Court File No. CV-10-8561-00CL

ONTARIO

SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE

(COMMERCIAL LIST)

IN THE MATTER OF the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT of SIGNATURE ALUMINUM CANADA INC.

Applicant

FACTUM OF THE APPLICANT

PART I – OVERVIEW

1. Signature Aluminum Canada Inc. (the "Applicant") seeks (i) an extension of the initial stay period to and including May 14, 2010 (the "Stay Extension"), and (ii) approval of a claims process for the determination of claims of creditors against the Applicant for voting and/or distribution purposes (the "Claims Procedure").

2. The Stay Extension is needed to provide stability while the Applicant continues to pursue a restructuring of its business and is appropriate in the circumstances because the Applicant has acted, and continues to act in good faith and with due diligence with a view to pursuing either a going concern sale of its business or the negotiation and implementation of a plan of arrangement or compromise (a "Plan") with its creditors.

3. If the Applicant pursues a Plan, the Claims Procedure will enable the Applicant and the Monitor to review and process potential claims so that the Applicant will be in a position to negotiate the terms of a Plan with its creditors and to call a meeting of such creditors for the purposes of voting on the Plan.

PART II – FACTS

4. The facts are set out in the affidavit of Parminder Punia sworn February 22, 2010 and are briefly summarized below.[1]

Background

5. On January 29, 2010, the Applicant filed for and obtained protection from its creditors under the *Companies Creditors Arrangement Act* (the "CCAA"), pursuant to an order of the Honourable Mr. Justice Morawetz (the "Initial Order"). Pursuant to the Initial Order, FTI Consulting Canada Inc. was appointed as Monitor of the Applicant (the "Monitor").[2]

6. In order to facilitate a restructuring and enable a going concern solution, Biscayne Metals Finance, L.L.C. ("Biscayne"), a senior secured creditor of the Applicant which is an indirect affiliate of the Applicant, agreed to the terms of a Plan Support Agreement dated January 28, 2010 with the Applicant (the "Plan Support Agreement") pursuant to which Biscayne has agreed to fund a Plan, subject to and in accordance with the terms of the Plan Support Agreement or, at its option, together with 3241715 Nova Scotia Limited purchase the assets of the Applicant (the "Credit Bid").[3]

7. The Initial Order authorized a marketing process (the "Marketing Process") to determine if it is possible to identify a purchaser for the Applicant's assets and business that would make a higher and better offer for the assets of the Applicant than it would receive under the Credit Bid. In such event, the Applicant intends to attend before the Court to seek approval of the additional steps necessary to determine the highest and best offer or series of offers, and complete the Marketing Process.[4]

---

[1] Affidavit of Parminder Punia sworn February 22, 2010 ["Punia Affidavit"].
[2] Punia Affidavit at paras. 3-4.
[3] Punia Affidavit at para. 5.
[4] Punia Affidavit at para. 6.

Restructuring Activities

8. Since the issuance of the Initial Order, the Applicant has been working diligently to stabilize its business and maintain operations in compliance with the cash projections filed with this Honourable Court.[5]

9. In summary, the Applicant has been implementing aggressive cost cutting measures, in accordance with its proposed budget, in an effort to make the business of the Applicant viable. This has included the continued rationalization of production at the Applicant's plant in Pickering, Ontario, the elimination of certain customer accounts that were not profitable, the negotiation of new prices and volumes with customers to enable production to be undertaken profitably, and, the reduction of the Applicant's salaried workforce by laying off approximately 34 employees from its management staff.[6]

Marketing Activities

10. Since the issuance of the Initial Order, the Applicant, the Monitor and the Applicant's financial advisor, CIBC Mid Market Investment Banking, a division of Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce ("CIBC"), have commenced and continue to implement the Marketing Process. CIBC has contacted 100 potentially interested parties. Of the parties contacted 39 received and executed confidentiality agreements and were sent a copy of the confidential information memorandum providing information about the Company, and were provided access to a data room containing additional information about the Company.[7]

11. In accordance with the Court approved Marketing Process, letters of intent are due on or before February 26, 2010. If no letters of intent that comply with the terms of the Plan Support Agreement are received from suitable bidders the Marketing

---

[5] Punia Affidavit at para. 7.
[6] Punia Affidavit at para. 8.
[7] Punia Affidavit at para. 12.

Process will cease and the Applicant will begin to work towards formulating and negotiating the Plan with its creditors.[8]

Projected Timeline

12. Upon cessation of the Marketing Process, the Plan Support Agreement requires that the Applicant use best efforts to (i) obtain an order on or prior to May 7, 2010 approving the filing of the Plan and scheduling a date for a meeting of the Applicant's creditors to vote on the Plan (the "Creditors' Meeting"), (ii) hold the Creditors' Meeting on or before June 2, 2010 and (iii) implement a Plan on or before June 7, 2010.[9]

PART III – ISSUES AND THE LAW

13. This Honourable Court must determine the following:

(a) Should this Honourable Court approve the requested Stay Extension?

(b) Should this Honourable Court approve the Claims Procedure?

A. Extension of the Stay of Proceedings

14. The Court has the authority pursuant to section 11.02(2) to extend the stay of proceedings beyond the period provided for in the Initial Order.[10] However, the Court must be satisfied that (a) the circumstances exist that make the order appropriate and (b) the Applicant has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence.[11]

15. The Applicant requires a stable environment within which to restructure its business through either a Plan, or through a sale of its business as a going concern. In order to permit the Applicant to complete the Marketing Process, in the event that letters of intent are received, or in the alternative develop the details of a Plan in conjunction with the Monitor and interested stakeholders in accordance with the timeline provided

---

[8] Punia Affidavit at para. 13.
[9] Punia Affidavit at para. 16.
[10] CCAA, s.11.02(2).
[11] CCAA, s.11.02(3).

for by the Plan Support Agreement, it is appropriate to extend the stay of proceedings to May 14, 2010.

16. Cashflow Projections have been filed with the First Report indicating the Applicant has sufficient financial resources available to it throughout this period.[12]

17. The Applicant has been acting diligently as it has taken significant steps towards the implementation of its restructuring goals. The extension of the stay of proceedings will facilitate the continuation of these steps, which, if successful, will permit the Applicant to emerge from the protection of these CCAA proceedings as a viable going concern. The Applicant remains on course with its proposed timeline and its budget.[13]

18. The Monitor believes that the Applicant has acted in good faith and with due diligence and recommends the Stay Extension to May 14, 2010, and believes that creditors will not be materially prejudiced by the Stay Extension.[14] Moreover, the Applicant and the Monitor believe that the duration of the proposed extension is advantageous as it removes a degree of uncertainty among employees, customers and suppliers.[15]

19. Given that the circumstances exist that make the order appropriate and that the applicant has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence, this Honourable Court should grant the Stay Extension.

B. The Claims Procedure

20. Recently amended section 11 of the CCAA preserved the Court's authority to make any order that it considers appropriate subject to the restrictions set out in the CCAA.[16] The Court also has the inherent jurisdiction to control and regulate its process and proceedings.[17] The approval of a process that involves the identification and assessment by the Monitor and by a claims officer of claims against the Applicant (before such claims may be adjudicated before a judge of this Honourable Court), is a

---

[12] First Report of the Monitor dated February 23, 2010 at para. 54 [the "First Report"].
[13] Punia Affidavit at para. 24.
[14] First Report at paras. 55-57.
[15] First Report at para. 53.
[16] CCAA, s.11.
[17] *ScoZinc Ltd., Re* (2009), 53 C.B.R. (5th) 96 (N.S.S.C.) at para. 27 ["*ScoZinc*"].

valid exercise of the Court's inherent jurisdiction and the statutory authority conferred upon it pursuant to section 11 the CCAA.[18]

21. Moreover, the recent amendments to the CCAA have also confirmed the Court's authority to fix deadlines for the purposes of voting or distribution under a Plan. Section 12 of the CCAA provides that:

> **12.** The court may fix deadlines for the purposes of voting and for the purposes of distributions under a compromise or arrangement.

22. In addition, establishment of a claims process utilizing the Monitor and/or a claims officer by court orders is a well accepted practice.[19] In the CCAA proceedings of *ScoZinc Ltd.*, the Honourable Mr. Justice Beveridge of the Nova Scotia Supreme Court summarized this accepted practice at paras 23-24:

> The practice has arisen for the court to create by order a claims process that is both flexible and expeditious. The Monitor identifies, by review of the debtor's records, all potential claimants and sends to them a claim package. To ensure that all creditors come forward and participate on a timely basis, there is a provision in the claims process order requiring creditors to file their claims by a fixed date. If they do not, subject to further relief provided by the claims process order, or by the court, the creditor's claim is barred.
>
> If the Monitor disagrees with the claim, and the disagreement cannot be resolved, then a claimant can present its case to a claims officer who is usually given the power to adjudicate disputed claims, with the right of appeal to a judge of the court overseeing the *CCAA* proceedings.

23. The Claims Procedure mirrors the above described accepted practice. The key steps in the Claims Procedure can be summarized as follows (all capitalized terms not defined herein shall have the meaning given to them in the Claims Procedure):

(a) The Notice to Creditors, the Claims Procedure, a blank form of proof of claim and a blank form of notice of dispute will be posted on the Monitor's Website as soon as practicable after the issuance of an order approving the Claims Procedure;

---

[18] *ScoZinc* at para. 29.
[19] *ScoZinc* at para. 25.

(b) The Notice to Creditors will be published in the Globe and Mail (national edition) and La Presse on or around March 3, 2010;

(c) A Notice to Creditors along with either (i) a Notice of Claim (setting out the quantum of a creditor's claim as reflected in the Applicant's books and records), or (ii) a blank form of proof of claim will be sent to each Known Creditor with a Pre-Filing Claim on or around March 3, 2010;

(d) In the event of any action by the Applicant which gives rise to a Subsequent Claim, the Applicant is required to provide the Monitor with the details of the Subsequent Claimant and its Subsequent Claim, and, within three Business Days after receipt of these details, the Monitor, at its discretion, will send to the Subsequent Claimant either a Notice of Claim or a blank form of proof of claim, along with a Notice to Creditors;

(e) Any Claimant wishing to dispute its Notice of Claim must file a Notice of Dispute by the Claims Bar Date of March 26, 2010 in respect of a Pre-Filing Claim, or by the Subsequent Claims Bar Date in respect of a Subsequent Claim (the Subsequent Claims Bar Date is the later of (i) the Claims Bar Date and (ii) 15 days from the date of the Notice of Claim or Notice to Creditors, as applicable);

(f) Any person who does not receive a Notice of Claim and who wishes to assert a Claim must file a Proof of Claim by the Claims Bar Date of March 26, 2010 in respect of a Pre-Filing Claim, or by the Subsequent Claims Bar Date in respect of a Subsequent Claim;

(g) Proofs of Claim will be reviewed by the Monitor in consultation with the Applicant, and the Monitor shall either accept, revise or disallow the Claim in whole or in part by issuing a Notice of Revisions or Disallowance if it disagrees with the Claim as set out in the Proof of Claim;

(h) If a Claimant disagrees with the assessment of its Claim as set out in the Notice of Revision or Disallowance, it must deliver a Notice of Dispute within 15 days of the date of the Notice of Revision or Disallowance;

(i) Notices of Dispute will be reviewed by the Monitor in consultation with the Applicant, and the Monitor will advise a Claimant in writing if it does not accept all or any part of the Claim asserted in the Notice of Dispute and the Monitor may then:

  (i) Attempt to consensually resolve the classification and the amount of the Claim with the Claimant;

  (ii) Accept the Claim for voting and/or distribution purposes; and/or

  (iii) Refer the dispute to a claims officer; and

(j) Any decision of the Claims Officer may be appealed to the Court.

24. The Claims Procedure is consistent with section 20(2) of the CCAA, which allows an applicant to accept a claim for voting purposes under any Plan, without prejudice to the applicant's position to dispute the Claim for distribution purposes. As this is a Monitor run process, the Claims Procedure grants the Monitor this discretion.

25. The definition of "Subsequent Claim" takes into account the recent amendments to section 19(1) of the CCAA which now provides as follows:

> **19.** (1) Subject to subsection (2), the only claims that may be dealt with by a compromise or arrangement in respect of a debtor company are
>
> (a) claims that relate to debts or liabilities, present or future, to which the company is subject on the earlier of
>
> (i) the day on which proceedings commenced under this Act, and
>
> (ii) if the company filed a notice of intention under section 50.4 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or commenced proceedings under this Act with the consent of inspectors referred to in section 116 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, the date of the initial bankruptcy event within the meaning of section 2 of that Act; and
>
> (b) claims that relate to debts or liabilities, present or future, to which the company may become subject before the compromise or arrangement is sanctioned by reason of any obligation incurred by the company before the earlier of the days referred to in subparagraphs (*a*)(i) and (ii).

26. The definition of "Subsequent Claim" in the Applicant's Claims Procedure now mirrors the language of section 19(1) of the CCAA, but the intent of the definition remains in keeping with previous practice in that the Applicant intends to call for claims arising after the Filing Date as a result of the restructuring of the Applicant's business.

27. It is submitted that the Claims Procedure mirrors the accepted practice described by Justice Beveridge in *ScoZinc*. The Monitor believes it is appropriate to conduct the Claims Procedure at this time given the timeline that the Applicant has established for

its restructuring.[20] It is therefore submitted that the approval of the Claims Procedure is appropriate in the circumstances and accordingly, this Honourable Court should exercise its statutory discretion and inherent jurisdiction and approve the Claims Procedure.

PART IV – NATURE OF THE ORDER SOUGHT

28. As a result of the foregoing, the Applicant requests an Order approving, *inter alia*, (i) a Stay Extension to and including May 14, 2010, and (ii) the Claims Procedure.

ALL OF WHICH IS RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

FOR: Linc Rogers/Katherine McEachern

[20] First Report at para. 46.

TAB A

SCHEDULE "A"

CASE LAW

1. *ScoZinc Ltd., Re* (2009), 53 C.B.R. (5th) 96 (N.S.S.C.).

TAB 1

2009 CarswellNS 229, 2009 NSSC 136, 53 C.B.R. (5th) 96, 882 A.P.R. 251, 277 N.S.R. (2d) 251

C
2009 CarswellNS 229

ScoZinc Ltd., Re

In the Matter of The Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c.C-36, as amended

And In the Matter of A Plan of Compromise or Arrangement of ScoZinc Ltd. (Applicant)

Nova Scotia Supreme Court

D.R. Beveridge J.

Heard: April 3, 2009
Judgment: April 3, 2009
Written reasons: April 28, 2009
Docket: Hfx. 305549

Counsel: John G. Stringer, Q.C., Mr. Ben R. Durnford for Applicant

Robert MacKeigan, Q.C. for Grant Thornton

Subject: Insolvency

Bankruptcy and insolvency --- Proposal — Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act — Miscellaneous issues

Company was granted protection pursuant to s. 11 of Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act ("CCAA") — Monitor was appointed pursuant to s. 11.7 of CCAA — Determination of creditors' claims was set by claims procedure order ("order") — Three creditors submitted proofs of claim by claims bar date set out in order and then submitted revised proofs of claim after claims bar date, but before date set for monitor to complete assessment of claims — Monitor determined errors in proofs of claims were due to inadvertence and issued notice of revision or disallowance, allowing claims as revised if it was determined monitor had power to do so — Monitor brought motion for directions on whether it had authority to allow revision of claim by increasing it after claim's bar date but before date set for monitor to complete assessment of claims — Monitor had necessary authority — Court creates claims process by court order — Determination that claims had to initially be identified and assessed by monitor, and heard first by claims officer, was valid exercise of court's inherent jurisdiction — Logical and practical that monitor, as officer of court, be directed to fulfil analogous role to that of trustee under Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, and order accomplished this — Provision in order mandated monitor to review all proofs of claim filed on or before claims bar date and accept, revise or disallow them — While normally monitor's revision would be to reduce proof of claim, nothing in order so restricted monitor's authority — It did not matter that revised claims were submitted after claims bar date — In essence, monitor simply acted to revise proofs of claim already submitted to conform with evidence elicited by monitor or submitted to it.

Cases considered by *D.R. Beveridge J.*:

Air Canada, Re (2004), 2 C.B.R. (5th) 23, 2004 CarswellOnt 3320 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Blue Range Resource Corp., Re (2000), 2000 CarswellAlta 30, (sub nom. *Blue Range Resources Corp., Re)* 250 A.R. 239, (sub nom. *Blue Range Resources Corp., Re)* 213 W.A.C. 239, 15 C.B.R. (4th) 192, 2000 ABCA 16 (Alta. C.A. [In Chambers]) — referred to

Blue Range Resource Corp., Re (2000), 2000 ABCA 285, 2000 CarswellAlta 1145, [2001] 2 W.W.R. 477, (sub nom. *Enron Canada Corp. v. National-Oilwell Canada Ltd.)* 193 D.L.R. (4th) 314, 271 A.R. 138, 234 W.A.C. 138, 87 Alta. L.R. (3d) 352 (Alta. C.A.) — followed

Carlen Transport Inc. v. Juniper Lumber Co. (Monitor of) (2001), 21 C.B.R. (4th) 222, (sub nom. *Juniper Lumber Co., Re)* 233 N.B.R. (2d) 111, (sub nom. *Juniper Lumber Co., Re)* 601 A.P.R. 111, 2001 CarswellNB 21 (N.B. Q.B.) — referred to

Federal Gypsum Co., Re (2007), 2007 NSSC 384, 2007 CarswellNS 630, 261 N.S.R. (2d) 314, 835 A.P.R. 314, 40 C.B.R. (5th) 39 (N.S. S.C.) — referred to

Freeman, Re (1922), 55 N.S.R. 545, [1923] 1 D.L.R. 378, 1922 CarswellNS 57 (N.S. C.A.) — considered

Laidlaw Inc., Re (2002), 2002 CarswellOnt 790, 34 C.B.R. (4th) 72 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]) — referred to

Muscletech Research & Development Inc., Re (2006), 25 C.B.R. (5th) 231, 2006 CarswellOnt 6230 (Ont. S.C.J.) — referred to

Olympia & York Developments Ltd. v. Royal Trust Co. (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 1, (sub nom. *Olympia & York Developments Ltd., Re)* 12 O.R. (3d) 500, 1993 CarswellOnt 182 (Ont. Gen. Div.) — referred to

Pine Valley Mining Corp., Re (2008), 2008 CarswellBC 579, 2008 BCSC 356, 41 C.B.R. (5th) 43 (B.C. S.C.) — referred to

Siscoe & Savoie v. Royal Bank (1994), 1994 CarswellNB 14, 29 C.B.R. (3d) 1, 157 N.B.R. (2d) 42, 404 A.P.R. 42 (N.B. C.A.) — considered

Skeena Cellulose Inc., Re (2003), 2003 CarswellBC 1399, 2003 BCCA 344, 184 B.C.A.C. 54, 302 W.A.C. 54, 43 C.B.R. (4th) 187, 13 B.C.L.R. (4th) 236 (B.C. C.A.) — considered

Stelco Inc., Re (2005), 253 D.L.R. (4th) 109, 75 O.R. (3d) 5, 2 B.L.R. (4th) 238, 9 C.B.R. (5th) 135, 2005 CarswellOnt 1188, 196 O.A.C. 142 (Ont. C.A.) — considered

Triton Tubular Components Corp., Re (2005), 2005 CarswellOnt 4439, 14 C.B.R. (5th) 264 (Ont. S.C.J.) — referred to

Statutes considered:

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3

Generally — referred to

s. 135(2) — referred to

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36

Generally — referred to

s. 4 — considered

s. 5 — considered

s. 6 — considered

s. 11 — pursuant to

s. 11.7 [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

s. 11.7(1) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

s. 11.7(2) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

s. 11.7(3) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

s. 11.7(3)(d) [en. 1997, c. 12, s. 124] — considered

s. 12 — considered

s. 12(1) "claim" — considered

s. 12(2) — considered

Probate Act, R.S.N.S. 1900, c. 158

Generally — referred to

MOTION by monitor appointed under *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* for directions on whether it had authority to allow revision of claim after claim's bar date but before date set for monitor to complete its assessment of claims.

***D.R. Beveridge J.* (orally):**

1 On December 22, 2008 ScoZinc Ltd. was granted protection by way of a stay of proceedings of all claims against it pursuant to s.11 of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36. The stay has been

extended from time to time. Grant Thornton was appointed as the Monitor of the business and financial affairs of ScoZinc pursuant to s.11.7 of the *CCAA*.

2 The determination of creditors' claims was set by a Claims Procedure Order. This order set dates for the submission of claims to the Monitor, and for the Monitor to assess the claims. The Monitor brought a motion seeking directions from the court on whether it has the necessary authority to allow a revision of a claim after the claim's bar date but before the date set for the Monitor to complete its assessment of claims.

3 The motion was heard on April 3, 2009. At the conclusion of the hearing of the motion I concluded that the Monitor did have the necessary authority. I granted the requested order with reasons to follow. These are my reasons.

Background

4 The procedure for the identification and quantification of claims was established pursuant to my order of February 18, 2009. Any persons asserting a claim was to deliver to the Monitor a Proof of Claim by 5:00 p.m. on March 16, 2009, including a statement of account setting out the full details of the claim. Any claimant that did not deliver a Proof of Claim by the claims bar date, subject to the Monitor's agreement or as the court may otherwise order, would have its claim forever extinguished and barred from making any claim against ScoZinc.

5 The Monitor was directed to review all Proofs of Claim filed on or before March 16, 2009 and to accept, revise or disallow the claims. Any revision or disallowance was to be communicated by Notice of Revision or Disallowance, no later than March 27, 2009. If a creditor disagreed with the assessment of the Monitor, it could dispute the assessment before a Claims Officer and ultimately to a judge of the Supreme Court.

6 The three claims that have triggered the Monitor's motion for directions were submitted by Acadian Mining Corporation, Royal Roads Corp., and Komatsu International (Canada) Inc.

7 ScoZinc is 100% owned by Acadian Mining Corp. Theso two corporations share office space, managerial staff, and have common officers and directors. Acadian Mining is a substantial shareholder in Royal Roads and also have some common officers and directors.

8 Originally Royal Roads asserted a claim as a secured creditor on the basis of a first charge security held by it on ScoZinc's assets for a loan in the amount of approximately $2.3 million. Acadian Mining also claimed to be a secured creditor due to a second charge on ScoZinc's assets securing approximately $23.5 million of debt. Both Royal Roads and Acadian Mining have released their security. Each company submitted Proofs of Claim dated March 4, 2009 as unsecured creditors.

9 Royal Roads claim was for $579, 964.62. The claim by Acadian Mining was for $23,761.270.20. John Rawding, Financial Officer for Acadian Mining and ScoZinc, prepared the Proofs of Claim for both Royal Roads and Acadian Mining. It appears from the affidavit and materials submitted, and the Monitor's fifth report dated March 31, 2009 that there were errors in each of the Proofs of Claim.

10 Mr. Rawding incorrectly attributed $1,720,035.38 as debt by Acadian Mining to Royal Roads when it should have been debt owed by ScoZinc to Royal Roads. In addition, during year end audit procedures for Royal Roads, Acadian Mining and ScoZinc, other erroneous entries were discovered. The total claim that should have been advanced by Royal Roads was $2,772,734.19.

11 The appropriate claim that should have been submitted by Acadian Mining was $22,041,234.82, a reduction of $1,720,035.38. Both Royal Roads and Acadian Mining submitted revised Proofs of Claim on March 25, 2009

with supporting documentation.

12 The third claim is by Komatsu. Its initial Proof of Claim was dated March 16, 2009 for both secured and unsecured claims of $4,245,663.78. The initial claim did not include a secured claim for the equipment that had been returned to Komatsu, nor include a claim for equipment that was still being used by ScoZinc. A revised Proof of Claim was filed by Komatsu on March 26, 2009.

13 The Monitor, sets out in its fifth report dated March 31, 2009, that after reviewing the relevant books and records, the errors in the Proofs of Claim by Royal Roads, Acadian Mining and Komatsu were due to inadvertence. For all of these claims it issued a Notice of Revision or Disallowance on March 27, 2009, allowing the claims as revised "if it is determined by the court that the Monitor has the power to do so".

14 The request for directions and the circumstances pose the following issue:

Issue

15 Does the Monitor have the authority to allow the revision of a claim by increasing it based on evidence submitted by a claimant within the time period set for the monitor to carry out its assessment of claims?

Analysis

16 The jurisdiction of the Monitor stems from the jurisdiction of the court granted to it by the *CCAA*. Whenever an order is made under s.11 of the *CCAA* the court is required to appoint a monitor. Section 11.7 of the *CCAA* provides:

11.7(1) When an order is made in respect of a company by the court under section 11, the court shall at the same time appoint a person, in this section and in section 11.8 referred to as "the monitor", to monitor the business and financial affairs of the company while the order remains in effect.

(2) Except as may be otherwise directed by the court, the auditor of the company may be appointed as the monitor.

(3) The monitor shall

(a) for the purposes of monitoring the company's business and financial affairs, have access to and examine the company's property, including the premises, books, records, data, including data in electronic form, and other financial documents of the company to the extent necessary to adequately assess the company's business and financial affairs;

(b) file a report with the court on the state of the company's business and financial affairs, containing prescribed information,

(i) forthwith after ascertaining any material adverse change in the company's projected cash-flow or financial circumstances,

(ii) at least seven days before any meeting of creditors under section 4 or 5, or

(iii) at such other times as the court may order;

(c) advise the creditors of the filing of the report referred to in paragraph (b) in any notice of a meeting of credi-

tors referred to in section 4 or 5; and

(d) carry out such other functions in relation to the company as the court may direct.

...

17 It appears that the purpose of the *CCAA* is to grant to an insolvent company protection from its creditors in order to permit it a reasonable opportunity to restructure its affairs in order to reach a compromise or arrangement between the company and its creditors. The court has the power to order a meeting of the creditors or class of creditors for them to consider a compromise or arrangement proposed by the debtor company (s. 4, 5). Where a majority of the creditors representing two thirds value of the creditors or class of creditors agree to a compromise or arrangement, the court may sanction it and thereafter such compromise or arrangement is binding on all creditors, or class of creditors (s. 6).

18 Section 12 of the *Act* defines a claim to mean "any indebtedness, liability or obligation of any kind that, if unsecured, would be a debt provable in bankruptcy within the meaning of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*." However, as noted by McElcheran in *Commercial Insolvency in Canada* (LexisNexis Canada Inc., Markham, Ontario, 2005 at p. 279-80) the *CCAA* does not set out a process for identification or determination of claims; instead, the Court creates a claims process by court order.

19 The only guidance provided by the *CCAA* is that in the event of a disagreement the amount of a claim shall be determined by the court on summary application by the company or by the creditor. Section 12(2) of the *Act* provides:

Determination of amount of claim

(2) For the purposes of this Act, the amount represented by a claim of any secured or unsecured creditor shall be determined as follows:

(a) the amount of an unsecured claim shall be the amount

(i) in the case of a company in the course of being wound up under the Winding-up and Restructuring Act, proof of which has been made in accordance with that Act,

(ii) in the case of a company that has made an authorized assignment or against which a bankruptcy order has been made under the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, proof of which has been made in accordance with that Act, or

(iii) in the case of any other company, proof of which might be made under the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, but if the amount so provable is not admitted by the company, the amount shall be determined by the court on summary application by the company or by the creditor; and

(b) the amount of a secured claim shall be the amount, proof of which might be made in respect thereof under the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act if the claim were unsecured, but the amount if not admitted by the company shall, in the case of a company subject to pending proceedings under the Winding-up and Restructuring Act or the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, be established by proof in the same manner as an unsecured claim under the Winding-up and Restructuring Act or the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, as the case may be, and in the case of any other company the amount shall be determined by the court on summary application by the company or the creditor.

20 The only parties who appeared on this motion were the Monitor, ScoZinc and Komatsu. No specific submissions were requested nor made by the parties with respect to the nature of the court's jurisdiction to determine the mechanism and time lines to classify and quantify claims against the debtor company.

21 Under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* the Trustee is the designated gatekeeper who first determines whether a Proof of Claim submitted by a creditor is valid. The trustee may admit the claim or disallow it in whole or in part (s.135(2) *BIA)*. A creditor who is dissatisfied with a decision by the trustee may appeal to a judge of the Bankruptcy Court.

22 In contrast, the *CCAA* does not set out the procedure beyond the language in s.12. The language only accomplishes two things. The first is that the debtor company can agree on the amount of a secured or unsecured claim; and secondly, if there is a disagreement, then on application of either the company or the creditor, the amount shall be determined by the court on "summary application".

23 The practice has arisen for the court to create by order a claims process that is both flexible and expeditious. The Monitor identifies, by review of the debtor's records, all potential claimants and sends to them a claim package. To ensure that all creditors come forward and participate on a timely basis, there is a provision in the claims process order requiring creditors to file their claims by a fixed date. If they do not, subject to further relief provided by the claims process order, or by the court, the creditor's claim is barred.

24 If the Monitor disagrees with the claim, and the disagreement cannot be resolved, then a claimant can present its case to a claims officer who is usually given the power to adjudicate disputed claims, with the right of appeal to a judge of the court overseeing the *CCAA* proceedings.

25 The establishment of a claims process utilizing the monitor and or a claims officer by court order appears to be a well accepted practice (See for example *Federal Gypsum Co., Re*, 2007 NSSC 384 (N.S. S.C.); *Olympia & York Developments Ltd. v. Royal Trust Co.* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 1 (Ont. Gen. Div.); *Air Canada, Re* (2004), 2 C.B.R. (5th) 23 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]); *Triton Tubular Components Corp., Re*, [2005] O.J. No. 3926 (Ont. S.C.J.); *Muscletech Research & Development Inc., Re*, [2006] O.J. No. 4087 (Ont. S.C.J.); *Pine Valley Mining Corp., Re*, 2008 BCSC 356 (B.C. S.C.); *Blue Range Resource Corp., Re*, 2000 ABCA 285 (Alta. C.A.); *Carlen Transport Inc. v. Juniper Lumber Co. (Monitor of)* (2001), 21 C.B.R. (4th) 222 (N.B. Q.B.).)

26 I could find no reported case that doubt the authority of the court to create a claims process. Kenneth Kraft in his article "The CCAA and the Claims Bar Process", (2000), 13 *Commercial Insolvency Reporter* 6, endorsed the utilization of a claims process on the basis of reliance on the court's inherent jurisdiction, provided the process adhered to the specific mandates of the *CCAA*. In unrelated contexts, caution has been expressed with respect to reliance on the inherent jurisdiction of the superior court as the basis for dealing with the myriad issues that can arise under the *CCAA* (See: *Skeena Cellulose Inc., Re* (2003), 43 C.B.R. (4th) 187 (B.C. C.A.)) and *Stelco Inc., Re*, [2005] O.J. No. 1171 (Ont. C.A.)).

27 Sir J.H. Jacob, Q.C. in his seminal article "The Inherent Jurisdiction of the Court", (1970) *Current Legal Problems* 23, concluded that it has been clear law from the earliest times that superior courts of justice, as part of their inherent jurisdiction, have the power to control their own proceedings and process. He wrote:

> Under its inherent jurisdiction, the court has power to control and regulate its process and proceedings, and it exercises this power in a great variety of circumstances and by many different methods. Some of the instances of the exercise of this power have been of far-reaching importance, others have dealt with matters of detail or have been of transient value. Some have involved the exercise of administrative powers, others of judicial powers. Some have been turned into rules of law, others by long usage or custom may have acquired the force of

> law, and still others remain mere rules of practice. The exercise of this power has been pervasive throughout the whole legal machinery and has been extended to all stages of proceedings, pre-trial, trial and post-trial. Indeed, it is difficult to set the limits upon the powers of the court in the exercise of its inherent jurisdiction to control and regulate its process, for these limits are coincident with the needs of the court to fulfil its judicial functions in the administration of justice.
>
> p. 32-33

28 The *CCAA* gives no specific guidance to the court on how to determine the existence, nature, validity or extent of a claim against a debtor company. As noted earlier, the only reference is in s. 12 of the *Act* that if there is a dispute as to the amount of a claim, then the amount shall be determined by the court "on summary application". In *Freeman, Re*, [1922] N.S.J. No. 15, [1923] 1 D.L.R. 378 (N.S. C.A.) (en banc) the court considered the words "on summary application" as they appeared in the *Probate Act* R.S.N.S. 1900 c.158. Harris C.J. wrote:

[17] The words "summary application" do not mean without notice, but simply imply that the proceedings before the Court are not to be conducted in the ordinary way, but in a concise way.

[18] The Oxford Dictionary p. 140 gives as one of the meanings of "summary" dispensing with needless details or formalities — done with despatch.

[19] In the case of the Western &c R. *Co. v. Atlanta* (1901), 113 Ga. 537, the meaning of the words "summary proceeding" is discussed at some length and the Court held at pp. 543-544: —

> "In a summary manner does not at all mean that they may be abated without notice or hearing, but simply that it may be done without a trial in the ordinary forms prescribed by law for a regular judicial procedure."
>
> [20] I cite this not because it is a binding authority, but because its reasoning commends itself to my judgment and I adopt it.

29 In my opinion, whatever process may be appropriate and necessary to adjudicate disputed claims that ultimately end up before a judge of the superior court, the determination by the court that claims must initially be identified and assessed by the Monitor, and heard first by a Claims Officer, is a valid exercise of the court's inherent jurisdiction.

30 The *CCAA* gives to the court the express and implied jurisdiction to do a variety of things. They need not all be enumerated. The court is required to appoint a monitor (s.11.7). Once appointed, the monitor is required to monitor the company's business and financial affairs. The *Act* mandates that the monitor have access to and examine the company's property including all records. The monitor must file a report with the court on the state of the company's business and financial affairs and contain prescribed information. In addition, the monitor shall carry out such other functions in relation to the company as the court may direct (s.11.7(3)(d)).

31 In these circumstances, it is not only logical, but eminently practical that the monitor, as an officer of the court, be directed by court order to fulfil the analogous role to that of the trustee under the *BIA*. The Claims Procedure Order of February 18, 2009 accomplishes this.

Power of the Monitor

32 The Monitor was required by the Order to publish a notice to claimants in the newspaper regarding the claims procedure. It was also required to send a claims package to known potential claimants identified by the Moni-

tor through its review of the books and records of ScoZinc. The claims bar date was set as March 16, 2009, or such later date as may be ordered by the court.

33 The duties of the Monitor, once a claim was received by it, were set out in paragraphs 9 and 10 of the Claims Procedure Order. They provide as follows:

9. Upon receipt of a Proof of Claim:

> a. The Monitor is hereby authorized and directed to use reasonable discretion as to the adequacy of compliance as to the manner in which Proofs of Claim are completed and executed and may, where it is satisfied that a Claim has been adequately proven, waive strict compliance with the requirements of this Order as to the completion and the execution of a Proof of Claim. A Claim which is accepted by the Monitor shall constitute a Proven Claim;
>
> b. the Monitor and ScoZinc may attempt to consensually resolve the classification and amount of any Claim with the claimant prior to accepting, revising or disallowing such Claim; and

...

> 10. The Monitor shall review all Proofs of Claim filed on or before the Claims Bar Date. The Monitor shall accept, revise or disallow such Proofs of Claim as contemplated herein. The Monitor shall send a Notice of Revision or Disallowance and the form of Notice of Dispute to the Claimant as soon as the Claim has been revised or disallowed but in any event no later than 11:59 p.m. (Halifax time) on March 27, 2009 or such later date as the Court may order. Where the Monitor does not send a Notice of Revision or Disallowance by the aforementioned date to a Claimant who has submitted a Proof of Claim, the Monitor shall be deemed to have accepted such Claim.

34 Any person who wished to dispute a Notice of Revision or Disallowance was required to file a notice to the monitor and to the Claims Officer no later than April 6, 2009. The Claims Officer was designated to be Richard Cregan, Q.C., serving in his personal capacity and not as Registrar in Bankruptcy. Subject to the direction of the court, the Claims Officer was given the power to determine how evidence would be brought before him and any other procedural matters that may arise with respect to the claim. A claimant or the Monitor may appeal the Claims Officer's decision to the court.

35 The Monitor suggests that the power given to it under paragraph 9(a) and 10 is sufficient to permit it to accept the revised Proofs of Claim filed after the claim's bar date of March 16, 2009, but before its assessment date of March 27, 2009.

36 Reliance is also placed on the decision of the Alberta Court of Appeal in *Blue Range Resource Corp., Re*, 2000 ABCA 285 (Alta. C.A.). As noted by the Monitor, the decision in *Blue Range* did not directly deal with the issue on which the Monitor here seeks directions. In *Blue Range*, the claims procedure established by the court set the claims bar date of June 15, 1999. Claims of creditors not proven in accordance with the procedures set out were deemed to be forever barred. Some creditors filed their Notice of Claim after the claims bar date. The monitor disallowed their claims. There were a second group of creditors who filed their Notice of Claim prior to the applicable claims bar date, but then sought to amend their claims after the claims bar date had passed. The monitor also disallowed these claims as late. What is not clear from the reported decisions is whether this second group of creditors requested amendments of their claims during the time period granted to the Monitor to carry out its assessment.

37 The chambers judge allowed the late and amended claims to be filed. Enron Capital Corp. and the creditor's committee sought leave to appeal that decision. Leave to appeal was granted on January 14, 2000 with respect to the

following question:

> What criteria in the circumstances of these cases should the Court use to exercise its discretion in deciding whether to allow late claimants to file claims which, if proven, may be recognized, notwithstanding a previous claims bar order containing a claims bar date which would otherwise bar the claim of the late claimants, and applying the criteria to each case, what is the result?
>
> *Blue Range Resource Corp., Re*, 2000 ABCA 16 (Alta. C.A. [In Chambers])

38 Wittmann J.A. delivered the judgment of the court. He noted that all counsel conceded that the court had the authority to allow the late filing of claims and that the appeal was really a matter of what criteria the court should use in exercising that power. Accordingly, a Claims Procedure Order that contains a claims bar date should not purport to forever bar a claim without a saving provision. Wittmann J.A. set out the test for determining when a late claim may be included to be as follows:

> [26] Therefore, the appropriate criteria to apply to the late claimants is as follows:
>
> 1. Was the delay caused by inadvertence and if so, did the claimant act in good faith?
>
> 2. What is the effect of permitting the claim in terms of the existence and impact of any relevant prejudice caused by the delay?
>
> 3. If relevant prejudice is found can it be alleviated by attaching appropriate conditions to an order permitting late filing?
>
> 4. If relevant prejudice is found which cannot be alleviated, are there any other considerations which may nonetheless warrant an order permitting late filing?
>
> [27] In the context of the criteria, "inadvertent" includes carelessness, negligence, accident, and is unintentional. I will deal with the conduct of each of the respondents in turn below and then turn to a discussion of potential prejudice suffered by the appellants.
>
> 2000 ABCA 285 (Alta. C.A.)

39 The appellants claimed that they would be prejudiced if the late claims were allowed because if they had known the late claims would be allowed they would have voted differently. This assertion was rejected by the chambers judge. With respect to what is meant by prejudiced, Wittmann J.A. wrote:

> 40 In a CCAA context, as in a BIA context, the fact that Enron and the other Creditors will receive less money if late and late amended claims are allowed is not prejudice relevant to this criterion. Re-organization under the CCAA involves compromise. Allowing all legitimate creditors to share in the available proceeds is an integral part of the process. A reduction in that share can not be characterized as prejudice: Re Cohen (1956), 36 C.B.R. 21 (Alta. C.A.) at 30-31. Further, I am in agreement with the test for prejudice used by the British Columbia Court of Appeal in 312630 British Columbia Ltd. It is: did the creditor(s) by reason of the late filings lose a realistic opportunity to do anything that they otherwise might have done? Enron and the other creditors were fully informed about the potential for late claims being permitted, and were specifically aware of the existence of the late claimants as creditors. I find, therefore, that Enron and the Creditors will not suffer any relevant prejudice should the late claims be permitted.

40 In considering how the Monitor should carry out its duties and responsibilities under the Claims Procedure Order it is important to note that the Monitor is an officer of the court and is obliged to ensure that the interests of the stakeholders are considered including all creditors, the company and its shareholders (See *Laidlaw Inc., Re* (2002), 34 C.B.R. (4th) 72 (Ont. S.C.J. [Commercial List]).

41 In a different context Turnball J.A. in *Siscoe & Savoie v. Royal Bank* (1994), 29 C.B.R. (3d) 1 (N.B. C.A.) commented that the monitor is an agent of the court and as a result is responsible and accountable to the court, owing a fiduciary duty to all of the parties (para. 28).

42 In my opinion, para. 9(a) is not of assistance in determining the authority of the Monitor to revise upward a claim filed after the claim's bar date but before the assessment date. Paragraph 9(a) authorizes the Monitor to use reasonable discretion as to the adequacy of compliance as to *the manner* to which Proofs of Claim are completed and executed. If it satisfied that the claim has been adequately proven it may waive strict compliance with the requirements of the order as to *completion* and the *execution* of a Proof of Claim.

43 Paragraph 10 of the Claims Procedure Order mandates the Monitor shall review all Proofs of Claim filed on or before the claims bar date. It shall "accept, revise or disallow such Proofs of Claim as contemplated herein". While normally a monitor's revision would be to reduce a Proof of Claim, there is in fact nothing in the Claims Procedure Order that so restricts the Monitor's authority. It is obviously contemplated by para. 10 that the monitor is to carry out some assessment of the claims that are submitted.

44 In my view, the Proofs of Claim that are filed act both as a form of pleading and an opportunity for the claimant to provide supporting documents to evidence its claim. In the case before me, the creditors discovered that the claims they had submitted were inaccurate and further evidence was tendered to the Monitor to demonstrate. The Monitor, after reviewing the evidence, accepted the validity of the claims.

45 Courts in a general way are engaged in dispensing justice. They do so by setting up and applying procedural rules to ensure that litigants are afforded a fair hearing. The resolution of disputes through the litigation process, including the ultimate hearing, is fundamentally a truth-seeking process to determine the facts and to apply the law to those facts. Can it be any different where the process is not in the court but under its supervision pursuant to a claims process under the *CCAA.?*

46 To suggest that the monitor does not have the authority to receive evidence and submissions and to consider them is to say that it does not have any real authority to carry out its court appointed role to assess the claims that have been submitted. The notion that the monitor cannot look at documentary evidence on its own initiative or at the instance of a claimant, and even consider submissions, is to deny it any real power to consider and make a preliminary determination of the merits of a claim.

47 The Claims Procedure Order contains a number of provisions that anticipate the exchange of information between the Monitor, the company and a creditor. Paragraph 9(b) authorizes the Monitor and ScoZinc to attempt to consensually resolve the classification and the amount of any claim with a claimant prior to accepting, revising or disallowing such claim. Paragraph 17 of the Claims Procedure Order directs that the Monitor shall at all times be authorized to enter into negotiations with claimants and settle any claim on such terms as the Monitor may consider appropriate.

48 In my opinion, it does not matter that revised claims were submitted after the claims bar date. In essence, the Monitor simply acted to revise the Proofs of Claim already submitted to conform with the evidence elicited by the Monitor, or submitted to it. The Monitor had the necessary authority to revise the claims, either as to classification or amount.

49 If a claimant seeks to revise or amend its claim after the assessment date set out in the Claims Procedure Order, different considerations may come into play. The appropriate procedure will depend on the provisions of the Claims Procedure Order. In addition, the court, as the ultimate arbiter of disputed claims under s. 12 of the *CCAA*, should always be viewed as having the jurisdiction to permit appropriate revision of claims.

Order accordingly.

END OF DOCUMENT

TAB B

SCHEDULE "B"

STATUTORY REFERENCES

Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act

General power of court

11. Despite anything in the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*, if an application is made under this Act in respect of a debtor company, the court, on the application of any person interested in the matter, may, subject to the restrictions set out in this Act, on notice to any other person or without notice as it may see fit, make any order that it considers appropriate in the circumstances.

...

Stays, etc. — other than initial application

11.02 (2) A court may, on an application in respect of a debtor company other than an initial application, make an order, on any terms that it may impose,

(*a*) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, for any period that the court considers necessary, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under an Act referred to in paragraph (1)(*a*);

(*b*) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and

(*c*) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of any action, suit or proceeding against the company.

Burden of proof on application

(3) The court shall not make the order unless

(*a*) the applicant satisfies the court that circumstances exist that make the order appropriate; and

(*b*) in the case of an order under subsection (2), the applicant also satisfies the court that the applicant has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence.

Restriction

(4) Orders doing anything referred to in subsection (1) or (2) may only be made under this section.

Fixing deadlines

12. The court may fix deadlines for the purposes of voting and for the purposes of distributions under a compromise or arrangement.

...

Claims that may be dealt with by a compromise or arrangement

19. (1) Subject to subsection (2), the only claims that may be dealt with by a compromise or arrangement in respect of a debtor company are

(*a*) claims that relate to debts or liabilities, present or future, to which the company is subject on the earlier of

(i) the day on which proceedings commenced under this Act, and

(ii) if the company filed a notice of intention under section 50.4 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or commenced proceedings under this Act with the consent of inspectors referred to in section 116 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, the date of the initial bankruptcy event within the meaning of section 2 of that Act; and

(*b*) claims that relate to debts or liabilities, present or future, to which the company may become subject before the compromise or arrangement is sanctioned by reason of any obligation incurred by the company before the earlier of the days referred to in subparagraphs (*a*)(i) and (ii).

...

Admission of claims

20. (2) Despite subsection (1), the company may admit the amount of a claim for voting purposes under reserve of the right to contest liability on the claim for other purposes, and nothing in this Act, the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act* or the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* prevents a secured creditor from voting at a meeting of secured creditors or any class of them in respect of the total amount of a claim as admitted.

IN THE MATTER OF THE *COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT*, R.S.C., 1985 c. C-36 AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF SIGNATURE ALUMINUM CANADA INC. Applicant

Court File No. CV-10-8561-00CL

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
(COMMERCIAL LIST)

Proceeding commenced at Toronto

FACTUM

BLAKE, CASSELS & GRAYDON LLP
Box 25, Commerce Court West
Toronto, Ontario M5L 1A9

Linc Rogers LSUC No.: LSUC No.: 43562N
Tel: (416) 863-4186

Katherine McEachern LSUC No.: 38345M
Tel: (416) 863-4168

Jackie Moher LSUC No.: 53166V
Tel: (416) 863-3174
Fax: (416) 863-2653

Lawyers for the Applicant