Court File No: CV-19-614614-00CL

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 IMERYS TALC AMERICA, INC., IMERYS TALC VERMONT, INC., AND IMERYS TALC CANADA INC. (THE "DEBTORS")

APPLICATION OF IMERYS TALC CANADA INC., UNDER SECTION 46 OF THE *COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED

BOOK OF AUTHORITIES
(Returnable August 7, 2019)

August 2, 2019

STIKEMAN ELLIOTT LLP
Barristers and Solicitors
5300 Commerce Court West
199 Bay Street
Toronto ON M5L 2B9

Maria Konyukhova LSO#: 52880V
Tel: (416) 869-5230

Patricia Joseph LSO#: 75535Q
Tel: (416) 869-5642
Fax: (416) 947-0866

Lawyers for the Applicant

INDEX

Court File No: CV-19-614614-00CL

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 IMERYS TALC AMERICA, INC., IMERYS TALC VERMONT, INC., AND IMERYS TALC CANADA INC. (THE "DEBTORS")

APPLICATION OF IMERYS TALC CANADA INC., UNDER SECTION 46 OF THE *COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED

INDEX

TAB 1

2000 CarswellOnt 704
Ontario Superior Court of Justice [Commercial List]

Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd., Re

2000 CarswellOnt 704, [2000] O.J. No. 786, 18 C.B.R. (4th) 157, 5 B.L.R. (3d) 75, 95 A.C.W.S. (3d) 608

In the Matter of Section 18.6 of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended

In the Matter of Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd.

Farley J.

Heard: February 25, 2000
Judgment: February 25, 2000
Docket: 00-CL-3667

Counsel: *Derrick Tay*, for Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd.
Paul Macdonald, for Citibank North America Inc., Lenders under the Post-Petition Credit Agreement.

Subject: Corporate and Commercial; Insolvency

APPLICATION by solvent corporation for interim order under s. 18.6 of *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act.*

***Farley J.*:**

1 I have had the opportunity to reflect on this matter which involves an aspect of the recent amendments to the insolvency legislation of Canada, which amendments have not yet been otherwise dealt with as to their substance. The applicant, Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd. ("BW Canada"), a solvent company, has applied for an interim order under s. 18.6 of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA"):

> (a) that the proceedings commenced by BW Canada's parent U.S. corporation and certain other U.S. related corporations (collectively "BWUS") for protection under Chapter 11 of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code in connection with mass asbestos claims before the U.S. Bankruptcy Court be recognized as a "foreign proceeding" for the purposes of s. 18.6;
>
> (b) that BW Canada be declared a company which is entitled to avail itself of the provisions of s. 18.6;
>
> (c) that there be a stay against suits and enforcements until May 1, 2000 (or such later date as the Court may order) as to asbestos related proceedings against BW Canada, its property and its directors;
>
> (d) that BW Canada be authorized to guarantee the obligations of its parent to the DIP Lender (debtor in possession lender) and grant security therefor in favour of the DIP Lender; and
>
> (e) and for other ancillary relief.

2 In Chapter 11 proceedings under the U.S. Bankruptcy Code, the U.S. Bankruptcy Court in New Orleans issued a temporary restraining order on February 22, 2000 wherein it was noted that BW Canada may be subject to actions in Canada similar to the U.S. asbestos claims. U.S. Bankruptcy Court Judge Brown's temporary restraining order was directed against certain named U.S. resident plaintiffs in the asbestos litigation:

> . . . and towards all plaintiffs and potential plaintiffs in Other Derivative Actions, that they are hereby restrained further prosecuting Pending Actions or further prosecuting or commencing Other Derivative Actions against Non-Debtor Affiliates, until the Court decides whether to grant the Debtors' request for a preliminary injunction.

Judge Brown further requested the aid and assistance of the Canadian courts in carrying out the U.S. Bankruptcy Court's orders. The "Non-Debtor Affiliates" would include BW Canada.

3 Under the 1994 amendments to the U.S. Bankruptcy Code, the concept of the establishment of a trust sufficient to meet the court determined liability for a mass torts situations was introduced. I am advised that after many years of successfully resolving the overwhelming majority of claims against it on an individual basis by settlement on terms BWUS considered reasonable, BWUS has determined, as a result of a spike in claims with escalating demands when it was expecting a decrease in claims, that it is appropriate to resort to the mass tort trust concept. Hence its application earlier this week to Judge Brown with a view to eventually working out a global process, including incorporating any Canadian claims. This would be done in conjunction with its joint pool of insurance which covers both BWUS and BW Canada. Chapter 11 proceedings do not require an applicant thereunder to be insolvent; thus BWUS was able to make an application with a view towards the 1994 amendments (including s. 524(g)). This subsection would permit the U.S. Bankruptcy Court on confirmation of a plan of reorganization under Chapter 11 with a view towards rehabilitation in the sense of avoiding insolvency in a mass torts situation to:

> . . . enjoin entities from taking legal action for the purpose of directly or indirectly collecting, recovering, or receiving payment or recovery with respect to any claims or demand that, under a plan of reorganization, is to be paid in whole or in part by a trust.

4 In 1997, ss. 267-275 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. B-3, as amended ("BIA") and s. 18.6 of the CCAA were enacted to address the rising number of international insolvencies ("1997 Amendments"). The 1997 Amendments were introduced after a lengthy consultation process with the insolvency profession and others. Previous to the 1997 Amendments, Canadian courts essentially would rely on the evolving common law principles of comity which permitted the Canadian court to recognize and enforce in Canada the judicial acts of other jurisdictions.

5 La Forest J in *Morguard Investments Ltd. v. De Savoye* (1990), 76 D.L.R. (4th) 256 (S.C.C.), at p. 269 described the principle of comity as:

> "Comity" in the legal sense, is neither a matter of absolute obligation, on the one hand, nor of mere courtesy and goodwill, upon the other. But it is the recognition which one nation allows within its territory to the legislative, executive or judicial acts of another nation, having due regard both to international duty and convenience, and to the rights of its own citizens or of other persons who are under the protections of its laws . . .

6 In *ATL Industries Inc. v. Han Eol Ind. Co.* (1995), 36 C.P.C. (3d) 288 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]), at pp. 302-3 I noted the following:

> Allow me to start off by stating that I agree with the analysis of MacPherson J. in *Arrowmaster Inc. v. Unique Forming Ltd.* (1993), 17 O.R. (3d) 407 (Gen. Div.) when in discussing *Morguard Investments Ltd. v. De Savoye*, [1990] 3 S.C.R. 1077, 76 D.L.R. (4th) 256, 52 B.C.L.R. (2d) 160, 122 N.R. 81, [1991] 2 W.W.R. 217, 46 C.P.C. (2d) 1, 15 R.P.R. (2d) 1, he states at p.411:
>
> > The leading case dealing with the enforcement of "foreign" judgments is the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada in *Morguard Investments, supra*. The question in that case was whether, and the circumstances in which, the judgment of an Alberta court could be enforced in British Columbia. A unanimous court, speaking through La Forest J., held in favour of enforceability and, in so doing, discussed in some detail the doctrinal principles governing inter-jurisdictional enforcement of orders. I think it fair to say that the overarching theme of La Forest J.'s reasons is the necessity and desirability, in a mobile global society, for governments and courts to

respect the orders made by courts in foreign jurisdictions with comparable legal systems, including substantive laws and rules of procedure. He expressed this theme in these words, at p. 1095:

> Modern states, however, cannot live in splendid isolation and do give effect to judgments given in other countries in certain circumstances. Thus a judgment *in rem*, such as a decree of divorce granted by the courts of one state to persons domiciled there, will be recognized by the courts of other states. In certain circumstances, as well, our courts will enforce personal judgments given in other states. Thus, we saw, our courts will enforce an action for breach of contract given by the courts of another country if the defendant was present there at the time of the action or has agreed to the foreign court's exercise of jurisdiction. *This, it was thought, was in conformity with the requirements of comity, the informing principle of private international law, which has been stated to be the deference and respect due by other states to the actions of a state legitimately taken within its territory. Since the state where the judgment was given has power over the litigants, the judgments of its courts should be respected.* (emphasis added in original)

Morguard Investments was, as stated earlier, a case dealing with the enforcement of a court order across provincial boundaries. However, the historical analysis in La Forest J.'s judgment, of both the United Kingdom and Canadian jurisprudence, and the doctrinal principles enunciated by the court are equally applicable, in my view, in a situation where the judgment has been rendered by a court in a foreign jurisdiction. This should not be an absolute rule - there will be some foreign court orders that should not be enforced in Ontario, perhaps because the substantive law in the foreign country is so different from Ontario's or perhaps because the legal process that generates the foreign order diverges radically from Ontario's process. (my emphasis added)

Certainly the substantive and procedural aspects of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code including its 1994 amendments are not so different and do not radically diverge from our system.

7 After reviewing La Forest J.'s definition of comity, I went on to observe at p. 316:

> As was discussed by J.G. Castel, *Canadian Conflicts of Laws*, 3rd ed. (Toronto: Butterworths, 1994) at p. 270, there is a presumption of validity attaching to a foreign judgment unless and until it is established to be invalid. It would seem that the same type of evidence would be required to impeach a foreign judgment as a domestic one: fraud practiced on the court or tribunal: see *Sun Alliance Insurance Co. v. Thompson* (1981), 56 N.S.R. (2d) 619, 117 A.P.R. 619 (T.D.), Sopinka, supra, at p. 992.

La Forest J. went on to observe in *Morguard* at pp. 269-70:

> In a word, the rules of private international law are grounded in the need in modern times to facilitate the flow of wealth, skills and people across state lines in a fair and orderly manner.
>
> . . . . .
>
> Accommodating the flow of wealth, skills and people across state lines has now become imperative. Under these circumstances, our approach to the recognition and enforcement of foreign judgments would appear ripe for reappraisal.

See also *Hunt v. T & N plc* (1993), 109 D.L.R. (4th) 16 (S.C.C.), at p. 39.

8 While *Morguard* was an interprovincial case, there is no doubt that the principles in that case are equally applicable to international matters in the view of MacPherson J. and myself in *Arrowmaster* (1993), 17 O.R. (3d) 407 (Ont. Gen. Div.), and *ATL* respectively. Indeed the analysis by La Forest J. was on an international plane. As a country whose well-being is so heavily founded on international trade and investment, Canada of necessity is very conscious of the desirability of invoking comity in appropriate cases.

9 In the context of cross-border insolvencies, Canadian and U.S. Courts have made efforts to complement, coordinate and where appropriate accommodate the proceedings of the other. Examples of this would include *Olympia & York*

Developments Ltd., *Ever fresh Beverages Inc.* and *Loewen Group Inc. v. Continental Insurance Co. of Canada* (1997), 48 C.C.L.I. (2d) 119 (B.C. S.C.). Other examples involve the situation where a multi-jurisdictional proceeding is specifically connected to one jurisdiction with that jurisdiction's court being allowed to exercise principal control over the insolvency process: see *Roberts v. Picture Butte Municipal Hospital* (1998), 23 C.P.C. (4th) 300 (Alta. Q.B.), at pp. 5-7 [[1998] A.J. No. 817]; *Microbiz Corp. v. Classic Software Systems Inc.* (1996), 45 C.B.R. (3d) 40 (Ont. Gen. Div.), at p. 4; *Tradewell Inc. v. American Sensors Electronics, Inc.*, 1997 WL 423075 (S.D.N.Y. 1997).

10 In *Roberts*, Forsythe J. at pp. 5-7 noted that steps within the proceedings themselves are also subject to the dictates of comity in recognizing and enforcing a U.S. Bankruptcy Court stay in the *Dow Corning* litigation [*Taylor v. Dow Corning Australia Pty. Ltd.* (December 19, 1997), Doc. 8438/95 (Australia Vic. Sup. Ct.)] as to a debtor in Canada so as to promote greater efficiency, certainty and consistency in connection with the debtor's restructuring efforts. Foreign claimants were provided for in the U.S. corporation's plan. Forsyth J. stated:

> Comity and cooperation are increasingly important in the bankruptcy context. *As internationalization increases, more parties have assets and carry on activities in several jurisdictions. Without some coordination there would be multiple proceedings, inconsistent judgments and general uncertainty*.
>
> *. . . I find that common sense dictates that these matters would be best dealt with by one court, and in the interest of promoting international comity it seems the forum for this case is in the U.S. Bankruptcy Court*. Thus, in either case, whether there has been an attornment or not, I conclude it is appropriate for me to exercise my discretion and apply the principles of comity and grant the Defendant's stay application. I reach this conclusion based on all the circumstances, including the clear wording of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code provision, the similar philosophies and procedures in Canada and the U.S., the Plaintiff's attornment to the jurisdiction of the U.S. Bankruptcy Court, and the incredible number of claims outstanding . . . (emphasis added)

11 The CCAA as remedial legislation should be given a liberal interpretation to facilitate its objectives. See *Hongkong Bank of Canada v. Chef Ready Foods Ltd.* (1990), 4 C.B.R. (3d) 311 (B.C. C.A.), at p. 320; *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd., Re* (1993), 17 C.B.R. (3d) 24 (Ont. Gen. Div. [Commercial List]).

12 David Tobin, the Director General, Corporate Governance Branch, Department of Industry in testifying before the Standing Committee on Industry regarding Bill C-5, An Act to amend the BIA, the CCAA and the Income Tax Act, stated at 1600:

> Provisions in Bill C-5 attempt to actually codify, which has always been the practice in Canada. They include the Court recognition of foreign representatives; Court authority to make orders to facilitate and coordinate international insolvencies; provisions that would make it clear that foreign representatives are allowed to commence proceedings in Canada, as per Canadian rules - however, they clarify that foreign stays of proceedings are not applicable but a foreign representative can apply to a court for a stay in Canada; and Canadian creditors and assets are protected by the bankruptcy and insolvency rules.

The philosophy of the practice in international matters relating to the CCAA is set forth in *Olympia & York Developments Ltd. v. Royal Trust Co.* (1993), 20 C.B.R. (3d) 165 (Ont. Gen. Div.), at p. 167 where Blair J. stated:

> The Olympia & York re-organization involves proceedings in three different jurisdictions: Canada, the United States and the United Kingdom. Insolvency disputes with international overtones and involving property and assets in a multiplicity of jurisdictions are becoming increasingly frequent. Often there are differences in legal concepts - sometimes substantive, sometimes procedural - between the jurisdictions. The Courts of the various jurisdictions should seek to cooperate amongst themselves, in my view, in facilitating the trans-border resolution of such disputes as a whole, where that can be done in a fashion consistent with their own fundamental principles of jurisprudence. The interests of international cooperation and comity, and the interests of developing at least some degree of certitude in international business and commerce, call for nothing less.

Blair J. then proceeded to invoke inherent jurisdiction to implement the Protocol between the U.S. Bankruptcy Court and the Ontario Court. See also my endorsement of December 20, 1995, in *Everfresh Beverages Inc.* where I observed: "I would think that this Protocol demonstrates the 'essence of comity' between the Courts of Canada and the United States of America." *Everfresh* was an example of the effective and efficient use of the Cross-Border Insolvency Concordat, adopted by the Council of the International Bar Association on May 31, 1996 (after being adopted by its Section on Business Law Council on September 17, 1995), which Concordat deals with, inter alia, principal administration of a debtor's reorganization and ancillary jurisdiction. See also the UNCITRAL Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency.

13 Thus it seems to me that this application by BW Canada should be reviewed in light of (i) the doctrine of comity as analyzed in *Morguard, Arrowmaster* and *ATL, supra*, in regard to its international aspects; (ii) inherent jurisdiction; (iii) the aspect of the liberal interpretation of the CCAA generally; and (iv) the assistance and codification of the 1997 Amendments.

"Foreign proceeding" is defined in s. 18.6(1) as:

> In this section,
>
> > "foreign proceeding" means a judicial or administrative proceeding commenced outside Canada in respect of a debtor under a law relating to bankruptcy or insolvency and dealing with the collective interests of creditors generally; . . .

Certainly a U.S. Chapter 11 proceeding would fit this definition subject to the question of "debtor". It is important to note that the definition of "foreign proceeding" in s. 18.6 of the CCAA contains no specific requirement that the debtor be insolvent. In contrast, the BIA defines a "debtor" in the context of a foreign proceeding (Part XIII of the BIA) as follows:

> s. 267 In this Part,
>
> > "debtor" means an *insolvent person* who has property in Canada, a *bankrupt* who has property in Canada or a *person who has the status of a bankrupt* under foreign law in a foreign proceeding and has property in Canada; . . . (emphasis added)

I think it a fair observation that the BIA is a rather defined code which goes into extensive detail. This should be contrasted with the CCAA which is a very short general statute which has been utilized to give flexibility to meet what might be described as the peculiar and unusual situation circumstances. A general categorization (which of course is never completely accurate) is that the BIA may be seen as being used for more run of the mill cases whereas the CCAA may be seen as facilitating the more unique or complicated cases. Certainly the CCAA provides the flexibility to deal with the thornier questions. Thus I do not think it unusual that the draftees of the 1997 Amendments would have it in their minds that the provisions of the CCAA dealing with foreign proceedings should continue to reflect this broader and more flexible approach in keeping with the general provisions of the CCAA, in contrast with the corresponding provisions under the BIA. In particular, it would appear to me to be a reasonably plain reading interpretation of s. 18.6 that recourse may be had to s. 18.6 of the CCAA in the case of a solvent debtor. Thus I would conclude that the aspect of insolvency is not a condition precedent vis-a-vis the "debtor" in the foreign proceedings (here the Chapter 11 proceedings) for the proceedings in Louisiana to be a foreign proceeding under the definition of s. 18.6. I therefore declare that those proceedings are to be recognized as a "foreign proceeding" for the purposes of s. 18.6 of the CCAA.

14 It appears to me that my conclusion above is reinforced by an analysis of s. 18.6(2) which deals with concurrent filings by a debtor under the CCAA in Canada and corresponding bankruptcy or insolvency legislation in a foreign jurisdiction. This is not the situation here, but it would be applicable in the *Loewen* case. That subsection deals with the coordination of proceedings as to a "debtor company" initiated pursuant to the CCAA and the foreign legislation.

> s. 18.6(2). The court may, in respect of a *debtor company*, make such orders and grant such relief as it considers appropriate to facilitate, approve or implement arrangements that will result in a coordination of proceedings under the Act with any foreign proceeding. (emphasis added)

15 The definition of "debtor company" is found in the general definition section of the CCAA, namely s. 2 and that definition incorporates the concept of insolvency. Section 18.6(2) refers to a "debtor company" since only a "debtor company" can file under the CCAA to propose a compromise with its unsecured or secured creditors: ss. 3, 4 and 5 CCAA. See also s. 18.6(8) which deals with currency concessions "[w]here a compromise or arrangement is proposed in respect of a debtor company . . . ". I note that "debtor company" is not otherwise referred to in s. 18.6; however "debtor" is referred to in both definitions under s. 18.6(1).

16 However, s. 18.6(4) provides a basis pursuant to which a company such as BW Canada, a solvent corporation, may seek judicial assistance and protection in connection with a foreign proceeding. Unlike s. 18.6(2), s. 18.6(4) does not contemplate a full filing under the CCAA. Rather s. 18.6(4) may be utilized to deal with situations where, notwithstanding that a full filing is not being made under the CCAA, ancillary relief is required in connection with a foreign proceeding.

> s. 18.6(4) Nothing in this section prevents the court, on the application of a foreign representative or *any other interested persons*, from applying such legal or equitable rules governing the recognition of foreign insolvency orders and assistance to foreign representatives as are not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act. (emphasis added)

BW Canada would fit within "any interested person" to bring the subject application to apply the principles of comity and cooperation. It would not appear to me that the relief requested is of a nature contrary to the provisions of the CCAA.

17 Additionally there is s. 18.6(3) whereby once it has been established that there is a foreign proceeding within the meaning of s. 18.6(1) (as I have concluded there is), then this court is given broad powers and wide latitude, all of which is consistent with the general judicial analysis of the CCAA overall, to make any order it thinks appropriate in the circumstances.

> s. 18.6(3) An order of the court under this Section may be made on such terms and conditions as the court considers appropriate in the circumstances.

This subsection reinforces the view expressed previously that the 1997 Amendments contemplated that it would be inappropriate to pigeonhole or otherwise constrain the interpretation of s. 18.6 since it would be not only impracticable but also impossible to contemplate the myriad of circumstances arising under a wide variety of foreign legislation which deal generally and essentially with bankruptcy and insolvency but not exclusively so. Thus, the Court was entrusted to exercise its discretion, but of course in a judicial manner.

18 Even aside from that, I note that the Courts of this country have utilized inherent jurisdiction to fill in any gaps in the legislation and to promote the objectives of the CCAA. Where there is a gap which requires bridging, then the question to be considered is what will be the most practical common sense approach to establishing the connection between the parts of the legislation so as to reach a just and reasonable solution. See *Westar Mining Ltd., Re* (1992), 14 C.B.R. (3d) 88 (B.C. S.C.), at pp. 93-4; *Pacific National Lease Holding Corp. v. Sun Life Trust Co.* (1995), 34 C.B.R. (3d) 4 (B.C. C.A.), at p. 2; *Lehndorff General Partner Ltd.* at p. 30.

19 The Chapter 11 proceedings are intended to resolve the mass asbestos related tort claims which seriously threaten the long term viability of BWUS and its subsidiaries including BW Canada. BW Canada is a significant participant in the overall Babcock & Wilcox international organization. From the record before me it appears reasonably clear that there is an interdependence between BWUS and BW Canada as to facilities and services. In addition there is the fundamental element of financial and business stability. This interdependence has been increased by the financial assistance given by the BW Canada guarantee of BWUS' obligations.

20 To date the overwhelming thrust of the asbestos related litigation has been focussed in the U.S. In contradistinction BW Canada has not in essence been involved in asbestos litigation to date. The 1994 amendments to the U.S. Bankruptcy Code have provided a specific regime which is designed to deal with the mass tort claims (which number in the hundreds of thousands of claims in the U.S.) which appear to be endemic in the U.S. litigation arena involving asbestos related claims as well as other types of mass torts. This Court's assistance however is being sought to stay asbestos related claims against BW Canada with a view to this stay facilitating an environment in which a global solution may be worked out within the context of the Chapter 11 proceedings trust.

21 In my view, s. 18.6(3) and (4) permit BW Canada to apply to this Court for such a stay and other appropriate relief. Relying upon the existing law on the recognition of foreign insolvency orders and proceedings, the principles and practicalities discussed and illustrated in the Cross-Border Insolvency Concordat and the UNCITRAL Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvencies and inherent jurisdiction, all as discussed above, I would think that the following may be of assistance in advancing guidelines as to how s. 18.6 should be applied. I do not intend the factors listed below to be exclusive or exhaustive but merely an initial attempt to provide guidance:

(a) The recognition of comity and cooperation between the courts of various jurisdictions are to be encouraged.

(b) Respect should be accorded to the overall thrust of foreign bankruptcy and insolvency legislation in any analysis, unless in substance generally it is so different from the bankruptcy and insolvency law of Canada or perhaps because the legal process that generates the foreign order diverges radically from the process here in Canada.

(c) All stakeholders are to be treated equitably, and to the extent reasonably possible, common or like stakeholders are to be treated equally, regardless of the jurisdiction in which they reside.

(d) The enterprise is to be permitted to implement a plan so as to reorganize as a global unit, especially where there is an established interdependence on a transnational basis of the enterprise and to the extent reasonably practicable, one jurisdiction should take charge of the principal administration of the enterprise's reorganization, where such principal type approach will facilitate a potential reorganization and which respects the claims of the stakeholders and does not inappropriately detract from the net benefits which may be available from alternative approaches.

(e) The role of the court and the extent of the jurisdiction it exercises will vary on a case by case basis and depend to a significant degree upon the court's nexus to that enterprise; in considering the appropriate level of its involvement, the court would consider:

(i) the location of the debtor's principal operations, undertaking and assets;

(ii) the location of the debtor's stakeholders;

(iii) the development of the law in each jurisdiction to address the specific problems of the debtor and the enterprise;

(iv) the substantive and procedural law which may be applied so that the aspect of undue prejudice may be analyzed;

(v) such other factors as may be appropriate in the instant circumstances.

(f) Where one jurisdiction has an ancillary role,

(i) the court in the ancillary jurisdiction should be provided with information on an ongoing basis and be kept apprised of developments in respect of that debtor's reorganizational efforts in the foreign jurisdiction;

(ii) stakeholders in the ancillary jurisdiction should be afforded appropriate access to the proceedings in the principal jurisdiction.

(g) As effective notice as is reasonably practicable in the circumstances should be given to all affected stakeholders, with an opportunity for such stakeholders to come back into the court to review the granted order with a view, if thought desirable, to rescind or vary the granted order or to obtain any other appropriate relief in the circumstances.

22 Taking these factors into consideration, and with the determination that the Chapter 11 proceedings are a "foreign proceeding" within the meaning of s. 18.6 of the CCAA and that it is appropriate to declare that BW Canada is entitled to avail itself of the provisions of s. 18.6, I would also grant the following relief. There is to be a stay against suits and enforcement as requested; the initial time period would appear reasonable in the circumstances to allow BWUS to return to the U.S. Bankruptcy Court. Assuming the injunctive relief is continued there, this will provide some additional time to more fully prepare an initial draft approach with respect to ongoing matters. It should also be recognized that if such future relief is not granted in the U.S. Bankruptcy Court, any interested person could avail themselves of the "comeback" clause in the draft order presented to me and which I find reasonable in the circumstances. It appears appropriate, in the circumstances that BW Canada guarantee BWUS' obligations as aforesaid and to grant security in respect thereof, recognizing that same is permitted pursuant to the general corporate legislation affecting BW Canada, namely the *Business Corporations Act* (Ontario). I note that there is also a provision for an "Information Officer" who will give quarterly reports to this Court. Notices are to be published in the Globe & Mail (National Edition) and the National Post. In accordance with my suggestion at the hearing, the draft order notice has been revised to note that persons are alerted to the fact that they may become a participant in these Canadian proceedings and further that, if so, they may make representations as to pursuing their remedies regarding asbestos related claims in Canada as opposed to the U.S. As discussed above the draft order also includes an appropriate "comeback" clause. This Court (and I specifically) look forward to working in a cooperative judicial way with the U.S. Bankruptcy Court (and Judge Brown specifically).

23 I am satisfied that it is appropriate in these circumstances to grant an order in the form of the revised draft (a copy of which is attached to these reasons for the easy reference of others who may be interested in this area of s. 18.6 of the CCAA).

24 Order to issue accordingly.

Application granted.

APPENDIX

Court File No. 00-CL-3667

SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
COMMERCIAL LIST

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE FARLEY	FRIDAY, THE 25{TH} DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2000

IN THE MATTER OF S. 18.6 OF THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED
AND IN THE MATTER OF BABCOCK & WILCOX CANADA LTD.

INITIAL ORDER

THIS MOTION made by the Applicant Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd. for an Order substantially in the form attached to the Application Record herein was heard this day, at 393 University Avenue, Toronto, Ontario.

ON READING the Notice of Application, the Affidavit of Victor J. Manica sworn February 23, 2000 (the "Manica Affidavit"), and on notice to the counsel appearing, and upon being advised that no other person who might be interested in these proceedings was served with the Notice of Application herein.

SERVICE

1. *THIS COURT ORDERS* that the time for service of the Notice of Application and the Affidavit in support of this Application be and it is hereby abridged such that the Application is properly returnable today, and, further, that any requirement for service of the Notice of Application and of the Application Record upon any interested party, other than the parties herein mentioned, is hereby dispensed with.

RECOGNITION OF THE U.S. PROCEEDINGS

2. *THIS COURT ORDERS AND DECLARES* that the proceedings commenced by the Applicant's United States corporate parent and certain other related corporations in the United States for protection under Chapter 11 of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code in connection with asbestos claims before the U.S. Bankruptcy Court (the "U.S. Proceedings") be and hereby is recognized as a "foreign proceeding" for purposes of Section 18.6 of the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C. 1985, c.C-36, as amended, (the "CCAA").

APPLICATION

3. *THIS COURT ORDERS AND DECLARES* that the Applicant is a company which is entitled to relief pursuant to s. 18.6 of the CCAA.

PROTECTION FROM ASBESTOS PROCEEDINGS

4. *THIS COURT ORDERS* that until and including May 1, 2000, or such later date as the Court may order (the "Stay Period"), no suit, action, enforcement process, extra-judicial proceeding or other proceeding relating to, arising out of or in any way connected to damages or loss suffered, directly or indirectly, from asbestos, asbestos contamination or asbestos related diseases ("Asbestos Proceedings") against or in respect of the Applicant, its directors or any property of the Applicant, wheresoever located, and whether held by the Applicant in whole or in part, directly or indirectly, as principal or nominee, beneficially or otherwise shall be commenced, and any Asbestos Proceedings against or in respect of the Applicant, its directors or the Applicant's Property already commenced be and are hereby stayed and suspended.

5. *THIS COURT ORDERS* that during the Stay Period, the right of any person, firm, corporation, governmental authority or other entity to assert, enforce or exercise any right, option or remedy arising by law, by virtue of any agreement or by any other means, as a result of the making or filing of these proceedings, the U.S. Proceedings or any allegation made in these proceedings or the U.S. Proceedings be and is hereby restrained.

DIP FINANCING

6. *THIS COURT ORDERS* that the Applicant is hereby authorized and empowered to guarantee the obligations of its parent, The Babcock & Wilcox Company, to Citibank, N.A., as Administrative Agent, the Lenders, the Swing Loan Lender, and Issuing Banks (as those terms are defined in the Post-Petition Credit Agreement (the "Credit Agreement")) dated as of February 22, 2000 (collectively, the "DIP Lender"), and to grant security (the "DIP Lender's Security") for such guarantee substantially on the terms and conditions set forth in the Credit Agreement.

7. *THIS COURT ORDERS* that the obligations of the Applicant pursuant to the Credit Agreement, the DIP Lender's Security and all the documents delivered pursuant thereto constitute legal, valid and binding obligations of the Applicant enforceable against it in accordance with the terms thereof, and the payments made and security granted by the Applicant pursuant to such documents do not constitute fraudulent preferences, or other challengeable or reviewable transactions under any applicable law.

8. *THIS COURT ORDERS* that the DIP Lender's Security shall be deemed to be valid and effective notwithstanding any negative covenants, prohibitions or other similar provisions with respect to incurring debt or the creation of liens or security contained in any existing agreement between the Applicant and any lender and that, notwithstanding any provision to the contrary in such agreements,

> (a) the execution, delivery, perfection or registration of the DIP Lender's Security shall not create or be deemed to constitute a breach by the Applicant of any agreement to which it is a party, and
>
> (b) the DIP Lender shall have no liability to any person whatsoever as a result of any breach of any agreement caused by or resulting from the Applicant entering into the Credit Agreement, the DIP Lender's Security or other document delivered pursuant thereto.

REPORT AND EXTENSION OF STAY

9. As part of any application by the Applicant for an extension of the Stay Period:

> (a) the Applicant shall appoint Victor J. Manica, or such other senior officer as it deems appropriate from time to time, as an information officer (the "Information Officer");
>
> (b) the Information Officer shall deliver to the Court a report at least once every three months outlining the status of the U.S. Proceeding, the development of any process for dealing with asbestos claims and such other information as the Information Officer believes to be material (the "Information Reports"); and
>
> (c) the Applicant and the Information Officer shall incur no liability or obligation as a result of the appointment of the Information Officer or the fulfilment of the duties of the Information Officer in carrying out the provisions of this Order and no action or other proceedings shall be commenced against the Applicant or Information Officer as an result of or relating in any way to the appointment of the Information Officer or the fulfilment of the duties of the Information Officer, except with prior leave of this Court and upon further order securing the solicitor and his own client costs of the Information Officer and the Applicant in connection with any such action or proceeding.

SERVICE AND NOTICE

10. *THIS COURT ORDERS* that the Applicant shall, within fifteen (15) business days of the date of entry of this Order, publish a notice of this Order in substantially the form attached as Schedule "A" hereto on two separate days in the Globe & Mail (National Edition) and the National Post.

11. *THIS COURT ORDERS* that the Applicant be at liberty to serve this Order, any other orders in these proceedings, all other proceedings, notices and documents by prepaid ordinary mail, courier, personal delivery or electronic transmission to any interested party at their addresses as last shown on the records of the Applicant and that any such service or notice by courier, personal delivery or electronic transmission shall be deemed to be received on the next business day following the date of forwarding thereof, or if sent by ordinary mail, on the third business day after mailing.

MISCELLANEOUS

12. *THIS COURT ORDERS* that notwithstanding anything else contained herein, the Applicant may, by written consent of its counsel of record herein, agree to waive any of the protections provided to it herein.

13. *THIS COURT ORDERS* that the Applicant may, from time to time, apply to this Court for directions in the discharge of its powers and duties hereunder or in respect of the proper execution of this Order.

14. *THIS COURT ORDERS* that, notwithstanding any other provision of this Order, any interested person may apply to this Court to vary or rescind this order or seek other relief upon 10 days' notice to the Applicant and to any other party likely to be affected by the order sought or upon such other notice, if any, as this Court may order.

15. *THIS COURT ORDERS AND REQUESTS* the aid and recognition of any court or any judicial, regulatory or administrative body in any province or territory of Canada (including the assistance of any court in Canada pursuant to Section 17 of the CCAA) and the Federal Court of Canada and any judicial, regulatory or administrative tribunal or other court constituted pursuant to the Parliament of Canada or the legislature of any province and any court or any judicial, regulatory or administrative body of the United States and the states or other subdivisions of the United States and of any other nation or state to act in aid of and to be complementary to this Court in carrying out the terms of this Order.

Schedule "A"

NOTICE

RE: IN THE MATTER OF S. 18.6 OF THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED (the "CCAA")

AND IN THE MATTER OF BABCOCK & WILCOX CANADA LTD.

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that this notice is being published pursuant to an Order of the Superior Court of Justice of Ontario made February 25, 2000. The corporate parent of Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd. and certain other affiliated corporations in the United States have filed for protection in the United States under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code to seek, as the result of recent, sharp increases in the cost of settling asbestos claims which have seriously threatened the Babcock & Wilcox Enterprise's long term health, protection from mass asbestos claims to which they are or may become subject. Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd. itself has not filed under Chapter 11 but has sought and obtained an interim order under Section 18.6 of the CCAA affording it a stay against asbestos claims in Canada. Further application may be made to the Court by Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd. to ensure fair and equal access for Canadians with asbestos claims against Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd. to the process established in the United States. Representations may also be made by parties who would prefer to pursue their remedies in Canada.

Persons who wish to be a party to the Canadian proceedings or to receive a copy of the order or any further information should contact counsel for Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd., Derrick C. Tay at Meighen Demers (Telephone (416) 340-6032 and Fax (416) 977-5239).

DATED this day of, 2000 at Toronto, Canada

TAB 2

Court File No. CV-16-11656-00CL

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
(COMMERCIAL LIST)

THE HONOURABLE	)	**WEDNESDAY THE 25TH**
	)	
MR. JUSTICE NEWBOULD	)	**DAY OF JANUARY, 2017**

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF MODULAR SPACE INTERMEDIATE HOLDINGS, INC., MODULAR SPACE CORPORATION, RESUN MODSPACE, INC., MODSPACE GOVERNMENT FINANCIAL SERVICES, INC., MODSPACE FINANCIAL SERVICES CANADA, LTD., RESUN CHIPPEWA, LLC AND MODULAR SPACE HOLDINGS, INC. (THE "DEBTORS")

APPLICATION OF MODULAR SPACE CORPORATION UNDER SECTION 46 OF THE *COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED

O R D E R

THIS MOTION, made by Modular Space Corporation ("**MSC**"), in its capacity as the foreign representative (the "**Foreign Representative**") of the Debtors, pursuant to the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended (the "**CCAA**") for an Order substantially in the form enclosed in the Motion Record was heard this day at 330 University Avenue, Toronto, Ontario.

ON READING the affidavit of David Orlofsky sworn January 20, 2017 and the exhibits thereto (the "**Orlofsky Affidavit**"), the first report of Alvarez & Marsal Canada Inc. ("**A&M**") in its capacity as the Court-appointed information officer (the "**Information Officer**") dated January 20, 2017 (the "**First Report**"), and on hearing the submissions of counsel for the

Debtors, counsel for the Information Officer, counsel for Bank of America, N.A., as Administrative Agent for the lenders under the Debtors' Post-Petition Credit Agreement (collectively, the "**DIP Lender**"), counsel for the Ad Hoc Group of Noteholders and such other counsel as may be present, and upon reading the affidavit of service of Evita Ferreira sworn January 20, 2017, filed,

SERVICE

1. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the time for service and filing of the Notice of Motion and the Motion Record is hereby abridged and validated so that this motion is properly returnable today and hereby dispenses with further service thereof.

APPROVAL OF A&M'S ACTIVITIES AND REPORTS

2. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Preliminary Report dated December 24, 2016 (the "**Preliminary Report**") and the activities of A&M in its capacity as the proposed Information Officer, as described in the Preliminary Report, be and are hereby approved.

3. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the First Report and the activities of A&M in its capacity as the Information Officer, as described in the First Report, be and are hereby approved.

RECOGNITION OF FOREIGN ORDERS

4. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the following orders (the "**Second Day Orders**") of the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware made in the insolvency proceedings of the Debtors under Chapter 11 of Title 11 of the United States Code are hereby recognized and

given full force and effect in all provinces and territories of Canada pursuant to Section 49 of the CCAA:

a. a final order (i) authorizing the Debtors to obtain post-petition financing (the "**DIP Financing**"); (ii) granting liens and super-priority administrative expense claims to the DIP Lenders; (iii) authorizing use of the DIP Financing proceeds to pay certain outstanding US pre-filing obligations; (iv) providing adequate protection to certain of the Debtors' pre-filing credit parties; (v) modifying the automatic stay as necessary to give effect to the DIP Financing order (the "**Final DIP Order**");

b. an order authorizing the Debtors' assumption of and performance under the restructuring support agreement dated as of December 20, 2016 (the "**RSA Order**");

c. an order approving the Debtors' entry into and performance under a stock purchase and backstop agreement dated as of December 28, 2016 and authorizing them to pay certain fees and expenses in connection with that agreement (the "**SPBA Order**");

d. a final order authorizing the Debtors to pay pre-Petition wages, compensation and employee benefits (the "**Final Wages Order**");

e. a final order: (i) authorizing, but not directing, the Debtors to maintain their existing bank accounts; (ii) authorizing the continued use of existing cash management systems; (iii) authorizing continued use of existing business forms; (iv) authorizing the continuation of (and administrative expense priority status of) intercompany transactions; and (iv) extending the time for the Debtors'

compliance under section 345(b) of the United States Bankruptcy Code to February 28, 2017 (the "**Final Cash Management Order**");

f. a final order with respect to utility providers: (i) approving the Debtors' form of adequate assurance of payment; (ii) establishing procedures to resolve objections by utility companies; and (iii) restraining utility companies from discontinuing, alternating or refusing service (the "**Final Utilities Order**");

g. a final order establishing notification procedures and approving restrictions on certain transfers of or claims for worthlessness with respect to equity securities (the "**Final NOL Order**"); and

h. an order authorizing the Debtors to employ and pay professionals utilized in the ordinary course of business, *nunc pro tunc*, to December 21, 2016 and waiving certain information requirements (the "**OCP Order**").

provided, however, that in the event of any conflict between the terms of the Second Day Orders and the Orders of this Court made in these proceedings, the Orders of this Court shall govern with respect to the Property (as defined in the Supplemental Order (Foreign Main Proceeding) of this Court made in these proceedings on December 27, 2016) in Canada. Copies of the Second Day Orders are attached as Exhibits D to K of the Orlofsky Affidavit.

GENERAL

5. **THIS COURT HEREBY 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 Foreign Representative, the Debtors, the Information Officer and their respective 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 Foreign Representative, the Debtors, the Information Officer, as an officer of this Court, as may be necessary or desirable to give effect to this Order or to assist the Foreign Representative, the Debtors, the Information Officer and their respective agents in carrying out the terms of this Order.

6. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that each of the Foreign Representative, the Debtors and the Information Officer be at liberty and is hereby authorized and empowered to apply to any court, tribunal, regulatory or administrative body, wherever located, for the recognition of this Order and for assistance in carrying out the terms of this Order.

ENTERED AT / INSCRIT À TORONTO
ON / BOOK NO:
LE / DANS LE REGISTRE NO:

JAN 25 2017

PER / PAR:

Court File No.: CV-16-11656-00CL

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF MODULAR SPACE INTERMEDIATE HOLDINGS, INC., MODULAR SPACE CORPORATION, RESUN MODSPACE, INC., MODSPACE GOVERNMENT FINANCIAL SERVICES, INC., MODSPACE FINANCIAL SERVICES CANADA, LTD., RESUN CHIPPEWA, LLC AND MODULAR SPACE HOLDINGS, INC. (THE "DEBTORS")

APPLICATION OF MODULAR SPACE CORPORATION UNDER SECTION 46 OF THE *COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
(COMMERCIAL LIST)

PROCEEDINGS COMMENCED AT TORONTO

ORDER

BORDEN LADNER GERVAIS LLP
Bay Adelaide Centre, East Tower
22 Adelaide St. W.
Toronto, ON M5H 4E3

ROGER JAIPARGAS / LSUC # 43275C
Tel: 416-367-6266
Email: rjaipargas@blg.com

EVITA FERREIRA / LSUC # 69967K
Tel: 416-367-6708
Email: eferreira@blg.com

Lawyers for Modular Space Holdings, Inc., Modular Space Intermediate Holdings, Inc., Modular Space Corporation, Resun ModSpace, Inc., ModSpace Government Financial Services, Inc., ModSpace Financial Services Canada, Ltd. and Resun Chippewa, LLC

TAB 3

Court File No. CV-18-597987-00CL

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
(COMMERCIAL LIST)

THE HONOURABLE	)	THURSDAY THE 14TH
	)	
JUSTICE MCEWEN	)	DAY OF JUNE, 2018

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF ROCKPORT BLOCKER, LLC, THE ROCKPORT GROUP HOLDINGS, LLC, TRG 1-P HOLDINGS, LLC, TRG INTERMEDIATE HOLDINGS, LLC, TRG CLASS D, LLC, THE ROCKPORT GROUP, LLC, THE ROCKPORT COMPANY, LLC, DRYDOCK FOOTWEAR, LLC, DD MANAGEMENT SERVICES LLC AND ROCKPORT CANADA ULC (THE "DEBTORS")

APPLICATION OF ROCKPORT BLOCKER, LLC, UNDER SECTION 46 OF THE *COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED

ORDER

THIS MOTION, made by Rockport Blocker, LLC ("**Rockport Blocker**"), in its capacity as the foreign representative (the "**Foreign Representative**") of the Debtors, pursuant to the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, as amended (the "**CCAA**") for an Order substantially in the form enclosed in the Motion Record was heard this day at 330 University Avenue, Toronto, Ontario.

ON READING the affidavit of Paul Kosturos sworn June 13, 2018 and the exhibits thereto (the "**Second Kosturos Affidavit**"), the first report of Richter Advisory Group Inc. ("**Richter**") in its capacity as the Court-appointed information officer (the "**Information Officer**") dated June 14, 2018 (the "**First Report**"), and on hearing the submissions of counsel

for the Debtors, counsel for the Information Officer, counsel for Citizens Business Capital, in its capacity as Administrative Agent and Collateral Agent for the lenders under the Senior Secured Super-Priority Debtor-in-Possession Revolving Credit Agreement, counsel for the Senior Secured Noteholders and DIP Note Lenders, counsel for The Cadillac Fairview Corporation Limited, counsel for Cushman & Wakefield Asset Services Inc., Ivanhoe Cambridge Inc., RioCan Real Estate Investment Trust, and upon no one appearing for any other parties although duly served as appears from the Affidavit of Service of Evita Ferreira sworn June 13, 2018, filed,

SERVICE

1. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the time for service and filing of the Notice of Motion and the Motion Record is hereby abridged and validated so that this motion is properly returnable today and hereby dispenses with further service thereof.

RECOGNITION OF FOREIGN ORDERS

2. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that any capitalized terms not otherwise defined herein shall have the meanings given to such terms in the Second Kosturos Affidavit.

3. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the following orders of the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware (the "**US Court**") made in the insolvency proceedings of the Debtors under Chapter 11 of Title 11 of the United States Bankruptcy Code are hereby recognized and given full force and effect in all provinces and territories of Canada pursuant to Section 49 of the CCAA:

a. an order, *inter alia*, (i) approving the bidding procedures, attached as Exhibit 1 to the Bidding Procedures Order, pursuant to which the Debtors will solicit and select the

highest or otherwise best offer for the sale (the "**Sale**") of all or substantially all of the Debtors' assets, (ii) approving the Stalking Horse Protections (as defined in the Bidding Procedures Order) provided by the Debtors to CB Marathon Opco, LLC, an affiliate of Charlesbank Equity Fund IX, Limited Partnership, (iii) scheduling an auction, if necessary, (iv) authorizing and approving the Sale Notice, substantially in the form attached to the Bidding Procedures Order as Exhibit 2 thereto, and the Potential Assumption and Assignment Notice, substantially in the form attached to the Bidding Procedures Order as Exhibit 3 thereto, (v) approving the amendments to Sections 4.4(i) and 4.6(a) of the Stalking Horse Agreement, substantially in the form attached to the Bidding Procedures Order as Exhibit 4 thereto, to address the unsecured creditors' committee's objection to the Stalking Horse Protections (as defined in the Bidding Procedures Order), (vi) authorizing and approving procedures for the assumption and assignment of the Contracts and Leases and the determination of Cure Costs with respect thereto, (vii) scheduling a hearing to approve the Sale, and (viii) granting related relief (the "**Bidding Procedures Order**");

b. an order, *inter alia*, (i) authorizing, but not directing, the Debtors to (a) conduct store closing sales (the "**Store Closing Sales**") at the Debtors' retail stores in the United States and Canada (collectively, the "**Closing Stores**") in accordance with the terms of the store closing sale guidelines attached as Exhibit 1 to the Store Closing Sales Order, and (b) pay retention and shrink bonuses to non-insider retail employees at the Closing Stores who remain employed for the duration of the Store Closing Sales, and (ii) granting certain related relief (the "**Store Closing Sales Order**");

c. an order, among other things, authorizing, but not directing, the Debtors to retain and pay professionals utilized in the ordinary course of business, including, but not limited to those set forth on Exhibit 1, attached to the Ordinary Course Professionals Order, as of the Filing Date or the applicable date of engagement, in accordance with the procedures proposed therein (the "**Ordinary Course Professionals Order**");

d. an order, among other things, authorizing the Debtors to employ and retain Prime Clerk LLC as administrative advisor in the US Proceedings, *nunc pro tunc,* to the Filing Date (the "**Administrative Advisor Order**");

e. an order, among other things, (i) authorizing the Debtors to retain Alvarez & Marsal North America, LLC together with employees of its professional service provider affiliates (all of which are wholly-owned by its parent company and employees) and its wholly-owned subsidiaries (collectively, "**A&M and Affiliates**") pursuant to the terms of that certain letter agreement between A&M and Affiliates and the Debtors, dated March 1, 2018 (replacing the prior engagement letter dated as of October 10, 2017) to provide the Debtors with an interim chief financial officer ("**Interim CFO**"), interim chief operating officer (the "**Interim COO**") and additional employees of A&M and Affiliates (the "**Additional Personnel**", and together with the Interim CFO and Interim COO, the "**Engagement Personnel**"), as needed to assist the Interim CFO and Interim COO, (ii) designating Paul Kosturos as Interim CFO and Josh Jacobs as Interim COO to the Debtors effective *nunc pro tunc* as of the Filing Date, and (iii) granting certain related relief (the "**A&M Retention Order**");

f. an order, among other things, (i) authorizing the retention and employment of HYPERAMS, LLC as the Debtors' liquidation consultant *nunc pro tunc* to May 25, 2018, and (ii) modifying certain reporting requirements under the Local Rules (the "**Consultant Retention Order**");

g. a final order (i) authorizing, but not directing, the Rockport Group, in their sole discretion, to pay (a) all or a portion of the shipping and warehousing claims and (b) certain import charges; and (ii) authorizing applicable banks and other financial institutions to receive, process, honour and pay any and all cheques drawn on the Debtors' general disbursement account and other transfers, to the extent such cheques and transfers relate to any of the foregoing (the "**Final Shippers and Warehousemen Order**");

h. a final order (i) authorizing, but not directing, the Rockport Group to pay prepetition obligations of certain (a) critical vendors, up to US$2,000,000; and (b) foreign vendors up to US$20 million; and (ii) authorizing applicable banks and financial institutions to receive, process, honor and pay any and all cheques drawn on the Rockport Group's general disbursement account and other transfers, to the extent these cheques and transfers relate to any of the foregoing (the "**Final Critical and Foreign Vendors Order**");

i. a final order (i) authorizing, but not directing, the Rockport Group, in their sole discretion, to pay Covered Taxes and Fees (as defined in the First Day Declaration), whether asserted prior to, on or after the commencement of the Chapter 11 cases; and (ii) authorizing and directing applicable banks and financial institutions to receive,

process, honor and pay any and all cheques drawn on the Rockport Group's general disbursement account and other transfers to the extent these cheques and transfers relate to any of the foregoing (the "**Final Taxes Order**");

j. a final order (i) authorizing the Rockport Group to continue and renew their (a) Insurance Programs (as defined in the First Day Declaration), including Premium Financing (as defined in the First Day Declaration), and (b) Surety Bond Program (as defined in the First Day Declaration) and honor all obligations under the Insurance and Surety Bond Programs; (ii) modifying the automatic stay imposed by Section 362 of the Bankruptcy Code to the extent necessary to permit the Rockport Group's employees to proceed with any claims they may have under the Workers' Compensation Program (as defined in the First Day Declaration); and (iii) authorizing financial institutions to honor and process related cheques and transfers (the "**Final Insurance Order**");

k. a final order authorizing the Rockport Group to pay pre-Petition wages, compensation, employee benefits and claims of independent contractors (the "**Final Wages Order**");

l. a final order, with respect to utilities providers, (i) prohibiting the Rockport Group's utility service providers from altering or discontinuing service; (ii) approving an adequate assurance deposit as adequate assurance of post-Petition payment to the utilities; and (iii) establishing procedures for resolving any subsequent requests by the utilities for additional adequate assurance of payment (the "**Final Utilities Order**"); and

m. a final order authorizing, but not directing, the Rockport Group to maintain their existing bank accounts, cash management system and authorizing the continuation of (and administrative expense priority status of) intercompany transactions, subject to certain limitations set out therein (the "**Final Cash Management Order**", together with the aforementioned orders, the "**Second Day and Other US Orders**");

provided, however, that in the event of any conflict between the terms of the Second Day and Other US Orders and the Orders of this Court made in these proceedings, the Orders of this Court shall govern with respect to the Property (as defined in the Supplemental Order (Foreign Main Proceeding) of this Court made in these proceedings on May 16, 2018) in Canada. Copies of the Second Day and Other US Orders are attached as Exhibits D to P of the Second Kosturos Affidavit.

GENERAL

4. **THIS COURT HEREBY 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 Foreign Representative, the Debtors, the Information Officer and their respective 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 Foreign Representative, the Debtors, the Information Officer, as an officer of this Court, as may be necessary or desirable to give effect to this Order or to assist the Foreign Representative, the Debtors, the Information Officer and their respective agents in carrying out the terms of this Order.

5. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that each of the Foreign Representative, the Debtors and the Information Officer be at liberty and is hereby authorized and empowered to apply to any court, tribunal, regulatory or administrative body, wherever located, for the recognition of this Order and for assistance in carrying out the terms of this Order.

ENTERED AT / INSCRIT À TORONTO
ON / BOOK NO:
LE / DANS LE REGISTRE NO:

JUN 14 2018

PER / PAR:

Court File No.: CV-18-597987-00CL

IN THE MATTER OF THE *COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED AND IN THE MATTER OF ROCKPORT BLOCKER, LLC, THE ROCKPORT GROUP HOLDINGS, LLC, TRG 1-P HOLDINGS, LLC, TRG INTERMEDIATE HOLDINGS, LLC, TRG CLASS D, LLC, THE ROCKPORT GROUP, LLC, THE ROCKPORT COMPANY, LLC, DRYDOCK FOOTWEAR, LLC, DD MANAGEMENT SERVICES LLC AND ROCKPORT CANADA ULC (THE "DEBTORS")

APPLICATION OF ROCKPORT BLOCKER, LLC, UNDER SECTION 46 OF THE *COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
(COMMERCIAL LIST)

PROCEEDINGS COMMENCED AT TORONTO

ORDER
(June 14, 2018)

BORDEN LADNER GERVAIS LLP
Bay Adelaide Centre, East Tower
22 Adelaide Street West
Toronto ON M5H 4E3
Tel: 416-367-6000
Fax: 416-367-6749

Roger Jaipargas – LSO No. 43275C
Tel: 416-367-6266
rjaipargas@blg.com

Alex MacFarlane – LSO No. 28133Q
Tel: 416-367-6305
amacfarlane@blg.com

Evita Ferreira – LSO No. 69967K
Tel: 416-367-6708
eferreira@blg.com

Lawyers for Rockport Blocker, LLC, The Rockport Group Holdings, LLC, TRG 1-P Holdings, LLC, TRG Intermediate Holdings, LLC, TRG Class D, LLC, The Rockport Group, LLC, The Rockport Company, LLC, Drydock Footwear, LLC, DD Management Services LLC and Rockport Canada ULC

TAB 4

Citation: Re Xerium Technologies Inc., 2010 ONSC 3974
Court File No. 10-8652-00CL
Date: 20100928

SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
ONTARIO
(Commercial List)

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

XERIUM TECHNOLOGIES, INC., IN ITS CAPACITY AS THE FOREIGN REPRESENTATIVE OF XERIUM TECHNOLOGIES, INC., HUYCK LICENSCO INC., STOWE WOODWARD LICENSCO LLC, STOWE WOODWARD LLC, WANGNER ITELPA I LLC, WANGNER ITELPA II LLC, WEAVEXX, LLC, XERIUM ASIA, LLC, XERIUM III (US) LIMITED, XERIUM IV (US) LIMITED, XERIUM V (US) LIMITED, XTI LLC, XERIUM CANADA INC., HUYCK.WANGNER AUSTRIA GMBH, XERIUM GERMANY HOLDING GMBH, AND XERIUM ITALIA S.P.A.
(collectively, the "Chapter 11 Debtors")

Applicants

BEFORE: C. CAMPBELL J.

COUNSEL: *Derrick Tay, Randy Sutton* for the Applicants

HEARD: May 14, 2010

E N D O R S E M E N T

[1] The Recognition Orders sought in this matter exhibit the innovative and efficient employment of the provisions of Part IV of the *Companies Creditors Arrangement Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C.36, as amended (the "CCAA") to cross border insolvencies.

[2] Each of the "Chapter 11 Debtors" commenced proceedings on March 30, 2010 in the United States under Chapter 11 of Title 11 of the United States Bankruptcy Code (the "U.S. Bankruptcy Code") in the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware (the "Chapter 11 Proceedings.")

[3] On April 1, 2010, this Court granted the Recognition Order sought by, *inter alia*, the Applicant, Xerium Technologies Inc. ("Xerium") as the "Foreign Representative" of the Chapter 11 Debtors and recognizing the Chapter 11 Proceedings as a "foreign main proceeding" in respect of the Chapter 11 Debtors, pursuant to Part IV of the CCAA.

[4] On various dates in April 2010, Judge Kevin J. Carey of the U.S. Bankruptcy Court made certain orders in respect of the Chapter 11 Debtors' ongoing business operations.

[5] On May 12, 2010, Judge Carey confirmed the Chapter 11 Debtors' amended Joint Prepackaged Plan of Reorganization dated March 30, 2010 as supplemented (the "Plan")[1] pursuant to the U.S. Bankruptcy Code (the "U.S. Confirmation Order.")

[6] Xerium sought in this motion to have certain orders made by the U.S. Bankruptcy Court in April 2010, the U.S Confirmation Order and the Plan recognized and given effect to in Canada.

[7] The Applicant together with its direct and indirect subsidiaries (collectively, the "Company") are a leading global manufacturer and supplier of products used in the production of paper products.

[8] Both Xerium, a Delaware limited liability company, Xerium Canada Inc. ("Xerium Canada"), a Canadian company, together with other entities forming part of the Chapter 11 Debtors are parties to an Amended and Restated Credit and Guarantee Agreement dated as of May 30, 2008 as borrowers, with various financial institutions and other persons as lenders. The Credit Facility is governed by the laws of the State of New York.

[9] Due to a drop in global demand for paper products and in light of financial difficulties encountered by the Company due to the drop in demand in its products and is difficulty raising funds, the Company anticipated that it would not be in compliance with certain financial covenants under the Credit Facility for the period ended September 30, 2009. The Chapter 11 Debtors, their lenders under the Credit Facility, the Administrative Agent and the Secured Lender Ad Hoc Working Group entered into discussions exploring possible restructuring scenarios. The negotiations progressed smoothly and the parties worked toward various consensual restructuring scenarios.

[10] The Plan was developed between the Applicant, its direct and indirect subsidiaries together with the Administrative Agent and the Secured Lender Ad Hoc Working Group.

[11] Pursuant to the Plan, on March 2, 2010, the Chapter 11 Debtors commenced the solicitation of votes on the Plan and delivered copies of the Plan, the Disclosure Statement and the appropriate ballots to all holders of claims as of February 23, 2010 in the classes entitled to vote on the Plan.

[12] The Disclosure Statement established 4:00 p.m. (prevailing Eastern time) on March 22, 2010 as the deadline for the receipt of ballots to accept or reject the Plan, subject to the Chapter 11 Debtors' right to extend the solicitation period. The Chapter 11 Debtors exercised their right

[1] Capitalized terms used herein not otherwise defined shall have the meanings ascribed to them in the Plan. Unless otherwise stated, all monetary amounts contained herein are expressed in U.S. Dollars.

to extend the solicitation period to 6:00 p.m. (prevailing Eastern time) on March 26, 2010. The Plan was overwhelmingly accepted by the two classes of creditors entitled to vote on the Plan.

[13] On March 31, 2010, the U.S. Bankruptcy Court entered the Order (I) Scheduling a Combined Hearing to Consider (a) Approval of the Disclosure Statement, (b) Approval of Solicitation Procedures and Forms of Ballots, and (c) Confirmation of the Plan; (II) Establishing a Deadline to Object to the Disclosure Statement and the Plan; and (III) Approving the Form and Manner of Notice Thereof (the "Scheduling Order.")

[14] Various orders were made by the U.S. Bankruptcy Court in April 2010, which orders were recognized by this Court.

[15] On May 12, 2010, at the Combined Hearing, the U.S. Bankruptcy Court confirmed the Plan, and made a number of findings, *inter alia*, regarding the content of the Plan and the procedures underlying its consideration and approval by interested parties. These included the appropriateness of notice, the content of the Disclosure Statement, the voting process, all of which were found to meet the requirements of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code and fairly considered the interests of those affected.

[16] The Plan provides for a comprehensive financial restructuring of the Chapter 11 Debtors' institutional indebtedness and capital structure. According to its terms, only Secured Swap Termination Claims, claims on account of the Credit Facility, Unsecured Swap Termination Claims, and Equity Interests in Xerium are "impaired" under the Plan. Holders of all other claims are unimpaired.

[17] Under the Plan, the notional value of the Chapter 11 Debtors' outstanding indebtedness will be reduced from approximately U.S.$640 million to a notional value of approximately U.S.$480 million, and the Chapter 11 Debtors will have improved liquidity as a result of the extension of maturity dates under the Credit Facility and access to an U.S. $80 million Exit Facility.

[18] The Plan provides substantial recoveries in the form of cash, new debt and equity to its secured lenders and swap counterparties and provides existing equity holders with more than $41.5 million in value.

[19] Xerium has been unable to restructure its secured debt in any other manner than by its secured lenders voluntarily accepting equity and the package of additional consideration proposed to be provided to the secured lenders under the Plan.

[20] The Plan benefits all of the Chapter 11 Debtors' stakeholders. It reflects a global settlement of the competing claims and interests of these parties, the implementation of which will serve to maximize the value of the Debtors' estates for the benefit of all parties in interest.

[21] I conclude that the Plan is not likely to be followed by the liquidation or the need for further financial reorganization of the Chapter 11 Debtors.

[22] On April 1, 2010, the Recognition Order granted by this Court provided, among other things:

(a) Recognition of the Chapter 11 Proceedings as a "foreign main proceeding" pursuant to Subsection 47(2) of the CCAA;

(b) Recognition of the Applicant as the "foreign representative" in respect of the Chapter 11 Proceedings;

(c) Recognition of and giving effect in Canada to the automatic stay imposed under Section 362 of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code in respect of the Chapter 11 Debtors;

(d) Recognition of and giving effect in Canada to the U.S. First Day Orders in respect of the Chapter 11 Debtors;

(e) A stay of all proceedings taken or that might be taken against the Chapter 11 Debtors under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*;

(f) Restraint on further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the Chapter 11 Debtors;

(g) Prohibition of the commencement of any action, suit or proceeding against the Chapter 11 Debtors; and

(h) Prohibition of the Chapter 11 Debtors from selling or otherwise disposing of, outside the ordinary course of its business, any of the Chapter 11 Debtors' property in Canada that relates to their business and prohibiting the Chapter 11 Debtors from selling or otherwise disposing of any of their other property in Canada, unless authorized to do so by the U.S. Bankruptcy Court.

[23] I am satisfied that this Court does have the authority and indeed obligation to grant the recognition sought under Part IV of the CCAA. The recognition sought is precisely the kind of comity in international insolvency contemplated by Part IV of the CCAA.

[24] Section 44 identifies the purpose of Part IV of the CCAA. It states

> The purpose of this Part is to provide mechanisms for dealing with cases of cross-border insolvencies and to promote
>
> (a) cooperation between the courts and other competent authorities in Canada with those of foreign jurisdictions in cases of cross-border insolvencies;
>
> (b) greater legal certainty for trade and investment;
>
> (c) the fair and efficient administration of cross-border insolvencies that protects the interests of creditors and other interested persons, and those of debtor companies;

> (d) the protection and the maximization of the value of debtor company's property; and
>
> (e) the rescue of financially troubled businesses to protect investment and preserve employment.

[25] I am satisfied that the provisions of the Plan are consistent with the purposes set out in s. 61(1) of the CCAA, which states:

> Nothing in this Part prevents the court, on the application of a foreign representative or any other interested person, from applying any legal or equitable rules governing the recognition of foreign insolvency orders and assistance to foreign representatives that are not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act.

[26] In *Re Babcock & Wilcox Canada Ltd.*, 18 C.B.R. (4th) 157 at para. 21, this Court held that U.S. Chapter 11 proceedings are "foreign proceedings" for the purposes of the CCAA's cross-border insolvency provisions. The Court also set out a non exclusive or exhaustive list of factors that the Court should consider in applying those provisions.

[27] The applicable factors from *Re Babcock and Wilcox* that dictate in favour of recognition of the U.S. Confirmation Order are set out in paragraph 45 of the Applicant's factum:

(a) The Plan is critical to the restructuring of the Chapter 11 Debtors as a global corporate unit;

(b) The Company is a highly integrated business and is managed centrally from the United States. The Credit Facility which is being restructured is governed by the laws of the State of New York. Each of the Chapter 11 Debtors is a borrower or guarantor, or both, under the Credit Facility;

(c) Confirmation of the Plan in the U.S. Court occurred in accordance with standard and well established procedures and practices, including Court approval of the Disclosure Statement and the process for the solicitation and tabulation of votes on the Plan;

(d) By granting the Initial Order in which the Chapter 11 Proceedings were recognized as Foreign Main Proceedings, this Honourable Court already acknowledged Canada as an ancillary jurisdiction in the reorganization of the Chapter 11 Debtors;

(e) The Applicant carries on business in Canada through a Canadian subsidiary, Xerium Canada, which is one of Chapter 11 Debtors and has had the same access and participation in the Chapter 11 Proceedings as the other Chapter 11 Debtors;

(f) Recognition of the U.S. Confirmation Order is necessary for ensuring the fair and efficient administration of this cross-border insolvency, whereby all stakeholders who hold an interest in the Chapter 11 Debtors are treated equitably.

[28] Additionally, the Plan is consistent with the purpose of the CCAA. By confirming the Plan, the U.S. Bankruptcy Court has concluded that the Plan complies with applicable U.S. Bankruptcy principles and that, *inter alia*:

(a) it is made in good faith;

(b) it does not breach any applicable law;

(c) it is in the interests of the Chapter 11 Debtors' creditors and equity holders; and

(d) it will not likely be followed by the need for liquidation or further financial reorganization of the Chapter 11 Debtors.

These are principles which also underlie the CCAA, and thus dictate in favour of the Plan's recognition and implementation in Canada.

[29] In granting the recognition order sought, I am satisfied that the implementation of the Plan in Canada not only helps to ensure the orderly completion to the Chapter 11 Debtors' restructuring process, but avoids what otherwise might have been a time-consuming and costly process were the Canadian part of the Applicant itself to make a separate restructuring application under the CCAA in Canada.

[30] The Order proposed relieved the Applicant from the publication provisions of s. 53(b) of the CCAA. Based on the positive impact for creditors in Canada of the Plan as set out in paragraph 27 above, I was satisfied that given the cost involved in publication, the cost was neither necessary nor warranted.

[31] The requested Order is to issue in the form signed.

C. CAMPBELL J.

Released:

IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED
AND IN THE MATTER OF IMERYS TALC AMERICA, INC., IMERYS TALC VERMONT, INC., AND IMERYS TALC CANADA INC. (THE "DEBTORS")
APPLICATION OF IMERYS TALC CANADA INC. UNDER SECTION 46 OF THE COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED

Court File No: CV-19-61461400CL

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
(COMMERCIAL LIST)

Proceeding commenced at Toronto

BOOK OF AUTHORITIES
(Returnable August 7, 2019)

STIKEMAN ELLIOTT LLP
Barristers & Solicitors
5300 Commerce Court West
199 Bay Street
Toronto, Canada M5L 1B9

Maria Konyukhova LSO#: 52880V
Tel: (416) 869-5230

Patricia Joseph LSO#: 75535Q
Tel: (416) 869-5642
Fax: (416) 947-0866

Lawyers for the Applicant