

**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 URBANCORP TORONTO
MANAGEMENT INC., URBANCORP (ST. CLAIR VILLAGE)
INC., URBANCORP (PATRICIA) INC., URBANCORP
(MALLOW) INC., URBANCORP (LAWRENCE) INC.,
URBANCORP DOWNSVIEW PARK DEVELOPMENT INC.,
URBANCORP (952 QUEEN WEST) INC., KING
RESIDENTIAL INC., URBANCORP 60 ST. CLAIR INC.,
HIGH RES. INC., BRIDGE ON KING INC. (collectively, the
"Applicants") AND THE AFFILIATED ENTITIES LISTED IN
SCHEDULE "A" HERETO**

FACTUM OF THE URBANCORP CCAA ENTITIES

DLA PIPER (CANADA) LLP
1 First Canadian Place, Suite 6000
100 King Street West
Toronto, ON M5X 1E2

Edmond Lamek (LSO #33338U)
Tel: (416) 365-3444
Email: edmond.lamek@dlapiper.com

Danny M. Nunes (LSO #53802D)
Tel: (416) 365-3421
Email: danny.nunes@dlapiper.com

Lawyers for the Urbancorp CCAA Entities

PART I – OVERVIEW

1. Pursuant to the Order of the Honourable Justice Newbould dated May 18, 2016 (the “**Initial Order**”), the Applicants, along with certain affiliated entities (together, the “**Urbancorp CCAA Entities**”), were granted creditor protection pursuant to the *Companies Creditors’ Arrangement Act* (“**CCAA**”) and KSV Kofman Inc.¹ was appointed as Monitor of the Urbancorp CCAA Entities (the “**Monitor**”).
2. The Initial Order granted a stay of proceedings in favour of the Urbancorp CCAA Entities until and including June 17, 2016 or such later date as the Court may order (the “**Stay Period**”). The Stay Period was most recently extended on January 29, 2024 pursuant to the Order of the Honourable Chief Justice Morawetz until and including June 27, 2024.
3. The Urbancorp CCAA Entities seek an extension of the Stay Period until and including January 31, 2025. The Urbancorp CCAA Entities submit that the requested extension of the Stay Period should be granted as they have been acting in good faith and with due diligence in the conduct of the within CCAA proceeding.
4. The requested stay extension is appropriate and consistent with the objectives of the CCAA and will assist the Monitor as it continues to address the sole substantive matter outstanding in these CCAA proceedings before any final distributions can be made and the CCAA proceedings terminated. The requested extension of the Stay Period is necessary in the circumstances and is supported by the Monitor.

PART II - FACTS

5. Given that the facts relevant to the request for the extension of the Stay Period are those more recent facts arising since the date of the aforementioned Order of January 29, 2024, a more fulsome description of the background facts in respect of the Urbancorp CCAA Entities and these CCAA proceedings can be found in the Monitor’s reports to the Court, including the Sixtieth Report of the Monitor dated June 21, 2024 (the “**Sixtieth Report**”).
6. At the return of the Urbancorp CCAA Entities’ most recent stay extension motion, the Monitor advised the Court regarding the status of the wind-down of those Urbancorp CCAA Entities that had an interest in certain geothermal assets (the “**Geothermal Asset Owners**”). The wind-down of the Geothermal Asset Owners and the resultant tax issues was and remains the last substantive matter to be addressed in these CCAA proceedings.

¹ Effective August 31, 2020, KSV Kofman Inc. changed its name to KSV Restructuring Inc.

7. With the exception of one company, the Geothermal Asset Owners are solvent and all residual funds, net of professional fees, can be distributed to Urbancorp Inc. (“**UCI**”) primarily by way of intercorporate dividend. Prior to distributing those funds, the Monitor must receive clearance certificates from Canada Revenue Agency (“**CRA**”) confirming that the geothermal asset owners are not indebted to CRA on account of taxes or HST.²
8. As part of the process of obtaining clearance certificates, the Monitor was required to file up to date tax returns for all of the Geothermal Asset Owners. As at the date of the Sixtieth Report, CRA originally issued assessments in respect of the 2020 and 2021 tax returns and subsequently reassessed the 2020 tax return for one of the Geothermal Asset Owners and the Monitor understands that CRA is in the process of auditing the original 2021 tax return for another of the Geothermal Asset Owners. The Monitor is in communication with CRA to address issues arising from CRA’s review of the aforementioned returns.³
9. The Monitor has already filed 2022 tax returns for the Geothermal Asset Owners, all of which are essentially nil returns, and is working with MNP LLP (“**MNP**”), the Urbancorp CCAA Entities’ accountants, to have the 2023 tax returns prepared and filed, all of which are expected to reflect no taxes payable.⁴
10. Until such time as all tax returns have been filed and any assessments or re-assessments have been issued, the Monitor will not be able to obtain the necessary clearance certificates from CRA before it can distribute funds and terminate the CCAA proceedings.
11. However, the timeline for obtaining the clearance certificates is not within the control of the Monitor and, thus, while the Monitor is moving the matter forward as expeditiously as possible, there is no date certain by which the clearance certificates will be obtained.⁵
12. The length of the stay extension sought by the Urbancorp CCAA Entities reflects the uncertainty regarding the timing of the receipt of the clearance certificates but should the certificates be obtained prior to the expiry of the Stay Period, the Monitor will return to Court to seek orders to distribute the remaining funds and to terminate the CCAA proceedings.

² Sixtieth Report to Court of the Monitor, at pp. 2 and 5.

³ *Ibid*, at p. 5.

⁴ *Ibid*.

⁵ *Ibid*, at pg. 6.

PART III - ISSUES

13. The issues before the Court are (i) whether the requested stay extension to January 31, 2025 and (ii) the fee and report approvals sought by the Urbancorp CCAA Entities, should be granted.

PART IV - LAW AND ARGUMENT

A. Extension of the Stay Period

14. Section 11.02(2) of the CCAA provides that, on an application other than an initial application, the Court may make a stay order for any period that the Court considers necessary if the applicant satisfies the Court 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.⁶
15. As such, provided that the two aforementioned conditions are met, the Court has the discretion to grant an extension of the stay of proceedings in whatever duration the Court considers necessary and appropriate given the circumstances.
16. Other factors that the Court will consider in granting a stay extension include the debtor's progress during the previous stay period toward a restructuring, whether creditors will be prejudiced if the Court grants the extension and the comparative prejudice to the debtor, creditors and other stakeholders if the extension is not granted.⁷
17. The question of good faith relates to the conduct of the debtor during the CCAA proceeding.⁸ In the instant case, the Urbancorp CCAA Entities have acted in good faith throughout this CCAA proceeding and continue to do so and there has been no assertion by any party to the contrary.
18. The Urbancorp CCAA Entities have also acted with and continue to act with due diligence. During the course of the most recent Stay Period, the Monitor has continued to move forward on the sole substantive issue that remains to be addressed, obtaining clearance certificates for the Geothermal Asset Owners. As noted above, only once the clearance certificates are obtained can the net residual funds held by the Monitor be distributed. The Monitor has worked with its legal counsel and MNP on the various tax returns and amended tax returns

⁶ CCAA, s. 11.02(3).

⁷ *Federal Gypsum Co. (Re)*, 2007 NSSC 347 at paras. 24-29.

⁸ *Muscletech Research & Development Inc. (Re)*, 2006 CanLII 3282 (Ont.S.C.J. [Comm. List]) at para. 4.

that needed to be filed. Although the Monitor has no control over the timing to obtain the clearance certificates, it has acted and continues to act with due diligence to move the matter forward.

19. Lastly, in addition to the substantial progress that was made during the course of the last Stay Period, no creditor will be prejudiced if the requested extension of the Stay Period is granted and no party has voiced any opposition to the requested extension.

B. Fee and Report Approvals

20. As set out in *Nordstrom Canada Retail, Inc.*, the overarching test for assessing the fees and disbursements of the Monitor and its counsel is whether they are fair and reasonable in all of the circumstances and requires an overall assessment and consideration of the work done and the results achieved. In conducting that overall assessment and determining what is fair and reasonable, the predominant consideration for the Court should be the value provided.⁹
21. The Court shall consider the following factors in assessing the fees and disbursements: (i) the nature, extent and value of the assets being handled; (ii) the time spent and the complications and difficulties encountered; (iii) the Monitor’s knowledge, experience and skill; (iv) the diligence and thoroughness displayed by the Monitor; (v) the responsibilities the Monitor assumed; and (vi) the results of the Monitor’s efforts.¹⁰
22. The fees and disbursements of the Monitor and its counsel, Davies Ward Phillips & Vineberg LLP (“**Davies**”), as well as those of counsel to the Urbancorp CCAA Entities, DLA Piper (Canada) LLP (“**DLA**”), for the period January 1, 2024 to May 31, 2024, are set out in the fee affidavits of Noah Goldstein, Robin Schwill and Edmond Lamek, respectively (together, the “**Fee Affidavits**”), attached as appendices to the Sixtieth Report.
23. The Sixtieth Report details the efforts undertaken by the Monitor and Davies during the period of the most recent Stay Extension to advance the sole remaining substantive matter in the CCAA proceeding. In the instant case, the work done has been appropriately conducted in a timely and diligent manner by all parties and the fees and disbursements of the Monitor, Davies and DLA are both fair and reasonable in all of the circumstances.
24. With respect to the Urbancorp CCAA Entities’ request for approval of the Sixtieth Report and the Monitor’s activities described therein, the Court in *Target Canada Co. (Re)* noted that

⁹ *Nordstrom Canada Retail, Inc.*, 2023 ONSC 4199 (Ont. S.C.J. [Comm. List]) at para. 24.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

there are both policy and practical reasons for the approval of the Monitor's activities, including, among others, allowing the Monitor to move forward with the next steps in the CCAA proceeding, bringing the Monitor's activities before the Court, allowing an opportunity for the concerns of stakeholders to be addressed and any problems rectified, enabling the Court to satisfy itself that the Monitor's activities have been conducted in a prudent and diligent manner and providing the Monitor with protection not otherwise provided by the CCAA.¹¹

25. The Court's approval of the Sixtieth Report and the Monitor's activities fulfills the policy and practical purposes set out in the preceding paragraph and the other salutary effects noted by the Court in *Target*.
26. Finally, there has been no adverse comment about the fees and disbursements detailed in the Fee Affidavits nor the Sixtieth Report and the Monitor's activities described therein.

PART V - CONCLUSION

27. For the reasons set forth herein, the Urbancorp CCAA Entities request that the Order extending the Stay Period until and including January 31, 2025 be granted, the fees and disbursements of the Monitor, Davies and DLA be approved and the Sixtieth Report and the Monitor's activities detailed therein be approved, substantially in the form of the draft Order attached as Tab 3 to the Urbancorp CCAA Entities' Motion Record.

ALL OF WHICH IS RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 24th day of June, 2024.

DocuSigned by:
Danny Nunes
3B3681E27A544E6...

DLA PIPER (CANADA) LLP
1 First Canadian Place, Suite 6000
100 King Street West
Toronto, ON M5X 1E2

Edmond Lamek (LSO #33338U)
Tel: (416) 365-3444
Email: edmond.lamek@dlapiper.com

Danny M. Nunes (LSO#53802D)
Tel: (416) 365-3421
Email: danny.nunes@dlapiper.com

Lawyers for the Urbancorp CCAA Entities

¹¹ *Target Canada Co. (Re)*, 2015 ONSC 7574 (Ont S.C.J. [Comm. List]) at para. 23.

**SCHEDULE “A”
LIST OF AUTHORITIES**

1. [*Federal Gypsum Co. \(Re\)*](#), 2007 NSSC 347
2. [*Muscletech Research & Development Inc. \(Re\)*](#), 2006 CanLII 3282 (Ont.S.C.J. [Comm. List])
3. [*Nordstrom Canada Retail, Inc.*](#), 2023 ONSC 4199 (Ont. S.C.J. [Comm. List])
4. [*Target Canada Co. \(Re\)*](#), 2015 ONSC 7574 (Ont S.C.J. [Comm. List])

**SCHEDULE “B”
TEXT OF STATUTES, REGULATIONS & BY-LAWS**

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

s. 11.02(2)

Stays, etc. — other than initial application

(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.

s. 11.02(3)

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.

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 URBANCORP TORONTO MANAGEMENT INC., URBANCORP (ST. CLAIR VILLAGE) INC., URBANCORP (PATRICIA) INC., URBANCORP (MALLOW) INC., URBANCORP (LAWRENCE) INC., URBANCORP DOWNSVIEW PARK DEVELOPMENT INC., URBANCORP (952 QUEEN WEST) INC., KING RESIDENTIAL INC., URBANCORP 60 ST. CLAIR INC., HIGH RES. INC., BRIDGE ON KING INC. (THE "APPLICANTS") AND THE AFFILIATED ENTITIES LISTED IN SCHEDULE "A" HERETO

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
(COMMERCIAL LIST)
PROCEEDINGS COMMENCED AT TORONTO

FACTUM

DLA PIPER (CANADA) LLP
1 First Canadian Place, Suite 6000
100 King Street West
Toronto, ON M5X 1E2

Edmond F.B. Lamek (LSO #33338U)
Tel.: (416) 365-4444
Fax: (416) 369-7945
Email: edmond.lamek@dlapiper.com

Danny M. Nunes (LSO #53802D)
Tel.: (416) 365-3421
Fax: (416) 369-7945
Email: danny.nunes@dlapiper.com

Lawyers for the Urbancorp CCAA Entities