, and thus does not closely relate to the open court principle which involves institutional expression. Although the confidentiality order would

interrogatoire. De plus, le tribunal ne bénéficiera pas du contre-interrogatoire ou de cette preuve documentaire, et il lui faudra tirer des conclusions fondées sur un dossier de preuve incomplet. Cela nuira manifestement à la recherche de la vérité en l'espèce.

De plus, il importe de rappeler que l'ordonnance de confidentialité ne restreindrait l'accès qu'à un nombre relativement peu élevé de documents hautement techniques. La nature de ces documents est telle que le public en général est peu susceptible d'en comprendre le contenu, de sorte qu'ils contribueraient peu à l'intérêt du public à la recherche de la vérité en l'espèce. Toutefois, dans les mains des parties et de leurs experts respectifs, les documents peuvent être très utiles pour apprécier la conformité du processus d'évaluation environnementale chinois, ce qui devrait aussi aider le tribunal à tirer des conclusions de fait exactes. À mon avis, compte tenu de leur nature, la production des documents confidentiels en vertu de l'ordonnance de confidentialité sollicitée favoriserait mieux l'importante valeur de la recherche de la vérité, qui sous-tend à la fois la liberté d'expression et la publicité des débats judiciaires, que ne le ferait le rejet de la demande qui aurait pour effet d'empêcher les parties et le tribunal de se fonder sur les documents au cours de l'instance.

De plus, aux termes de l'ordonnance demandée, les seules restrictions imposées à l'égard de ces documents ont trait à leur distribution publique. Les documents confidentiels seraient mis à la disposition du tribunal et des parties, et il n'y aurait pas d'entrave à l'accès du public aux procédures. À ce titre, l'ordonnance représente une atteinte relativement minime à la règle de la publicité des débats judiciaires et elle n'aurait donc pas d'effets préjudiciables importants sur ce principe.

La deuxième valeur fondamentale sous-jacente à la liberté d'expression, la promotion de l'épanouissement personnel par le libre développement de la pensée et des idées, est centrée sur l'expression individuelle et n'est donc pas étroitement liée au principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires qui concerne l'expression institutionnelle. Même

restrict individual access to certain information which may be of interest to that individual, I find that this value would not be significantly affected by the confidentiality order.

The third core value, open participation in the political process, figures prominently in this appeal, as open justice is a fundamental aspect of a democratic society. This connection was pointed out by Cory J. in *Edmonton Journal*, *supra*, at p. 1339:

It can be seen that freedom of expression is of fundamental importance to a democratic society. It is also essential to a democracy and crucial to the rule of law that the courts are seen to function openly. The press must be free to comment upon court proceedings to ensure that the courts are, in fact, seen by all to operate openly in the penetrating light of public scrutiny.

Although there is no doubt as to the importance of open judicial proceedings to a democratic society, there was disagreement in the courts below as to whether the weight to be assigned to the open court principle should vary depending on the nature of the proceeding.

On this issue, Robertson J.A. was of the view that the nature of the case and the level of media interest were irrelevant considerations. On the other hand, Evans J.A. held that the motions judge was correct in taking into account that this judicial review application was one of significant public and media interest. In my view, although the public nature of the case may be a factor which strengthens the importance of open justice in a particular case, the level of media interest should not be taken into account as an independent consideration.

Since cases involving public institutions will generally relate more closely to the core value of public participation in the political process, the public nature of a proceeding should be taken into consideration when assessing the merits of a confidentiality order. It is important to note that this core value will always be engaged where the open court

si l'ordonnance de confidentialité devait restreindre l'accès individuel à certains renseignements susceptibles d'intéresser quelqu'un, j'estime que cette valeur ne serait pas touchée de manière significative.

La troisième valeur fondamentale, la libre participation au processus politique, joue un rôle primordial dans le pourvoi puisque la publicité des débats judiciaires est un aspect fondamental de la société démocratique. Ce lien est souligné par le juge Cory dans *Edmonton Journal*, précité, p. 1339 :

On voit que la liberté d'expression est d'une importance fondamentale dans une société démocratique. Il est également essentiel dans une démocratie et fondamental pour la primauté du droit que la transparence du fonctionnement des tribunaux soit perçue comme telle. La presse doit être libre de commenter les procédures judiciaires pour que, dans les faits, chacun puisse constater que les tribunaux fonctionnent publiquement sous les regards pénétrants du public.

Même si on ne peut douter de l'importance de la publicité des débats judiciaires dans une société démocratique, les décisions antérieures divergent sur la question de savoir si le poids à accorder au principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires devrait varier en fonction de la nature de la procédure.

Sur ce point, le juge Robertson estime que la nature de l'affaire et le degré d'intérêt des médias sont des considérations dénuées de pertinence. Le juge Evans estime quant à lui que le juge des requêtes a eu raison de tenir compte du fait que la demande de contrôle judiciaire suscite beaucoup d'intérêt de la part du public et des médias. À mon avis, même si la nature publique de l'affaire peut être un facteur susceptible de renforcer l'importance de la publicité des débats judiciaires dans une espèce particulière, le degré d'intérêt des médias ne devrait pas être considéré comme facteur indépendant.

Puisque les affaires concernant des institutions publiques ont généralement un lien plus étroit avec la valeur fondamentale de la participation du public au processus politique, la nature publique d'une instance devrait être prise en considération dans l'évaluation du bien-fondé d'une ordonnance de confidentialité. Il importe de noter que cette valeur

81

2002 SCC 41 (CanLII)

82

83

principle is engaged owing to the importance of open justice to a democratic society. However, where the political process is also engaged by the substance of the proceedings, the connection between open proceedings and public participation in the political process will increase. As such, I agree with Evans J.A. in the court below where he stated, at para. 87:

While all litigation is important to the parties, and there is a public interest in ensuring the fair and appropriate adjudication of all litigation that comes before the courts, some cases raise issues that transcend the immediate interests of the parties and the general public interest in the due administration of justice, and have a much wider public interest significance.

84

This motion relates to an application for judicial review of a decision by the government to fund a nuclear energy project. Such an application is clearly of a public nature, as it relates to the distribution of public funds in relation to an issue of demonstrated public interest. Moreover, as pointed out by Evans J.A., openness and public participation are of fundamental importance under the *CEAA*. Indeed, by their very nature, environmental matters carry significant public import, and openness in judicial proceedings involving environmental issues will generally attract a high degree of protection. In this regard, I agree with Evans J.A. that the public interest is engaged here more than it would be if this were an action between private parties relating to purely private interests.

85

However, with respect, to the extent that Evans J.A. relied on media interest as an indicium of public interest, this was an error. In my view, it is important to distinguish public interest, from media interest, and I agree with Robertson J.A. that media exposure cannot be viewed as an impartial measure of public interest. It is the public nature of the proceedings which increases the need for openness, and this public nature is not necessarily reflected by the media desire to probe the facts of the case.

fondamentale sera toujours engagée lorsque sera mis en cause le principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires, vu l'importance de la transparence judiciaire dans une société démocratique. Toutefois, le lien entre la publicité des débats judiciaires et la participation du public dans le processus politique s'accroît lorsque le processus politique est également engagé par la substance de la procédure. Sous ce rapport, je suis d'accord avec ce que dit le juge Evans (au par. 87) :

Bien que tous les litiges soient importants pour les parties, et qu'il en va de l'intérêt du public que les affaires soumises aux tribunaux soient traitées de façon équitable et appropriée, certaines affaires soulèvent des questions qui transcendent les intérêts immédiats des parties ainsi que l'intérêt du public en général dans la bonne administration de la justice, et qui ont une signification beaucoup plus grande pour le public.

La requête est liée à une demande de contrôle judiciaire d'une décision du gouvernement de financer un projet d'énergie nucléaire. La demande est clairement de nature publique, puisqu'elle a trait à la distribution de fonds publics en rapport avec une question dont l'intérêt public a été démontré. De plus, comme le souligne le juge Evans, la transparence du processus et la participation du public ont une importance fondamentale sous le régime de la *LCÉE*. En effet, par leur nature même, les questions environnementales ont une portée publique considérable, et la transparence des débats judiciaires sur les questions environnementales mérite généralement un degré élevé de protection. À cet égard, je suis d'accord avec le juge Evans pour conclure que l'intérêt public est en l'espèce plus engagé que s'il s'agissait d'un litige entre personnes privées à l'égard d'intérêts purement privés.

J'estime toutefois avec égards que, dans la mesure où il se fonde sur l'intérêt des médias comme indice de l'intérêt du public, le juge Evans fait erreur. À mon avis, il est important d'établir une distinction entre l'intérêt du public et l'intérêt des médias et, comme le juge Robertson, je note que la couverture médiatique ne peut être considérée comme une mesure impartiale de l'intérêt public. C'est la nature publique de l'instance qui accentue le besoin de transparence, et cette nature publique ne se reflète

I reiterate the caution given by Dickson C.J. in *Keegstra*, *supra*, at p. 760, where he stated that, while the speech in question must be examined in light of its relation to the core values, “we must guard carefully against judging expression according to its popularity”.

Although the public interest in open access to the judicial review application as a whole is substantial, in my view, it is also important to bear in mind the nature and scope of the information for which the order is sought in assigning weight to the public interest. With respect, the motions judge erred in failing to consider the narrow scope of the order when he considered the public interest in disclosure, and consequently attached excessive weight to this factor. In this connection, I respectfully disagree with the following conclusion of Evans J.A., at para. 97:

Thus, having considered the nature of this litigation, and having assessed the extent of public interest in the openness of the proceedings in the case before him, the Motions Judge cannot be said in all the circumstances to have given this factor undue weight, even though confidentiality is claimed for only three documents among the small mountain of paper filed in this case, and their content is likely to be beyond the comprehension of all but those equipped with the necessary technical expertise.

Open justice is a fundamentally important principle, particularly when the substance of the proceedings is public in nature. However, this does not detract from the duty to attach weight to this principle in accordance with the specific limitations on openness that the confidentiality order would have. As Wilson J. observed in *Edmonton Journal*, *supra*, at pp. 1353-54:

One thing seems clear and that is that one should not balance one value at large and the conflicting value in its context. To do so could well be to pre-judge the issue by placing more weight on the value developed at large than is appropriate in the context of the case.

pas nécessairement dans le désir des médias d’examiner les faits de l’affaire. Je réitère l’avertissement donné par le juge en chef Dickson dans *Keegstra*, précité, p. 760, où il dit que même si l’expression en cause doit être examinée dans ses rapports avec les valeurs fondamentales, « nous devons veiller à ne pas juger l’expression en fonction de sa popularité ».

Même si l’intérêt du public à la publicité de la demande de contrôle judiciaire dans son ensemble est important, à mon avis, il importe tout autant de prendre en compte la nature et la portée des renseignements visés par l’ordonnance demandée, lorsqu’il s’agit d’apprécier le poids de l’intérêt public. Avec égards, le juge des requêtes a commis une erreur en ne tenant pas compte de la portée limitée de l’ordonnance dans son appréciation de l’intérêt du public à la communication et en accordant donc un poids excessif à ce facteur. Sous ce rapport, je ne partage pas la conclusion suivante du juge Evans (au par. 97) :

Par conséquent, on ne peut dire qu’après que le juge des requêtes eut examiné la nature de ce litige et évalué l’importance de l’intérêt du public à la publicité des procédures, il aurait dans les circonstances accordé trop d’importance à ce facteur, même si la confidentialité n’est demandée que pour trois documents parmi la montagne de documents déposés en l’instance et que leur contenu dépasse probablement les connaissances de ceux qui n’ont pas l’expertise technique nécessaire.

La publicité des débats judiciaires est un principe fondamentalement important, surtout lorsque la substance de la procédure est de nature publique. Cela ne libère toutefois aucunement de l’obligation d’apprécier le poids à accorder à ce principe en fonction des limites particulières qu’imposerait l’ordonnance de confidentialité à la publicité des débats. Comme le dit le juge Wilson dans *Edmonton Journal*, précité, p. 1353-1354 :

Une chose semble claire et c’est qu’il ne faut pas évaluer une valeur selon la méthode générale et l’autre valeur en conflit avec elle selon la méthode contextuelle. Agir ainsi pourrait fort bien revenir à préjuger de l’issue du litige en donnant à la valeur examinée de manière générale plus d’importance que ne l’exige le contexte de l’affaire.

87

In my view, it is important that, although there is significant public interest in these proceedings, open access to the judicial review application would be only slightly impeded by the order sought. The narrow scope of the order coupled with the highly technical nature of the Confidential Documents significantly temper the deleterious effects the confidentiality order would have on the public interest in open courts.

88

In addressing the effects that the confidentiality order would have on freedom of expression, it should also be borne in mind that the appellant may not have to raise defences under the *CEAA*, in which case the Confidential Documents would be irrelevant to the proceedings, with the result that freedom of expression would be unaffected by the order. However, since the necessity of the Confidential Documents will not be determined for some time, in the absence of a confidentiality order, the appellant would be left with the choice of either submitting the documents in breach of its obligations, or withholding the documents in the hopes that either it will not have to present a defence under the *CEAA*, or that it will be able to mount a successful defence in the absence of these relevant documents. If it chooses the former option, and the defences under the *CEAA* are later found not to apply, then the appellant will have suffered the prejudice of having its confidential and sensitive information released into the public domain, with no corresponding benefit to the public. Although this scenario is far from certain, the possibility of such an occurrence also weighs in favour of granting the order sought.

89

In coming to this conclusion, I note that if the appellant is not required to invoke the relevant defences under the *CEAA*, it is also true that the appellant's fair trial right will not be impeded, even if the confidentiality order is not granted. However, I do not take this into account as a factor which weighs in favour of denying the order because, if the order is granted and the Confidential Documents are not required, there will be no deleterious effects on either the public interest in freedom of expression or the appellant's commercial interests or fair trial right. This neutral result is in contrast with the

À mon avis, il importe de reconnaître que, malgré l'intérêt significatif que porte le public à ces procédures, l'ordonnance demandée n'entraverait que légèrement la publicité de la demande de contrôle judiciaire. La portée étroite de l'ordonnance associée à la nature hautement technique des documents confidentiels tempère considérablement les effets préjudiciables que l'ordonnance de confidentialité pourrait avoir sur l'intérêt du public à la publicité des débats judiciaires.

Pour traiter des effets qu'aurait l'ordonnance de confidentialité sur la liberté d'expression, il faut aussi se rappeler qu'il se peut que l'appelante n'ait pas à soulever de moyens de défense visés par la *LCÉE*, auquel cas les documents confidentiels perdraient leur pertinence et la liberté d'expression ne serait pas touchée par l'ordonnance. Toutefois, puisque l'utilité des documents confidentiels ne sera pas déterminée avant un certain temps, l'appelante n'aurait plus, en l'absence d'ordonnance de confidentialité, que le choix entre soit produire les documents en violation de ses obligations, soit les retenir dans l'espoir de ne pas avoir à présenter de défense en vertu de la *LCÉE* ou de pouvoir assurer effectivement sa défense sans les documents pertinents. Si elle opte pour le premier choix et que le tribunal conclut par la suite que les moyens de défense visés par la *LCÉE* ne sont pas applicables, l'appelante aura subi le préjudice de voir ses renseignements confidentiels et délicats tomber dans le domaine public sans que le public n'en tire d'avantage correspondant. Même si sa réalisation est loin d'être certaine, la possibilité d'un tel scénario milite également en faveur de l'ordonnance sollicitée.

En arrivant à cette conclusion, je note que si l'appelante n'a pas à invoquer les moyens de défense pertinents en vertu de la *LCÉE*, il est également vrai que son droit à un procès équitable ne sera pas entravé même en cas de refus de l'ordonnance de confidentialité. Je ne retiens toutefois pas cela comme facteur militant contre l'ordonnance parce que, si elle est accordée et que les documents confidentiels ne sont pas nécessaires, il n'y aura alors aucun effet préjudiciable ni sur l'intérêt du public à la liberté d'expression ni sur les droits commerciaux ou le droit de l'appelante à un procès

scenario discussed above where the order is denied and the possibility arises that the appellant's commercial interests will be prejudiced with no corresponding public benefit. As a result, the fact that the Confidential Documents may not be required is a factor which weighs in favour of granting the confidentiality order.

In summary, the core freedom of expression values of seeking the truth and promoting an open political process are most closely linked to the principle of open courts, and most affected by an order restricting that openness. However, in the context of this case, the confidentiality order would only marginally impede, and in some respects would even promote, the pursuit of these values. As such, the order would not have significant deleterious effects on freedom of expression.

VII. Conclusion

In balancing the various rights and interests engaged, I note that the confidentiality order would have substantial salutary effects on the appellant's right to a fair trial, and freedom of expression. On the other hand, the deleterious effects of the confidentiality order on the principle of open courts and freedom of expression would be minimal. In addition, if the order is not granted and in the course of the judicial review application the appellant is not required to mount a defence under the *CEAA*, there is a possibility that the appellant will have suffered the harm of having disclosed confidential information in breach of its obligations with no corresponding benefit to the right of the public to freedom of expression. As a result, I find that the salutary effects of the order outweigh its deleterious effects, and the order should be granted.

Consequently, I would allow the appeal with costs throughout, set aside the judgment of the Federal Court of Appeal, and grant the confidentiality order on the terms requested by the appellant under Rule 151 of the *Federal Court Rules, 1998*.

équitable. Cette issue neutre contraste avec le scénario susmentionné où il y a refus de l'ordonnance et possibilité d'atteinte aux droits commerciaux de l'appelante sans avantage correspondant pour le public. Par conséquent, le fait que les documents confidentiels puissent ne pas être nécessaires est un facteur en faveur de l'ordonnance de confidentialité.

En résumé, les valeurs centrales de la liberté d'expression que sont la recherche de la vérité et la promotion d'un processus politique ouvert sont très étroitement liées au principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires, et sont les plus touchées par une ordonnance limitant cette publicité. Toutefois, dans le contexte en l'espèce, l'ordonnance de confidentialité n'entraverait que légèrement la poursuite de ces valeurs, et pourrait même les favoriser à certains égards. À ce titre, l'ordonnance n'aurait pas d'effets préjudiciables importants sur la liberté d'expression.

VII. Conclusion

Dans la pondération des divers droits et intérêts en jeu, je note que l'ordonnance de confidentialité aurait des effets bénéfiques importants sur le droit de l'appelante à un procès équitable et sur la liberté d'expression. D'autre part, les effets préjudiciables de l'ordonnance de confidentialité sur le principe de la publicité des débats judiciaires et la liberté d'expression seraient minimes. En outre, si l'ordonnance est refusée et qu'au cours du contrôle judiciaire l'appelante n'est pas amenée à invoquer les moyens de défense prévus dans la *LCÉE*, il se peut qu'elle subisse le préjudice d'avoir communiqué des renseignements confidentiels en violation de ses obligations sans avantage correspondant pour le droit du public à la liberté d'expression. Je conclus donc que les effets bénéfiques de l'ordonnance l'emportent sur ses effets préjudiciables, et qu'il y a lieu d'accorder l'ordonnance.

Je suis donc d'avis d'accueillir le pourvoi avec dépens devant toutes les cours, d'annuler l'arrêt de la Cour d'appel fédérale, et d'accorder l'ordonnance de confidentialité selon les modalités demandées par l'appelante en vertu de la règle 151 des *Règles de la Cour fédérale (1998)*.

90

91

92

Appeal allowed with costs.

Solicitors for the appellant: Osler, Hoskin & Harcourt, Toronto.

Solicitors for the respondent Sierra Club of Canada: Timothy J. Howard, Vancouver; Franklin S. Gertler, Montréal.

Solicitor for the respondents the Minister of Finance of Canada, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Canada, the Minister of International Trade of Canada and the Attorney General of Canada: The Deputy Attorney General of Canada, Ottawa.

Pourvoi accueilli avec dépens.

Procureurs de l'appelante : Osler, Hoskin & Harcourt, Toronto.

Procureurs de l'intimé Sierra Club du Canada : Timothy J. Howard, Vancouver; Franklin S. Gertler, Montréal.

Procureur des intimés le ministre des Finances du Canada, le ministre des Affaires étrangères du Canada, le ministre du Commerce international du Canada et le procureur général du Canada : Le sous-procureur général du Canada, Ottawa.

TAB 9

SUPREME COURT OF YUKON

Citation: *Yukon (Government of) v
Yukon Zinc Corporation*,
2022 YKSC 2

Date: 20220121
S.C. No. 19-A0067
Registry: Whitehorse

BETWEEN:

GOVERNMENT OF YUKON
as represented by the Minister of the Department of
Energy, Mines and Resources

PETITIONER

AND

YUKON ZINC CORPORATION

RESPONDENT

Before Chief Justice S.M. Duncan

Counsel for the Petitioner

John T. Porter and
Kimberly Sova (by video)

No one appearing

Yukon Zinc Corporation

Counsel for Welichem Research
General Partnership

H. Lance Williams and
Forrest Finn (by video)

Counsel for
PricewaterhouseCoopers Inc.

Tevia Jeffries and
Emma Newbery (by video)

REASONS FOR DECISION

Introduction

[1] The court-appointed Receiver, PricewaterhouseCoopers Inc., brings two applications: one for Orders approving the sale of certain mineral claims and related

assets of Yukon Zinc Corporation (“Yukon Zinc”) to Almaden Minerals Ltd. (“Almaden”) and for the termination of the sale and investment solicitation plan (the “SISP”), and the second for an Order sealing the Receiver’s Confidential Supplemental Eighth Report to the Court, with appendices, currently unfiled.

[2] The Government of Yukon supports these applications. The applications are unopposed or subject to no position taken by Welichem Research General Partnership (“Welichem”) a secured creditor of Yukon Zinc and lessor of items comprising substantially all of the infrastructure, tools, vehicles and equipment at the Wolverine Mine (the “Mine”). No other interested party appeared on the application or made submissions.

[3] For the following reasons, I will grant the Orders requested, subject to certain conditions as set out below.

Background

[4] These applications arise in the context of the ongoing receivership of all the assets, undertakings and property of Yukon Zinc. Its principal asset is the Mine, a zinc-silver-lead mine located 282 km northeast of Whitehorse, Yukon. It holds 2,945 quartz mineral claims, a quartz mining license issued under the *Quartz Mining Act*, SY 2003, c.14, and a water licence issued under the *Waters Act*, SY 2003, c.19. Yukon Zinc carried out exploration and development activities between 2008 and 2011. The Mine began production in March 2012. In January 2015, the Mine ceased operating because of financial difficulties and was put into care and maintenance. Despite a successful restructuring in October 2015, Yukon Zinc was unable to obtain additional funds to operate the Mine and it continued in care and maintenance. In 2017, the underground

portion of the Mine flooded and contaminated water was diverted to the tailings storage facility, creating an increased risk of the release of untreated water into the environment. In May 2018, the Yukon government requested from Yukon Zinc an increase in reclamation security from \$10,588,966 to \$35,548,650 to enable it to address the deteriorating condition of the Mine. Yukon Zinc never provided this increased amount. In September 2019, the Yukon government's petition for the appointment of the Receiver of Yukon Zinc's property and assets was granted by this Court. By October 2019, Yukon Zinc had not filed a proposal in the bankruptcy matter, commenced in British Columbia, and Yukon Zinc was deemed to have made an assignment into bankruptcy. PricewaterhouseCoopers Inc. was appointed the trustee in bankruptcy.

[5] Pursuant to s. 243(1) of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3 as amended (the "*BIA*"), the Receiver became responsible for the care and maintenance of the Mine. It developed the SISP that proposed the evaluation of bids for the assets and property of Yukon Zinc on various factors. The SISP was approved by the Court on May 26, 2020 but was stayed pending the outcome of an appeal by Welichem. The Court's approval was confirmed on appeal.

[6] The sale process began in April 2021. The Receiver contacted 559 potential bidders, advertised the SISP on-line and through media in British Columbia and Yukon and encouraged other stakeholders such as Yukon government and the Kaska Nation to provide additional contacts. Eighteen potential bidders signed non-disclosure agreements and were given access to the data room. By June 2021 several entities submitted non-binding expressions of interest. Throughout the summer of 2021, the

Receiver held multiple calls with each of these potential bidders to discuss their plans and ensure the Receiver understood them, to explain and clarify the SISP evaluation criteria, and to support the bidders' due diligence work, including providing explanations of the regulatory requirements. The Receiver also discussed the progress of the SISP regularly with Yukon government and the Kaska Nation. The binding bid deadline was extended and by July the Receiver had received several binding bids. The Receiver began to evaluate these bids. By September 2021, however, some bidders withdrew from the process for various reasons. These withdrawals were confirmed in writing by the Receiver (the "Removal Letters").

[7] On completion of the evaluation of the remaining bids, the Receiver concluded that no bid could result in a viable sale of substantially all of Yukon Zinc's assets. The Receiver advised the relevant stakeholders by letter, after consultation with Yukon government, that the sale process would be terminated (the "Termination Letters"). The Receiver also determined at that time that the preferred approach was to transfer the care and maintenance to the Yukon government.

[8] In June 2021, the Receiver received a non-binding expression of interest and subsequently a binding bid from Almaden for a small portion of the assets of Yukon Zinc, the Logan interests. Almaden had entered into a joint venture agreement with Yukon Zinc (then called Expatriate Resources Ltd.) in 2005. This agreement led to the forming of a contractual joint venture to explore and develop the Logan interests. No such activity was ever commenced. The Logan interests consist of 156 mineral claims located approximately 100 km south of the Mine. Under the joint venture, Yukon Zinc

had an interest of 60% and Almaden 40%. Almaden offered to purchase the Yukon Zinc 60% interest.

[9] The Receiver believes the Almaden bid could be a viable sale of the Logan interests and has entered into a purchase and sale agreement with Almaden for this purpose, subject to court approval.

[10] The Receiver has submitted copies of the non-binding expressions of interest, binding bids, Removal letters, Termination letters, the Almaden bid, and the Almaden purchase agreement as attachments to the Receiver's Confidential Supplemental Eighth Report. All of these documents along with the report are considered to contain sensitive commercial information and the Receiver seeks a sealing order over them.

Approval of Sale to Almaden

[11] Subsections 3(k) and (l) of the Receiver's powers set out in the Order dated September 13, 2019 provide the Receiver with express power and authority to market any or all of the Yukon Zinc assets, undertakings or property, including advertising and soliciting offers for all or part of the property, negotiating appropriate terms and conditions, as well as authority to sell, convey, transfer, lease or assign the property with approval of this Court if the transaction exceeds \$150,000.

[12] The SISP sets out at s. 22 the evaluation criteria for qualified purchase bids.

They are:

- (a) Price;
- (b) Structural complexity of the proposed transaction;
- (c) Nature and sufficiency of funding for the proposed transaction;

- (d) Probability of closing the proposed transaction and any relevant risks thereto, including nature of any remaining conditions and due diligence requirements;
- (e) Whether the proposed transaction leaves any of the YZC [Yukon Zinc Corporation] Assets within the receivership;
- (f) Impact on former employees of YZC;
- (g) Bidder's financial strength, technical and environmental expertise and relevant experience to carry out work required to maintain regulatory compliance at the Wolverine Mine after closing of the proposed transaction;
- (h) Bidder's historical environmental safety record, operational experience with undertakings of similar nature and/or scale and record of successful restart of mines out of care and maintenance;
- (i) Strength of a bidder's proposal for posted required Reclamation Security as required by the DEMR [Department of Energy, Mines and Resources] and any other security required by any other applicable regulator;
- (j) Qualified Bidder's willingness and demonstrated ability to obtain and maintain any necessary regulatory approval in connection with ownership and operation or care and maintenance of the Wolverine Mine, including from but not limited to the Water Board and the DEMR;
- (k) Benefits that may accrue to Yukon residents and businesses and the affected Kaska Nations of Ross River Dena Council, Liard First Nation, Kwadacha Nation and Dease River First Nation.

[13] The SISP also requires the Receiver to report to the Court on the outcome of the solicitation process, including whether it intends to proceed with any one or more of the qualified purchase bids. The applicable statutory obligations on the Receiver are set

out in s. 247(a) and (b) of the *BIA*: to act honestly and in good faith, and to deal with the property of the debtor in a commercially reasonable manner.

[14] The principles to be applied by a court in determining whether to approve a proposed sale by a receiver are set out in the leading case of *Royal Bank v Soundair Corp* (1991), 4 OR (3d) 1 (CA) at para. 16:

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

[15] Here, the Receiver made extensive efforts through direct and indirect contacts of potential bidders and advertising to obtain the best price for the assets. There is no evidence of any improvident actions by the Receiver. The Receiver spent time with each interested potential bidder to assist with their due diligence activities and other aspects of the bidding process.

[16] As the Receiver reported, a review of the submitted bids shows that Almaden was the only bidder specifically for the Logan interests. While other bidders referred to the Logan interests, and included them in their bids, their overall bids were withdrawn or unacceptable to the Receiver. Almaden provided the best price for the Logan interests. Almaden is an experienced mining exploration company based in Vancouver.

[17] The Receiver noted that although the Logan interests represent a small fraction of the Yukon Zinc assets and property, their sale will generate some funds for the estate

which is in the interests of all parties. Yukon government supports this sale and Welichem does not oppose it.

[18] The Almaden offer was obtained through the SISP process. This process was approved by the Court as fair, transparent and commercially efficacious.

[19] Finally, the evidence shows the SISP process was conducted by the Receiver honestly and in good faith. There is no suggestion or evidence of unfairness in the way the process was carried out.

[20] The finalizing of this sale process will be simple: the 60% interest in the Logan assets under the joint venture agreement will be transferred to Almaden. The other 40% are already in the name of Almaden. The commercial joint venture agreement will become defunct on closing. The Receiver advised the splitting off of these interests from the remainder of the assets and property would not be detrimental to any future sale process as they represent a small portion and there was no other bidder interested in solely the Logan interests. The cost to the Receiver of this transaction is reasonable given Almaden's existing agreement and interests.

[21] The Almaden Purchase Agreement, a redacted copy of which is included in the filed materials, is approved.

Termination of the SISP

[22] As noted above, the Receiver concluded that the SISP process did not lead to a viable sale. None of the bids was acceptable, either because the bidder withdrew from the process, or the bids contained conditions for closing or available consideration that were unacceptably uncertain. The specifics of each bid were not disclosed in the

publicly filed eighth report of the Receiver, for reasons of confidentiality. This issue is addressed below.

[23] In general, the reasons why certain bidders withdrew from the process included:

- (a) the realization during the SISP process of the need for the purchaser to obtain a new water licence instead of assuming the current water licence, a process which could take two years or more;
- (b) the possibility of ongoing litigation over the Welichem assets which remain at the site (the Court has been advised that the matter is in the process of settling, although the settlement agreement is not yet finalized);
- (c) the unknown extent and costs of reconstruction to make the Mine operational, given the flooded state of the underground part of the Mine and its questionable structural integrity;
- (d) the inability to determine potential value of the mineral claims because of an absence of updated exploration results; and
- (e) the uncertainty of reclamation or remediation costs and how they will be shared with the Yukon government.

[24] The Receiver explained that there was not one issue that presented a bar to the bidders who withdrew or were rejected; the concerns were different for each bidder.

[25] The Order approving the SISP or the SISP do not contain a provision for termination of the SISP process. However, s. 30(a) of the SISP states that the Receiver, in consultation with Yukon government, may reject at any time any bid that is:

- (i) inadequate or insufficient;

- (ii) not in conformity with the requirements of the BIA, this SISP or any orders of the Court applicable to YZC or the Receiver; or
- (iii) contrary to the interests of YZC's estate and stakeholders as determined by the Receiver;

[26] Further, s. 23(f) of the SISP contemplates the possibility that the Receiver may report to the Court that it will not proceed with any one or more of the bids.

[27] The jurisprudence offers little guidance on the role of the court in a situation of termination of a sales process in the event of no acceptable bidders. The Receiver noted one decision in which the Supreme Court of British Columbia observed it saw no reason why the Receiver could not recommend against completion of a sale, and that it had a duty to advise the court of any reason why the court might conclude the sale should not be approved (*Bank of Montreal v On-Stream Natural Gas Ltd Partnership* (1992), 29 CBR (3) 203 (BC SC) at para. 24).

[28] The case law is clear that in reviewing a sales process the court is to defer to the business expertise of the Receiver, and is not to intervene or “second guess” the Receiver’s recommendations and conclusions (*Royal Bank of Canada v Keller & Sons Farming Ltd*, 2016 MBCA 46 at para. 11). The court is to ensure the integrity of the process is maintained through the exercise of procedural fairness in any negotiations and bidding.

... The court should not proceed against the recommendations of its Receiver except in special circumstances and where the necessity and propriety of doing so are plain. ... [*Crown Trust Co v Rosenberg* (1986), 60 OR (2d) 87 (H Ct J) at para. 65]

[29] Here, the Receiver undertook a thorough process in attempting to attract and identify an acceptable bidder and ultimate purchaser, in consultation with Yukon

government and the Kaska Nation. By its own account, it provided substantial assistance to potential bidders throughout the summer of 2021, including extending deadlines, participating in multiple calls to clarify and understand their proposals, and providing them with necessary information and connections to enable them to complete their due diligence. The SISP has already been approved as fair and reasonable by this Court and as noted above, the Receiver's appears to have implemented the SISP fairly and in good faith.

[30] Yukon government agreed with the termination of the SISP, indicating that the Receiver's good faith efforts were the best that could be achieved at this time.

Welichem did not oppose the termination of the SISP.

[31] While the confidential documents set out the more detailed reasons why the Receiver has concluded there are no appropriate bidders, scrutiny or assessment of these reasons is not the Court's role.

[32] I note that the SISP process may have some value for future in that entities with interest in the project were identified and educated about the process, and a large amount of information was gathered and learned about the Mine both by the interested parties and the Receiver in consultation with Yukon government and the Kaska Nation. This may have some value for future bidding or sales processes.

[33] For these reasons, the termination of the SISP is approved. The draft Approval and Vesting Order filed by the Receiver on this application is approved, with appropriate adjustments to reflect appearances of counsel.

Sealing Order

[34] The Receiver seeks an order sealing its Confidential Supplemental Eighth Report to the Court containing the results of the SISP and attached documents. The report sets out details of the process including:

- (a) the names of the bidders, and the kind of work the Receiver engaged in over the summer of 2021 to advance the bids according to the evaluation criteria;
- (b) the details of each bid, including price and conditions;
- (c) the challenges of each bid;
- (d) the Receiver's review and application of the evaluation criteria; and
- (e) the reasons why certain bidders withdrew or were eliminated from the process.

[35] The documents attached to the report include unredacted:

- (a) expressions of interest;
- (b) binding bids;
- (c) Removal Letters;
- (d) Termination Letters;
- (e) Almaden's bid; and
- (f) Almaden's Purchase Agreement.

[36] The Receiver argues that the information in this report disclosing its application of the evaluation criteria and the challenges and problems with the bids, as well as the documents themselves, contain sensitive commercial information that would cause harm to any future efforts to market the Mine. Information about the identity of bidders, the proposed purchase prices, the proposed terms and conditions, the reasons for the

bidders' withdrawal or rejection would affect the possibility of free and open negotiation in any future sale process.

[37] The two-part test for a sealing order was set out in *Sierra Club of Canada v Canada (Minister of Finance)*, 2002 SCC 41 ("*Sierra Club*") at 543-44:

- (a) such an order is necessary in order to prevent a serious risk to an important interest, including a commercial interest, in the context of litigation because reasonably alternative measures will not prevent the risk; and
- (b) the salutary effects of the [sealing] order including the effects on the right of civil litigants to a fair trial, outweigh its deleterious effects, including the effects on the right to free expression, which in this context includes the public interest in open and accessible court proceedings.

[38] The recent Supreme Court of Canada decision of *Sherman Estate v Donovan*, 2021 SCC 25 ("*Sherman Estate*") confirmed the test set out in *Sierra Club* continues to be an appropriate guide for judicial discretion (at para.43), and added the following three core prerequisites to be met before the imposition of a sealing order at para. 38:

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

[39] In the insolvency context, especially where there is a sale process, it is a standard practice to keep all aspects of the bidding or sales process confidential.

Courts have found this appropriately meets the *Sierra Club* test as modified by *Sherman Estate*, as sealing this information ensures the integrity of the sales and marketing

process and avoids misuse of information by bidders in a subsequent process to obtain an unfair advantage. The important public interest at stake is described as the commercial interests of the Receiver, bidders, creditors and stakeholders in ensuring a fair sales and marketing process is carried out, with all bidders on a level playing field.

[40] This requirement for confidentiality no longer exists when the sale process is completed and as a result any sealing order is generally lifted at that time. As noted by the court in the insolvency proceeding of *GE Canada Real Estate Financing Business Property Co v 1262354 Ontario Inc*, 2014 ONSC 1173 at paras. 33-34:

The purpose of granting such a sealing order is to protect the integrity and fairness of the sales process by ensuring that competitors or potential bidders do not obtain an unfair advantage by obtaining sensitive commercial information about the asset up for sale while others have to rely on their own resources to place a value on the asset when preparing their bids.

To achieve that purpose a sealing order typically remains in place until the closing of the proposed sales transaction. If the transaction closes, then the need for confidentiality disappears and the sealed materials can become part of the public court file. If the transaction proposed by the receiver does not close for some reason, then the materials remain sealed so that the confidential information about the asset under sale does not become available to potential bidders in the next round of bidding, thereby preventing them from gaining an unfair advantage in their subsequent bids. The integrity of the sale process necessitates keeping all bids confidential until a final sale of the assets has taken place. [emphasis added].

[41] *Look Communications Inc v Look Mobile Corp* (2009), 183 ACWS (3d) 736 (Ont Sup Ct) (“*Look*”) was decided not in the insolvency context but in the context of a court-approved sales process requiring the appointment of a monitor, and a plan of arrangement under the *Business Corporations Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C.44. The facts

were like those of the case at bar in that only two of the five assets were sold through the initial sales process. The court ordered the monitor file an unredacted version of its report after the sale was completed and the monitor's certificate filed with the court. However, the company requested a further sealing of the report and documents for six months because it was continuing its efforts to sell the remaining assets and was in discussion with some of the same parties who submitted bids under the initial completed sales process. The court applied the principles in *Sierra Club*, noting that the "important commercial interest" must be more than the specific interest of the party requesting the confidentiality order, such as loss of business or profits. There must be a general principle at stake, such as a breach of a confidentiality agreement through the disclosure of the information.

[42] The court in *Look* noted at para. 17:

It is common when assets are being sold pursuant to a court process to seal the Monitor's report disclosing all of the various bids in case a further bidding process is required if the transaction being approved falls through. Invariably, no one comes back asking that the sealing order be set aside. That is because ordinarily all of the assets that were bid on during the court sale process end up being sold and approved by court order, and so long as the sale transaction or transactions closed, no one has any further interest in the information. In *8857574 Ontario Inc. v. Pizza Pizza Ltd.* (1994) 23 B.L.R. (2nd) 239, Farley J. discussed the fact that valuations submitted by a Receiver for the purpose of obtaining court approval are normally sealed. He pointed out that the purpose of that was to maintain fair play so that competitors or potential bidders do not obtain an unfair advantage by obtaining such information while others have to rely on their own resources. In that context, he stated that he thought the most appropriate sealing order in a court approval sale situation would be that the supporting valuation materials remain sealed until such time as the sale transaction had closed.

[43] The court in *Look* granted the company's request for a sealing order for a further six months, finding that even though the remaining sales would not occur under the original sale process, the commercial interest in ensuring the assets were sold for the benefit of all stakeholders was the same.

[44] Here, I acknowledge the importance of sealing the Receiver's Confidential Supplemental Eighth Report to the Court and attached documents during the sale process and until any ongoing sale process is complete. The important interest is the commercial interests of the bidders, the creditors, the stakeholders and maintaining the integrity of the sales process. The Receiver's counsel advised they represented to the bidders that the process would be confidential until completion. The bidders all signed non-disclosure agreements before they received access to the data. These interests outweigh the negative effects of a sealing order. Redaction of the documents or reports is not a reasonable alternative as virtually all of the information contained in the report and documents (other than the parts that are already public) is confidential for the reasons noted.

[45] The issue of a future sales process of some kind however, is far less certain than it was in *Look*, where the new sales process was underway at the time of the court application. All parties in this case agree that the current Receiver-led SISP process is exhausted, and the unopposed or supported request for court approval of its termination confirms this. The Receiver has no intention of starting a new sales process.

[46] Counsel for Yukon government indicated that they would be open to discussing the sale of some or all of the Yukon Zinc assets in future if approached by a potential purchaser. Yukon government confirmed it had no intention of commencing a similar

sales process to the SISF in the near future, as their priority will be care and maintenance of the Mine when this responsibility is transitioned from the Receiver to them, likely in the fall of 2022.

[47] The Receiver noted in its public reports several of the ongoing issues affecting a potential sale. These include the regulatory complexities of obtaining a new water licence, the uncertainty of the responsibilities and costs of restoring the Mine to an operable state, the uncertain value of the mineral claims, and the possibility of ongoing litigation over the Welichem assets if a settlement is not achieved. Unless one or more of these factors changes, the possibility of a future sale is unlikely, in the Receiver's view. This is different from *Look*, where the new sales process had commenced at the time the sealing order was requested.

[48] The Supreme Court of Canada has emphasized the importance of the fundamental principle of open and accessible court proceedings. Court openness is protected by the constitutional guarantee of freedom of expression and is essential to the proper functioning of our democracy (*Canadian Broadcasting Corp v New Brunswick (Attorney General)*, [1996] 3 SCR 480 at para. 23 ("*New Brunswick*"); *Vancouver Sun (Re)*, 2004 SCC 43 at paras. 23-26). Public and media access to the courts is the way in which the judicial process is scrutinized and criticized. "The open court principle has been described as "the very soul of justice," guaranteeing that justice is administered in a non-arbitrary manner" (*New Brunswick* at para. 22). There is a strong presumption in favour of court openness. Judicial discretion in determining confidentiality or sealing orders must be exercised against this backdrop.

[49] Given these unique factual circumstances, and applying the legal principles described above, I conclude the following in relation to sealing the materials.

[50] Once the Almaden sale is complete, and the Receiver's certificate has been filed with the Court, the redacted material related to Almaden's purchase of the Logan Interests will be unsealed. The Receiver has disclosed most of the information related to this purchase and sale but some information such as the purchase price remains redacted. As the sale of this portion of the assets will be over once this transaction is completed, there is no reason to continue to seal the Almaden documents contained in the Confidential Supplemental Eighth Report to Court that have not already been disclosed.

[51] The remoteness of a future sale of the remaining assets evident from the Receiver's materials and submissions means that the length of a sealing order could be indefinite. As noted in *Sierra Club* at 545, a court is to restrict the sealing order as much as is reasonably possible while preserving the important interest in question. While it is still in the public interest to maintain the sealing order where a future sale is a possibility, at some point that possibility may no longer be realistic. Or, so much time will have passed that the information in the original bids may have little relationship to the actual situation so the importance of the interest to be protected is diminished.

[52] The Receiver in this case advised that some of the current circumstances that prevented the success of the sales process would have to change before a sale is likely. Yukon government confirmed that their focus in the near term will be on care and maintenance issues and not on the longer term issues related to remediation, reconstruction, or water licence. It is possible, however, over the next few years, that

some of these circumstances may change. For example, the litigation between Welichem and the Receiver over its assets will either be settled or judicially determined, more clarity on the responsibilities for remediation or even further steps taken towards remediation and reconstruction may occur, or more work may be done to value the mineral claims. Some or all of these changes could lead to a successful sale.

[53] I will grant the sealing order over the Receiver's Confidential Supplemental Eighth Report to the Court, and attached documents, except for the documents related to the Almaden purchase once the Receiver's certificate is filed with the Court, for a period of three years, or until further order of this Court. The report shall be filed as of the date of these Reasons.

[54] The draft sealing order filed by the Receiver on this application should be modified to reflect the terms set out in these reasons and to reflect the presence of all counsel.

DUNCAN C.J.

TAB 10



CANADA

CONSOLIDATION

CODIFICATION

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act

Loi sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité

R.S.C., 1985, c. B-3

L.R.C. (1985), ch. B-3

Current to May 29, 2023

À jour au 29 mai 2023

Last amended on April 27, 2023

Dernière modification le 27 avril 2023

OFFICIAL STATUS OF CONSOLIDATIONS

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

Published consolidation is evidence

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

Inconsistencies in Acts

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

LAYOUT

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

NOTE

This consolidation is current to May 29, 2023. The last amendments came into force on April 27, 2023. Any amendments that were not in force as of May 29, 2023 are set out at the end of this document under the heading “Amendments Not in Force”.

CARACTÈRE OFFICIEL DES CODIFICATIONS

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

Codifications comme élément de preuve

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

Incompatibilité — lois

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

MISE EN PAGE

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

NOTE

Cette codification est à jour au 29 mai 2023. Les dernières modifications sont entrées en vigueur le 27 avril 2023. Toutes modifications qui n'étaient pas en vigueur au 29 mai 2023 sont énoncées à la fin de ce document sous le titre « Modifications non en vigueur ».

province, if this Part is in force in the province immediately before that subsection comes into force, this Part applies in respect of the province.

R.S., 1985, c. B-3, s. 242; 2002, c. 7, s. 85; 2007, c. 36, s. 57.

PART XI

Secured Creditors and Receivers

Court may appoint receiver

243 (1) Subject to subsection (1.1), on application by a secured creditor, a court may appoint a receiver to do any or all of the following if it considers it to be just or convenient to do so:

- (a) take possession of all or substantially all of the inventory, accounts receivable or other property of an insolvent person or bankrupt that was acquired for or used in relation to a business carried on by the insolvent person or bankrupt;
- (b) exercise any control that the court considers advisable over that property and over the insolvent person's or bankrupt's business; or
- (c) take any other action that the court considers advisable.

Restriction on appointment of receiver

(1.1) In the case of an insolvent person in respect of whose property a notice is to be sent under subsection 244(1), the court may not appoint a receiver under subsection (1) before the expiry of 10 days after the day on which the secured creditor sends the notice unless

- (a) the insolvent person consents to an earlier enforcement under subsection 244(2); or
- (b) the court considers it appropriate to appoint a receiver before then.

Definition of receiver

(2) Subject to subsections (3) and (4), in this Part, **receiver** means a person who

- (a) is appointed under subsection (1); or
- (b) is appointed to take or takes possession or control — of all or substantially all of the inventory, accounts receivable or other property of an insolvent person or bankrupt that was acquired for or used in relation to a

s'appliquer à la province en cause, la présente partie s'applique à toute province dans laquelle elle était en vigueur à l'entrée en vigueur de ce paragraphe.

L.R. (1985), ch. B-3, art. 242; 2002, ch. 7, art. 85; 2007, ch. 36, art. 57.

PARTIE XI

Créanciers garantis et séquestres

Nomination d'un séquestre

243 (1) Sous réserve du paragraphe (1.1), sur demande d'un créancier garanti, le tribunal peut, s'il est convaincu que cela est juste ou opportun, nommer un séquestre qu'il habilite :

- a) à prendre possession de la totalité ou de la quasi-totalité des biens — notamment des stocks et comptes à recevoir — qu'une personne insolvable ou un failli a acquis ou utilisés dans le cadre de ses affaires;
- b) à exercer sur ces biens ainsi que sur les affaires de la personne insolvable ou du failli le degré de prise en charge qu'il estime indiqué;
- c) à prendre toute autre mesure qu'il estime indiquée.

Restriction relative à la nomination d'un séquestre

(1.1) Dans le cas d'une personne insolvable dont les biens sont visés par le préavis qui doit être donné par le créancier garanti aux termes du paragraphe 244(1), le tribunal ne peut faire la nomination avant l'expiration d'un délai de dix jours après l'envoi de ce préavis, à moins :

- a) que la personne insolvable ne consente, aux termes du paragraphe 244(2), à l'exécution de la garantie à une date plus rapprochée;
- b) qu'il soit indiqué, selon lui, de nommer un séquestre à une date plus rapprochée.

Définition de séquestre

(2) Dans la présente partie, mais sous réserve des paragraphes (3) et (4), **séquestre** s'entend de toute personne qui :

- a) soit est nommée en vertu du paragraphe (1);
- b) soit est nommément habilitée à prendre — ou a pris — en sa possession ou sous sa responsabilité, aux termes d'un contrat créant une garantie sur des biens, appelé « contrat de garantie » dans la présente partie,

business carried on by the insolvent person or bankrupt — under

(i) an agreement under which property becomes subject to a security (in this Part referred to as a “security agreement”), or

(ii) a court order made under another Act of Parliament, or an Act of a legislature of a province, that provides for or authorizes the appointment of a receiver or receiver-manager.

Definition of *receiver* — subsection 248(2)

(3) For the purposes of subsection 248(2), the definition *receiver* in subsection (2) is to be read without reference to paragraph (a) or subparagraph (b)(ii).

Trustee to be appointed

(4) Only a trustee may be appointed under subsection (1) or under an agreement or order referred to in paragraph (2)(b).

Place of filing

(5) The application is to be filed in a court having jurisdiction in the judicial district of the locality of the debtor.

Orders respecting fees and disbursements

(6) If a receiver is appointed under subsection (1), the court may make any order respecting the payment of fees and disbursements of the receiver that it considers proper, including one that gives the receiver a charge, ranking ahead of any or all of the secured creditors, over all or part of the property of the insolvent person or bankrupt in respect of the receiver’s claim for fees or disbursements, but the court may not make the order unless it is satisfied that the secured creditors who would be materially affected by the order were given reasonable notice and an opportunity to make representations.

Meaning of *disbursements*

(7) In subsection (6), *disbursements* does not include payments made in the operation of a business of the insolvent person or bankrupt.

1992, c. 27, s. 89; 2005, c. 47, s. 115; 2007, c. 36, s. 58.

ou aux termes d’une ordonnance rendue sous le régime de toute autre loi fédérale ou provinciale prévoyant ou autorisant la nomination d’un séquestre ou d’un séquestre-gérant, la totalité ou la quasi-totalité des biens — notamment des stocks et comptes à recevoir — qu’une personne insolvable ou un failli a acquis ou utilisés dans le cadre de ses affaires.

Définition de *séquestre* — paragraphe 248(2)

(3) Pour l’application du paragraphe 248(2), la définition de *séquestre*, au paragraphe (2), s’interprète sans égard à l’alinéa a) et aux mots « ou aux termes d’une ordonnance rendue sous le régime de toute autre loi fédérale ou provinciale prévoyant ou autorisant la nomination d’un séquestre ou d’un séquestre-gérant ».

Syndic

(4) Seul un syndic peut être nommé en vertu du paragraphe (1) ou être habilité aux termes d’un contrat ou d’une ordonnance mentionné à l’alinéa (2)b).

Lieu du dépôt

(5) La demande de nomination est déposée auprès du tribunal compétent dans le district judiciaire de la localité du débiteur.

Ordonnances relatives aux honoraires et débours

(6) Le tribunal peut, relativement au paiement des honoraires et débours du séquestre nommé en vertu du paragraphe (1), rendre toute ordonnance qu’il estime indiquée, y compris une ordonnance portant que la réclamation de celui-ci à l’égard de ses honoraires et débours est garantie par une sûreté de premier rang sur tout ou partie des biens de la personne insolvable ou du failli, avec préséance sur les réclamations de tout créancier garanti; le tribunal ne peut toutefois déclarer que la réclamation du séquestre est ainsi garantie que s’il est convaincu que tous les créanciers garantis auxquels l’ordonnance pourrait sérieusement porter atteinte ont été avisés à cet égard suffisamment à l’avance et se sont vu accorder l’occasion de se faire entendre.

Sens de *débours*

(7) Pour l’application du paragraphe (6), ne sont pas comptés comme débours les paiements effectués dans le cadre des opérations propres aux affaires de la personne insolvable ou du failli.

1992, ch. 27, art. 89; 2005, ch. 47, art. 115; 2007, ch. 36, art. 58.

forthwith provide a copy thereof to the Superintendent and

(a) to the insolvent person or the trustee (in the case of a bankrupt); and

(b) to any creditor of the insolvent person or the bankrupt who requests a copy at any time up to six months after the end of the receivership.

1992, c. 27, s. 89.

Intellectual property — sale or disposition

246.1 (1) If the insolvent person or the bankrupt is a party to an agreement that grants to another party a right to use intellectual property that is included in a sale or disposition by the receiver, that sale or disposition does not affect that other party's right to use the intellectual property — including the other party's right to enforce an exclusive use — during the term of the agreement, including any period for which the other party extends the agreement as of right, as long as the other party continues to perform its obligations under the agreement in relation to the use of the intellectual property.

Intellectual property — disclaimer or resiliation

(2) If the insolvent person or the bankrupt is a party to an agreement that grants to another party a right to use intellectual property, the disclaimer or resiliation of that agreement by the receiver does not affect that other party's right to use the intellectual property — including the other party's right to enforce an exclusive use — during the term of the agreement, including any period for which the other party extends the agreement as of right, as long as the other party continues to perform its obligations under the agreement in relation to the use of the intellectual property.

2018, c. 27, s. 268.

Good faith, etc.

247 A receiver shall

(a) act honestly and in good faith; and

(b) deal with the property of the insolvent person or the bankrupt in a commercially reasonable manner.

1992, c. 27, s. 89.

Powers of court

248 (1) Where the court, on the application of the Superintendent, the insolvent person, the trustee (in the case of a bankrupt), a receiver or a creditor, is satisfied that the secured creditor, the receiver or the insolvent person is failing or has failed to carry out any duty imposed by sections 244 to 247, the court may make an order, on such terms as it considers proper,

a) à la personne insolvable ou, en cas de faillite, au syndic;

b) à tout créancier de la personne insolvable ou du failli qui en fait la demande au plus tard six mois après que le séquestre a complété l'exercice de ses attributions en l'espèce.

1992, ch. 27, art. 89.

Propriété intellectuelle — disposition

246.1 (1) Si la personne insolvable ou le failli est partie à un contrat qui autorise une autre partie à utiliser un droit de propriété intellectuelle qui est compris dans une disposition d'actifs par le séquestre, cette disposition n'empêche pas l'autre partie d'utiliser le droit en question ni d'en faire respecter l'utilisation exclusive, à condition que cette autre partie respecte ses obligations contractuelles à l'égard de l'utilisation de ce droit, et ce, pour la période prévue au contrat et pour toute prolongation de celle-ci dont elle se prévaut de plein droit.

Propriété intellectuelle — résiliation

(2) Si la personne insolvable ou le failli est partie à un contrat qui autorise une autre partie à utiliser un droit de propriété intellectuelle, la résiliation de ce contrat par le séquestre n'empêche pas l'autre partie d'utiliser le droit en question ni d'en faire respecter l'utilisation exclusive, à condition que cette autre partie respecte ses obligations contractuelles à l'égard de l'utilisation de ce droit, et ce, pour la période prévue au contrat et pour toute prolongation de celle-ci dont elle se prévaut de plein droit.

2018, ch. 27, art. 268.

Obligation de diligence

247 Le séquestre doit gérer les biens de la personne insolvable ou du failli en toute honnêteté et de bonne foi, et selon des pratiques commerciales raisonnables.

1992, ch. 27, art. 89.

Pouvoirs du tribunal

248 (1) S'il est convaincu, à la suite d'une demande du surintendant, de la personne insolvable, du syndic — en cas de faillite —, du séquestre ou d'un créancier que le créancier garanti, le séquestre ou la personne insolvable ne se conforme pas ou ne s'est pas conformé à l'une ou l'autre des obligations que lui imposent les articles 244 à

TAB 11



CANADA

CONSOLIDATION

CODIFICATION

Bankruptcy and Insolvency General Rules

Règles générales sur la faillite et l'insolvabilité

C.R.C., c. 368

C.R.C., ch. 368

Current to May 29, 2023

À jour au 29 mai 2023

Last amended on March 25, 2011

Dernière modification le 25 mars 2011

OFFICIAL STATUS OF CONSOLIDATIONS

Subsections 31(1) and (3) of the *Legislation Revision and Consolidation Act*, in force on June 1, 2009, provide as follows:

Published consolidation is evidence

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

...

Inconsistencies in regulations

(3) In the event of an inconsistency between a consolidated regulation published by the Minister under this Act and the original regulation or a subsequent amendment as registered by the Clerk of the Privy Council under the *Statutory Instruments Act*, the original regulation or amendment prevails to the extent of the inconsistency.

LAYOUT

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

NOTE

This consolidation is current to May 29, 2023. The last amendments came into force on March 25, 2011. Any amendments that were not in force as of May 29, 2023 are set out at the end of this document under the heading “Amendments Not in Force”.

CARACTÈRE OFFICIEL DES CODIFICATIONS

Les paragraphes 31(1) et (3) de la *Loi sur la révision et la codification des textes législatifs*, en vigueur le 1^{er} juin 2009, prévoient ce qui suit :

Codifications comme élément de preuve

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

[...]

Incompatibilité — règlements

(3) Les dispositions du règlement d'origine avec ses modifications subséquentes enregistrées par le greffier du Conseil privé en vertu de la *Loi sur les textes réglementaires* l'emportent sur les dispositions incompatibles du règlement codifié publié par le ministre en vertu de la présente loi.

MISE EN PAGE

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

NOTE

Cette codification est à jour au 29 mai 2023. Les dernières modifications sont entrées en vigueur le 25 mars 2011. Toutes modifications qui n'étaient pas en vigueur au 29 mai 2023 sont énoncées à la fin de ce document sous le titre « Modifications non en vigueur ».

General

2 Documents that by the Act are to be prescribed must be in the form prescribed, with any modifications that the circumstances require and subject to any deviations permitted by section 32 of the *Interpretation Act*, and must be used in proceedings under the Act.

SOR/92-579, s. 3; SOR/98-240, s. 1; SOR/2007-61, s. 2(E).

3 In cases not provided for in the Act or these Rules, the courts shall apply, within their respective jurisdictions, their ordinary procedure to the extent that that procedure is not inconsistent with the Act or these Rules.

SOR/98-240, s. 1.

4 If a period of less than six days is provided for the doing of an act or the initiating of a proceeding under the Act or these Rules, calculation of the period does not include Saturdays or holidays.

SOR/98-240, s. 1; SOR/2007-61, s. 63(E).

5 (1) Subject to subsection (2), a notice or other document that is received by a Division Office outside of its business hours is deemed to have been received

(a) on the next business day of that Division Office, if it was received

(i) between the end of business hours and midnight, local time, on a business day, or

(ii) on a Saturday or holiday; or

(b) at the beginning of business hours of that Division Office, if it was received between midnight and the beginning of business hours, local time, on a business day.

(2) Subsection (1) does not apply to documents related to proceedings under Part III of the Act that are filed by facsimile.

SOR/78-389, s. 1; SOR/92-579, s. 4; SOR/98-240, s. 1; SOR/2005-284, s. 1.

6 (1) Unless otherwise provided in the Act or these Rules, every notice or other document given or sent pursuant to the Act or these Rules must be served, delivered personally, or sent by mail, courier, facsimile or electronic transmission.

(2) Unless otherwise provided in these Rules, every notice or other document given or sent pursuant to the Act or these Rules

(a) must be received by the addressee at least four days before the event to which it relates, if it is served,

Dispositions générales

2 Les documents à prescrire au titre de la Loi sont en la forme prescrite, avec les adaptations nécessaires et les différences de présentation permises par l'article 32 de la *Loi d'interprétation*, et sont utilisés dans les procédures engagées sous le régime de la Loi.

DORS/92-579, art. 3; DORS/98-240, art. 1; DORS/2007-61, art. 2(A).

3 Dans les cas non prévus par la Loi ou les présentes règles, les tribunaux appliquent, dans les limites de leur compétence respective, leur procédure ordinaire dans la mesure où elle est compatible avec la Loi et les présentes règles.

DORS/98-240, art. 1.

4 Lorsqu'un délai de moins de six jours est prévu pour accomplir un acte ou tenter une procédure en vertu de la Loi ou des présentes règles, les samedis et les jours fériés n'entrent pas dans le calcul du délai.

DORS/98-240, art. 1; DORS/2007-61, art. 63(A).

5 (1) Sous réserve du paragraphe (2), les avis et autres documents que le bureau de division reçoit en dehors des heures d'ouverture sont réputés reçus :

a) le premier jour ouvrable suivant de ce bureau, s'ils sont reçus :

(i) après les heures d'ouverture et avant minuit, heure locale, un jour ouvrable,

(ii) le samedi ou un jour férié;

b) au début des heures d'ouverture de ce bureau, s'ils sont reçus entre minuit et le début des heures d'ouverture, heure locale, un jour ouvrable.

(2) Le paragraphe (1) ne s'applique pas aux documents concernant les procédures fondées sur la partie III de la Loi qui sont déposés par télécopieur.

DORS/78-389, art. 1; DORS/92-579, art. 4; DORS/98-240, art. 1; DORS/2005-284, art. 1.

6 (1) Sauf disposition contraire de la Loi ou des présentes règles, les avis et autres documents à remettre ou à envoyer sous le régime de la Loi ou des présentes règles sont signifiés, remis en mains propres ou envoyés par courrier, par service de messagerie, par télécopieur ou par transmission électronique.

(2) Sauf disposition contraire des présentes règles, les avis et autres documents à remettre ou à envoyer sous le régime des présentes règles :

a) doivent être reçus par le destinataire au moins quatre jours avant l'événement auquel ils se