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## Tab 1

# ONTARIO <br> SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE COMMERCIAL LIST 

BETWEEN:

DBDC SPADINA LTD., and THOSE CORPORATIONS LISTED ON SCHEDULE A HERETO

Applicants
and

NORMA WALTON, RONAULD WALTON, THE ROSE \& THISTLE GROUP LTD. and EGLINTON CASTLE INC.

Respondents
and
THOSE CORPORATIONS LISTED ON SCHEDULE B HERETO, TO BE BOUND BY THE RESULT

## NOTICE OF APPLICATION

## TO THE RESPONDENTS

A LEGAL PROCEEDING HAS BEEN COMMENCED by the Applicant. The Claim made by the Applicant appears on the following page.

THIS APPLICATION will come on for a hearing on a date to be set by a judge of the Superior Court of Justice presiding at the court house, 393 University Ave, 10th Floor, Toronto, ON, M5G 1E6.

IF YOU WISH TO OPPOSE THIS APPLICATION, to receive notice of any step in the application or to be served with any documents in the application you or an Ontario lawyer acting for you must forthwith prepare a notice of appearance in Form 38A prescribed by the Rules of Civil Procedure, serve it on the applicant's lawyer or, where the applicant does not have a lawyer, serve it on the applicant, and file it, with proof of service, in this court office, and you or your lawyer must appear at the hearing.

IF YOU WISH TO PRESENT AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE TO THE COURT OR TO EXAMINE OR CROSS-EXAMINE WITNESSES ON THE APPLICATION, you or your lawyer must, in addition to serving your notice of appearance, serve a copy of the evidence on the applicant's lawyer or, where the applicant does not have a lawyer, serve it on the applicant, and file it, with proof of service, in the court office where the application is to be heard as soon as possible, but at least four days before the hearing.

IF YOU FAIL TO APPEAR AT THE HEARING, JUDGMENT MAY BE GIVEN IN YOUR ABSENCE AND WITHOUT FURTHER NOTICE TO YOU. IF YOU WISH TO OPPOSE THIS APPLICATION BUT ARE UNABLE TO PAY LEGAL FEES, LEGAL AID MAY BE AVAILABLE TO YOU BY CONTACTING A LOCAL LEGAL AID OFFICE.

Date
Issued by

Local Registrar
Address of 393 University Ave, 10th Floor court office: Toronto, ON, M5G 1E6

## TO: SCHIBLE LAW

Suite 2200
181 University Avenue
Toronto, ON M5H 3M7
Guillermo Schible
Tel: (416) 601-6813
Fax: (416) 352-5454
Lawyers for the Respondents

## APPLICATION

1. The Applicants, DBDC Spadina Ltd., and those Corporations listed on Schedule A hereto, make an Application for:
(a) A mandatory Order restraining the Respondents Norma Walton, Ronauld Walton, The Rose \& Thistle Group Ltd. ("Rose \& Thistle") and Eglinton Castle Inc. from, or from causing, any dealings with the underlying real estate properties ("the Properties") held by the Schedule B Corporations, such that no transactions out of the ordinary course or in excess of $\$ 50,000$ be authorized without the agreement of the Applicants or a further Order of this Honourable Court;
(b) A mandatory Order restraining the Respondents from further encumbering any of the properties without written consent of the Applicants or further Order of this Honourable Court;
(c) An Order appointing Schonfeld Inc. as Inspector pursuant to Section 161(2)of the Business Corporations Act, R.S.O. 1980, c.B.16, as amended (the "OBCA") upon the basis that the business and affairs of the corporations listed on Schedule B ("Schedule B Corporations") have been carried on or conducted in a manner that is oppressive, is unfairly prejudicial to and unfairly disregards the interests of the Applicants in the Schedule B Corporations;
(d) An Order that the Respondents forthwith provide full and unrestricted access to the Inspector of:
(i) All records respecting each of the Properties (as defined below) and the Schedule B Corporations and Eglinton Castle Inc.;
(ii) The accounting, banking and other records of Rose \& Thistle, so as to reflect all dealings by which monies owned or attributable to the Properties, the Schedule B Corporations or the Applicant Corporations;
(e) An Order authorizing the Inspector to enter the premises of Rose \& Thistle at 32 Hazelton Avenue, Toronto, Ontario M5R 2E2, in order to obtain all relevant information and to examine any records, including accounting and bank records and any other records, therein and to make copies of all such documents for the purposes of the investigation;
(f) An Order requiring the Respondents, and any of them, to produce all records respecting the acquisition, purchase, financing, management, development and operation of the Properties to the Inspector;
(g) An Order requiring that all lawyers acting on the purchase and financing of the Properties for any of the Respondents and the Schedule B Companies make available all requested documents to the Inspector without assertion of privilege, and in particular, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the law firm of Devry Smith Frank LLP in respect of the mortgages on 1450 Don Mills Road and 1500 Don Mills Road;
(h) An Order requiring the Respondents to pay the costs of the investigation;
(i) An Order granting all necessary directions to the Inspector;
(j) An Order that the Inspector provide an interim report to this Honourable Court on or before October 15, 2013;
(k) The costs of this application and inspection; and
(1) Such further and other relief as to this Honourable Court may seem just.
2. The grounds for the Application are:

## PARTIES

(a) The Applicants, DBDC Spadina Ltd., and those Corporations listed on Schedule A hereto, are all corporations incorporated pursuant to the laws of Ontario. They are beneficially owned by Dr. Stanley Bernstein;
(b) Norma Walton is a lawyer and a member of the Law Society of Upper Canada. She is a co-founder, along with her husband Ronauld Walton, of The Rose \& Thistle Group Ltd. ("Rose \& Thistle") and President of its subsidiary, Rose \& Thistle Properties. Ms. Walton is a principal of Walton Advocates, an in-house law firm and trade mark agent that provides litigation, corporate and real estate legal services to the Rose \& Thistle group of companies. She has faced two disciplinary hearings before the Law Society of Upper Canada related to her financial dealings with clients;
(c) Ronauld Walton is a lawyer and a member of the Law Society of Upper Canada. He is a co-founder, along with his wife Norma Walton, of Rose \& Thistle and President of its subsidiary, Rose \& Thistle Properties. Walton is a principal of Walton Advocates, an in-house law firm and trade mark agent that provides
litigation, corporate and real estate legal services to the Rose \& Thistle group of companies;
(d) Rose \& Thistle is a holding company incorporated pursuant to the laws of Ontario. It and its various subsidiaries are engaged inter alia in real estate development, management and construction;
(e) Eglinton Castle Inc. is a corporation incorporated pursuant to the laws of Ontario. It is owned, to the knowledge of the Applicants, by Norman Walton and Ronauld Walton;
(f) The Corporations listed on Schedule B hereto, are all corporations incorporated pursuant to the laws of Ontario. They are owned $50 \%$ by Dr. Bernstein (or one of the Corporations listed on Schedule A hereto) and $50 \%$ by Norman Walton and Ronauld Walton (or Eglinton Castle Inc.). They were incorporated for the purpose of purchasing commercial real estate properties jointly between Dr. Bernstein and the Waltons;

## THE INVESTMENTS

(g) Beginning in 2008, Dr. Bernstein acted as the lender/mortgager of several commercial real estate properties owned by the Respondents Norma Walton and Ronauld Walton either through their company Rose \& Thistle or through other corporations of which they are the beneficial owners;
(h) Following several financings, Dr. Bernstein and the Waltons agreed to invest jointly in various commercial real estate projects;
(i) To date, Dr. Bernstien has invested approximately $\$ 110$ million into 31 projects;
(j) Dr. Bernstein and The Waltons entered into separate agreements for each project which provided as follows:
(i) A new company would be incorporated for each project (the "Owner Company");
(ii) Dr. Bernstein (through a company incorporated for this purpose) would hold $50 \%$ of the shares of the Owner Company;
(iii) The Waltons (either directly or through a company incorporated for this purpose) would hold the other $50 \%$ of the shares of the Owner Company;
(iv) Each of Dr. Bernstein and The Waltons would contribute an equal amount of equity to the Project;
(v) The Waltons would manage, supervise and complete the Project for an additional fee;
(vi) The Waltons also agreed to be responsible for the finances, bookkeeping, accounting and filing of tax returns, among other things, of the Owner

Company;
(vii) The Owner Company was to have a separate bank account;
(viii) Dr. Bernstein would not be required to play an active role in completing the Project, but his approval would be required for:
(1) Any decisions concerning the selling or refinancing of the Property;
(2) Any decisions concerning the increase in the total amount of equity required to complete Project; and
(3) Any cheque or transfer over $\$ 50,000$.
(ix) The Waltons agreed to provide Dr. Bernstein with:
(1) Ongoing reports on at least a monthly basis detailing all items related to the Properties;
(2) Copies of invoices for work completed the Projects monthly;
(3) Bank statements monthly; and
(4) Listing of all cheques monthly;
(x) The agreements provided generally that Dr. Bernstein and Norma Walton were to be the sole directors of the Joint Venture Company.
(k) A review in June 2013 of Dr. Bernstein's equity investments in the Projects revealed that:
(i) The Waltons were not making their portion of the equity investments into the Properties;
(ii) The Waltons appeared to be taking on third party investors in the Projects;
(iii) The Waltons were engaged in significant related party transactions in respect of Projects;
(iv) Dr. Bernstein's approval was not being sought for any the matters set out in subparagraph (j)(viii) above; and
(v) Dr. Bernstein was not receiving any of the required reporting, as set out in paragraph subparagraph (j)(ix) above; and
(vi) As a result of the Waltons not making their portion of the equity investments in the Properties, many of Dr. Bernstein's content, to interest bearing shzreholder loans.
(1) Dr. Bernstein caused a letter to be sent to Ms. Walton on June 13, 2013 setting out these concerns;
(m) Following an unresponsive letter from Ms. Walton, further requests were made, but not responded to or only partially responded to;
(n) Dr. Bernstein caused title searches to be run on all the Properties. Those title searches revealed that additional mortgages totally $\$ 6$ million had been placed on two Properties, without Dr. Berstein's knowledge or consent. Ms. Walton had failed to provide sufficient further information regarding the mortgages, including the loan documentation and information about the whereabouts of the funds.
(o) Ms. Walton has stated that she will provide information regarding the mortgages only in the context of a without prejudice mediation;
(p) On September 17, 2013, Peter Griffin, counsel for Dr. Bernstein, DBDC Spadina Ltd. and the corporations listed on Schedule A to the Notice of Application, sent a letter to Ms. Walton requesting further information regarding the Projects. Among other things, he requested information regarding two additional mortgages of approximately $\$ 3$ million each had been taken out on 1450 Don Mills Rd. and 1500 Don Mills Rd., without Dr. Bernstein's knowledge or approval. Mr. Griffin also requested access to the information The Waltons are contractually obliged to provide to Dr. Bernstein;
(q) On September 20, 2013, Jim Reitan, Director of Accounting and Finance at Dr. Bernstein Diet and Health Clinics, attended at the offices of Rose \& Thistle, along with Harlan Schonfeld and Jim Merryweather of Schonfeld Inc. Schonfeld Inc. was appointed by Dr. Bernstein to conduct an [independent] review of the various Joint Venture Projects in which Dr. Bernstein has an interest. Among the matters Schonfeld Inc. was tasked with reviewing were the two $\$ 3$ million mortgages on 1450 Don Mills Rd. and 1500 Don Mills Rd.;
(r) Ms. Walton sent various correspondence purporting to out her explanation for the additional mortgages. That correspondence does not respond fully or satisfactorily to the information requested;
(s) Mr. Reitan and Mr. Schonfeld have been unable to find any record of the $\$ 6$ million in mortgage proceeds in the respective companies' accounts and do not know where the mortgage proceeds are;
(t) Ms. Walton has to date provided information on 16 of 31 Projects in which Dr. Bernstein has an interest. That information is not complete and what information has been provided raises further concerns about the financing and management and fees charged to the Properties, among other things;
(u) Ms. Walton has advised that she requires several more weeks to provide the information requested by Dr. Bernstein on the balance of the 16 Projects;
(v) Such further and other grounds as the lawyers may advise.
3. The following documentary evidence will be used at the hearing of the Application:
(w) Affidavit of Dr. Stanley Bernstein sworn October 1, 2013;
(x) Affidavit of James Reitan sworn October 1, 2013;
(y) Affidavit of Harlan Schonfeld, CA, CIRP sworn October 1, 2013, including the consent of Schonfeld Inc. to act as Inspector; and
(z) Such further and other material as the lawyers may advise and this Honourable Court may permit.
$\qquad$

October 1, 2013
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Tab A

## SCHEDULE "A" COMPANIES

1. Dr. Bernstein Diet Clinics Ltd.
2. 2272551 Ontario Limited
3. DBDC Investments Atlantic Ltd.
4. DBDC Investment Pape Ltd.
5. DBDC Investments Highway 7 Ltd.
6. DBDC Investments Trent Ltd.
7. DBDC Investments St. Clair Ltd.
8. DBDC Investments Tisdale Ltd.
9. DBDC Investments Leslie Ltd.
10. DBDC Investments Lesliebrook Ltd.
11. DBDC Fraser Properties Ltd.
12. DBDC Fraser Lands Ltd.
13. DBDC Queen's Corner Inc.
14. DBDC Queen's Plate Holdings Inc.
15. DBDC Dupont Developments Ltd.
16. DBDC Red Door Developments Inc.
17. DBDC Red Door Lands Inc.
18. DBDC Global Mills Ltd.
19. DBDC Donalda Developments Ltd.
20. DBDC Salmon River Properties Ltd.
21. DBDC Cityview Industrial Ltd.
22. DBDC Weston Lands Ltd.
23. DBDC Double Rose Developments Ltd.
24. DBDC Skyway Holdings Ltd.
25. DBDC West Mall Holdings Ltd.
26. DBDC Royal Gate Holdings Ltd.
27. DBDC Dewhurst Developments Ltd.
28. DBDC Eddystone Place Ltd.
29. DBDC Richmond Row Holdings Ltd.
Tab B

## SCHEDULE "B" COMPANIES

1. Twin Dragons Corporation
2. Bannockburn Lands Inc. / Skyline - 1185 Eglinton Avenue Inc.
3. Wynford Professional Centre Ltd.
4. Liberty Village Properties Inc.
5. Liberty Village Lands Inc.
6. Riverdale Mansion Ltd.
7. Royal Agincourt Corp.
8. Hidden Gem Development Inc.
9. Ascalon Lands Ltd.
10. Tisdale Mews Inc.
11. Lesliebrook Holdings Ltd.
12. Lesliebrook Lands Ltd.
13. Fraser Properties Corp.
14. Fraser Lands Ltd.
15. Queen's Corner Corp.
16. Northern Dancer Lands Ltd.
17. Dupont Developments Ltd.
18. Red Door Developments Inc. and Red Door Lands Ltd.
19. Global Mills Inc.
20. Donalda Developments Ltd.
21. Salmon River Properties Ltd.
22. Cityview Industrial Ltd.
23. Weston Lands Ltd.
24. Double Rose Developments Ltd.
25. Skyway Holdings Ltd.
26. West Mall Holdings Ltd.
27. Royal Gate Holdings Ltd.
28. Dewhurst Developments Ltd.
29. Eddystone Place Inc.
30. Richmond Row Holdings Ltd.
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# ONTARIO <br> SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE COMMERCIAL LIST 

BETWEEN:

DBDC SPADINA LTD.,<br>AND THOSE CORPORATIONS LISTED ON SCHEDULE A HERETO<br>Applicants<br>and<br>NORMA WALTON, RONAULD WALTON, THE ROSE \& THISTLE GROUP LTD. and EGLINTON CASTLE INC.

Respondents
and
THOSE CORPORATIONS LISTED ON SCHEDULE C HERETO, TO BE BOUND BY THE RESULT

## NOTICE OF MOTION

The Applicants will make a Motion to a Judge of the Commercial List at 330 University Avenue, Toronto on Friday, October 5, 2013 at 10:00 am.

PROPOSED METHOD OF HEARING: The Motion is to be heard orally.

## THE MOTION IS FOR:

1. The Applicants, DBDC Spadina Ltd., and those Corporations listed on Schedule A hereto, make a Motion for:
(a) A mandatory Order restraining the Respondents Norma Walton, Ronauld Walton, The Rose \& Thistle Group Ltd. ("Rose \& Thistle") and Eglinton Castle Inc. from, or from causing, any dealings with the underlying real estate properties ("the Properties") held by the Schedule B Corporations, such that no transactions out of the ordinary course or in excess of $\$ 50,000$ be authorized without the agreement of the Applicants or a further Order of this Honourable Court;
(b) A mandatory Order restraining the Respondents from further encumbering any of the properties without written consent of the Applicants or further Order of this Honourable Court;
(c) An Order appointing Schonfeld Inc. as Inspector pursuant to Section 161(2)of the Business Corporations Act, R.S.O. 1980, c.B.16, as amended (the "OBCA") upon the basis that the business and affairs of the corporations listed on Schedule B ("Schedule B Corporations") have been carried on or conducted in a manner that is oppressive, is unfairly prejudicial to and unfairly disregards the interests of the Applicants in the Schedule B Corporations;
(d) An Order that the Respondents forthwith provide full and unrestricted access to the Inspector of:
(i) All records respecting each of the Properties (as defined below) and the Schedule B Corporations and Eglinton Castle Inc.;
(ii) The accounting, banking and other records of Rose \& Thistle, so as to reflect all dealings by which monies owned or attributable to the Properties, the Schedule B Corporations or the Applicant Corporations;
(e) An Order authorizing the Inspector to enter the premises of Rose \& Thistle at 32 Hazelton Avenue, Toronto, Ontario M5R 2E2, in order to obtain all relevant information and to examine any records, including accounting and bank records and any other records, therein and to make copies of all such documents for the purposes of the investigation;
(f) An Order requiring the Respondents, and any of them, to produce all records respecting the acquisition, purchase, financing, management, development and operation of the Properties to the Inspector;
(g) An Order requiring that all lawyers acting on the purchase and financing of the Properties for any of the Respondents and the Schedule B Companies make available all requested documents to the Inspector without assertion of privilege, and in particular, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the law firm of Devry Smith Frank LLP in respect of the mortgages on 1450 Don Mills Road and 1500 Don Mills Road;
(h) An Order requiring the Respondents to pay the costs of the investigation;
(i) An Order granting all necessary directions to the Inspector;
(j) An Order that the Inspector provide an interim report to this Honourable Court on or before October 15, 2013;
(k) The costs of this application and inspection; and
(1) Such further and other relief as to this Honourable Court may seem just.

## THE GROUNDS FOR THE MOTION ARE:

(a) Beginning in 2008, Dr. Bernstein acted as the lender/mortgager of several commercial real estate properties owned by the Respondents Norma Walton and Ronauld Walton either through their company Rose \& Thistle or through other corporations of which they are the beneficial owners;
(b) Following several financings, Dr. Bernstein and the Waltons agreed to invest jointly in various commercial real estate projects;
(c) To date, Dr. Bernstein has invested approximately $\$ 110$ million into 31 projects;
(d) Dr. Bernstein and The Waltons entered into separate agreements for each project which provided as follows:
(i) A new company would be incorporated for each project (the "Owner Company");
(ii) Dr. Bernstein (through a company incorporated for this purpose) would hold $50 \%$ of the shares of the Owner Company;
(iii) The Waltons (either directly or through a company incorporated for this purpose) would hold the other $50 \%$ of the shares of the Owner Company;
(iv) Each of Dr. Bernstein and The Waltons would contribute an equal amount of equity to the Project;
(v) The Waltons would manage, supervise and complete the Project for an additional fee;
(vi) The Waltons also agreed to be responsible for the finances, bookkeeping, accounting and filing of tax returns, among other things, of the Owner Company;
(vii) The Owner Company was to have a separate bank account;
(viii) Dr. Bernstein would not be required to play an active role in completing the Project, but his approval would be required for:
(1) Any decisions concerning the selling or refinancing of the Property;
(2) Any decisions concerning the increase in the total amount of equity required to complete Project; and
(3) Any cheque or transfer over $\$ 50,000$.
(ix) The Waltons agreed to provide Dr. Bernstein with:
(1) Ongoing reports on at least a monthly basis detailing all items related to the Properties;
(2) Copies of invoices for work completed the Projects monthly;
(3) Bank statements monthly; and
(4) Listing of all cheques monthly;
(x) The agreements provided generally that Dr. Bernstein and Norma Walton were to be the sole directors of the Joint Venture Company.
(e) A review in June 2013 of Dr. Bernstein's equity investments in the Projects revealed that:
(i) The Waltons were not making their portion of the equity investments into the Properties;
(ii) The Waltons appeared to be taking on third party investors in the Projects;
(iii) The Waltons were engaged in significant related party transactions in respect of Projects;
(iv) Dr. Bernstein's approval was not being sought for any the matters set out in subparagraph (d)(viii) above; and
(v) Dr. Bernstein was not receiving any of the required reporting, as set out in paragraph subparagraph (d)(ix) above; and
(vi) As a result of the Waltons not making their portion of the equity investments in the Properties, many of Dr. Bernstein's content, to interest bearing shareholder loans.
(f) Dr. Bernstein caused a letter to be sent to Ms. Walton on June 13, 2013 setting out these concerns;
(g) Following an unresponsive letter from Ms. Walton, further requests were made, but not responded to or only partially responded to;
(h) Dr. Bernstein caused title searches to be run on all the Properties. Those title searches revealed that additional mortgages totally $\$ 6$ million had been placed on two Properties, without Dr. Bernstein's knowledge or consent. Ms. Walton had failed to provide sufficient further information regarding the mortgages, including the loan documentation and information about the whereabouts of the funds.
(i) Ms. Walton has stated that she will provide information regarding the mortgages only in the context of a without prejudice mediation;
(j) On September 17, 2013, Peter Griffin, counsel for Dr. Bernstein, DBDC Spadina Ltd. and the corporations listed on Schedule A to the Notice of Application, sent a letter to Ms. Walton requesting further information regarding the Projects. Among other things, he requested information regarding two additional mortgages of approximately $\$ 3$ million each had been taken out on 1450 Don Mills Rd. and 1500 Don Mills Rd., without Dr. Bernstein's knowledge or approval. Mr. Griffin also requested access to the information The Waltons are contractually obliged to provide to Dr. Bernstein;
(k) On September 20, 2013, Jim Reitan, Director of Accounting and Finance at Dr. Bernstein Diet and Health Clinics, attended at the offices of Rose \& Thistle, along with Harlan Schonfeld and Jim Merryweather of Schonfeld Inc. Schonfeld Inc. was appointed by Dr. Bernstein to conduct an [independent] review of the various Joint Venture Projects in which Dr. Bernstein has an interest. Among the matters

Schonfeld Inc. was tasked with reviewing were the two $\$ 3$ million mortgages on 1450 Don Mills Rd. and 1500 Don Mills Rd.;
(1) Ms. Walton sent various correspondence purporting to out her explanation for the additional mortgages. That correspondence does not respond fully or satisfactorily to the information requested;
(m) Mr. Reitan and Mr. Schonfeld have been unable to find any record of the $\$ 6$ million in mortgage proceeds in the respective companies' accounts and do not know where the mortgage proceeds are;
(n) Ms. Walton has to date provided information on 16 of 31 Projects in which Dr. Bernstein has an interest. That information is not complete and what information has been provided raises further concerns about the financing and management and fees charged to the Properties, among other things;
(o) Ms. Walton has advised that she requires several more weeks to provide the information requested by Dr. Bernstein on the balance of the 16 Projects;
(p) Such further and other grounds as the lawyers may advise.

THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE will be used at the hearing of the Motion:
(a) Affidavit of Dr. Stanley Bernstein sworn October 1, 2013;
(b) Affidavit of James Reitan sworn October 1, 2013;
(c) Affidavit of Harlan Schonfeld, CA, CIRP sworn October 1, 2013, including the consent of Schonfeld Inc. to act as Inspector; and
(d) Such further and other material as the lawyers may advise and this Honourable Court may permit.

October 1, 2013

## LENCZNER SLAGHT ROYCE SMITH GRIFFIN LLP <br> Barristers <br> Suite 2600 <br> 130 Adelaide Street West <br> Toronto ON M5H 3P5 <br> Peter H. Griffin (19527Q) <br> Tel: (416) 865-2921 <br> Fax: (416) 865-3558 <br> Email: pgriffin@litigate.com <br> Shara N. Roy (49950H) <br> Tel: (416) 865-2942 <br> Fax: (416) 865-3973 <br> Email: sroy@litigate.com

Lawyers for the Applicants

TO: SCHIBLE LAW
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Guillermo-Schible
Tel: (416) 601-6813
Fax: (416) 352-5454
Lawyers for the Respondents

## Tab 3

Court File No.

BETWEEN:
DBDC SPADINA LTD.,
AND THOSE CORPORATIONS LISTED ON SCHEDULE A HERETO
Applicants
and
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Respondents
and
THOSE CORPORATIONS LISTED ON SCHEDULE B HERETO, TO BE BOUND BY THE RESULT

## AFFIDAVIT OF JAMES REITAN

I, JAMES REITAN, in the City of Woodbridge, in the Province of Ontario, MAKE OATH AND SWEAR:

1. I am the Director of Accounting and Finance at Dr. Bernstein Diet and Health Clinics. Dr. Stanley Bernstein is the beneficial holder and directing mind of DBDC Spadina Ltd. and the corporations listed on Schedule A to the Notice of Application. As part of my duties at Dr. Bernstein Diet and Health Clinics, I am responsible for reviewing the financial affairs of those companies. As such, I have knowledge of the matters contained herein. Where matters are
sworn to by way of information and belief, I have stated the source of that information and verily believe it to be true and accurate.
2. Beginning in 2008, Dr. Bernstein acted as the lender/mortgager of several commercial real estate properties owned by the Respondents Norma Walton and Ronauld Walton either through their company the Respondent The Rose \& Thistle Group Ltd ("Rose \& Thistle") or through other corporations of which they are the beneficial owners.
3. Following several financings, Dr. Bernstein and the Waltons agreed to invest jointly in various commercial real estate projects. To date, Dr. Bernstein has invested approximately $\$ 110$ million into 31 projects. The Waltons had at a point in time invested a total of $\$ 2,500,803$, based on the records available to me. It appears however that the equity investment is generally recaptured by the Waltons by intercompany invoicing, as detailed below, such that only $\$ 351,400$ of the capital investment remains in the Projects.
4. Dr. Bernstein and the Waltons entered into separate agreements for each project (the "Project") in respect of one or more properties (the "Properties"), which agreements provided as follows:
(a) A new company would be incorporated for each project (the "Owner Company");
(b) Dr. Bernstein (through a company incorporated for this purpose) would hold $50 \%$ of the shares of the Owner Company;
(c) The Waltons (either directly or through a company incorporated for this purpose) would hold the other $50 \%$ of the shares of the Owner Company;
(d) Each of Dr. Bernstein and the Waltons would contribute an equal amount of equity to the Project;
(e) The Waltons would manage, supervise and complete the Project for an additional fee;
(f) The Waltons also agreed to be responsible for the finances, bookkeeping, accounting and filing of tax returns, among other things, of the Owner Company;
(g) The Owner Company was to have a separate bank account;
(h) Dr. Bernstein would not be required to play an active role in completing the Project, but his approval would be required for:
(i) Any decisions concerning the selling or refinancing of the Property;
(ii) Any decisions concerning the increase in the total amount of equity required to complete the Project; and
(iii) Any cheque or transfer over $\$ 50,000$.
(i) The Waltons agreed to provide Dr. Bernstein with:
(i) Ongoing reports on at least a monthly basis detailing all items related to the Property;
(ii) Copies of invoices for work completed the Project monthly;
(iii) Bank statements monthly; and
(iv) Listing of all cheques monthly;
(j) Upon sale of the Property, Dr. Bernstein and the Waltons would receive back their capital contribution plus a division of profits; and
(k) The agreements generally provided that Dr. Bernstein and Norma Walton were to be the sole directors of the Owner Company.
5. These agreements were entered into in several forms. Attached hereto as Exhibit "A" are copies of a sample of the executed agreements between Dr. Bernstein and the Waltons. Each of the Projects has an agreement in one of these forms.
6. On June 7, 2013, following a review of Dr. Bernstein's equity investments, I wrote to Norma Walton to set out certain questions and concerns. Attached hereto as Exhibit "B" is a copy of the letter and email I sent to Norma Walton on June 7, 2013.
7. Of particular concern, it appeared from my review that:
(a) The Walton were not making their portion of the equity investments into the Properties;
(b) The Waltons appeared to be taking on third party investors in the Projects;
(c) The Walton were engaged in significant related party transactions in respect of the Projects;
(d) Dr. Bernstein's approval was not being sought for any the matters set out in subparagraph 4(h) above; and
(e) Dr. Bernstein was not receiving any of the required reporting, as set out in subparagraph 4(i) above.
8. As a result of the Waltons not making their portion of the equity investments into the Properties, many of Dr. Bernstein's equity investments were converted with Dr. Bernstein's consent to shareholder loans, bearing interest.
9. Ms. Walton responded to my letter with a four-page response, detailing over the first two pages Rose \& Thistle's reputation and work, rather than responding to the information requests. Attached hereto as Exhibit " C " is a copy of Ms. Walton's response, dated June 13, 2013. I continued to follow-up with Ms. Walton, but received little in the way of additional information. In early September 2013, she refused to continue to deal with me.
10. As part of my further work, I had searches run on the title of all Properties in which Dr. Bernstein has an interest. As a result of these property searches, I learned for the first time that additional mortgages were placed on 1450 Don Mills Road and 1500 Don Mills Road on July 31, 2013 and August 1, 2013 respectively. I am informed by Dr. Bernstein that he had no knowledge of and did not approve these mortgages, as contractually required. Attached as Exhibits "D" and "E" hereto are copies of those property searches for 1450 Don Mills Road and 1500 Don Mills Road, respectively.
11. In late August 2013, I observed an entry in the general ledger for Global Mills Inc., the Owner Company in respect of 1450 Don Mills. It appeared that the mortgage payment for August had not gone to the mortgagor, Trez Capital, but to Rose \& Thistle. I inquired of Ms. Walton and her staff and was told that Rose \& Thistle would have made the payment on behalf of Global Mills Inc. to Trez Capital. I requested documentation to support the payment, but was
reporting letter from the lawyers involved. She stated that she would only provide further information regarding the two mortgages during a without prejudice mediation process. I have been unable to find any record of the $\$ 6$ million in mortgage proceeds in the respective companies' accounts and do not know where the mortgage proceeds are.
12. Ms. Walton has provided to date some information on 16 of 31 Owner Companies in which Dr. Bernstein has an interest. That information is not complete. The outstanding requests include:
(a) access to the bank accounts for all ownership companies;
(b) invoices for amounts paid out of the ownership companies; and
(c) all Rose \& Thistle invoices with back up.
13. Ms. Walton has also advised that she requires several more weeks to provide the information requested by Dr. Bernstein on the balance of the 15 Owner Companies.
14. It appears to me that Ms. Walton and her staff are compiling or preparing accounting information at Rose \& Thistle as they go, including recent invoices for project management, development, maintenance and consulting services.
15. Ms. Walton has refused to provide direct access to the books and records requested. Instead, she has provided numerous explanations for why she or her staff must review or "cleanup" the records prior to them being shown to me or to Mr. Schonfeld. She has also not provided the information promised on time. Attached hereto as Exhibit " $I$ " is correspondence between

Ms. Walton and Mr. Schonfeld, on which I was copied, where Ms. Walton is not prepared or is unable to provide the information requested at the date and time promised.
23. The information that has been provided to date is not entirely complete and raises the following additional concerns:
(a) It appears that there has been extensive co-mingling of the Owner Company's funds with, and into the bank accounts of, Rose \& Thistle;
(b) Rose \& Thistle has rendered significant invoices to the Owned Companies and received payment or characterized as intercompany amounts owing for services it has not performed:
(i) The Owner Company, Riverdale Mansion Ltd. ("Riverdale") purchased 450 Pape Avenue for $\$ 1,700,000$ plus fees;
(ii) Dr. Bernstein provided an equity investment of $\$ 470 \mathrm{k}$ and a mortgage was placed on the Property in the amount of $\$ 1,300,000$, for a total of \$1,770,000;
(iii) Following the initial purchase, two funds transfers were made from Riverdale to Rose \& Thistle through the intereompany aceount in the amounts of $\$ 41,350$ and $\$ 6,050$. These two transfers were in excess of the amounts in Riverdale cash account, following payment of third party fees, and brought the balance to a negative $\$ 1,000$;
(iv) Construction funding advances were made on a mortgage held by 368230 Ontario Limited (a corporation owned beneficially by Dr. Bernstein). Upon each advance, a fund transfer was made to Rose \& Thistle in an amount very close to the funding. Total construction funding was in the amount of $\$ 1.64$ million, bringing the total mortgage to $\$ 3$ million;
(v) The intercompany balance between Riverdale and Rose \& Thistle increased through 2011 culminating in receipt of invoices for over \$1 million from Rose \& Thistle on December 31, 2011, thereby reducing the intercompany balance to $\$ 0$. I have made inquiries of Ms. Walton since September 20, 2013 (on or around which time I discovered these transactions). She informed me that the invoices included charges for future services, for which permitting has not even been obtained. It is my understanding that these services, for which invoices were rendered two years ago, have yet to be performed. Dr. Bernstein was neither informed of nor approved the intercompany amounts or the invoices;
(vi) The Riverdale / Rose \& Thistle intercompany has accumulated further since 2011 and currently stands at $\$ 488,000$ due to Rose \& Thistle; and
(vii) Attached as Exhibit " J " is an analysis I have prepared of these transactions;
(c) The Waltons have reversed equity contributions made by them. The December 31, 2011 general ledger reflected equity contributions by the Waltons as follows:

| Bannockburn Lands Inc | $\$ 83,717$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Wynford Professional Centre Ltd | 0 |
| Twin Dragons Corporation | 350,000 |
| Liberty Village Lands Inc. | 0 |
| Liberty Village Properties Inc. | 839,266 |
| Riverdale Mansion Ltd. | 250,021 |
| Royal Agincourt Corp. | 987,800 |
| Total | $\mathbf{\$ 2 , 5 0 0 , 8 0 3}$ |

The Waltons have reversed $\$ 2,150,000$ of these contributions. Attached as Exhibit " K " are copies of a sample of journal entries documenting the transfers.
(d) Rose \& Thistle has regularly invoiced the Owner Companies for monthly management fees in excess of the number of months for which services have been provided (for example, invoicing for January - June as 7 months other than 6 months). Attached as Exhibit "L" are copies of invoices showing this overbilling;
(e) Mortgage payments are being made to Rose \& Thistle by the Owner Companies, rather than to the named mortgagee, with no confirmation of payment to the mortgagor by Rose \& Thistle. Attached as Exhibit "M" is a copy of Global Mills Inc.'s bank statement, with my notations, showing the mortgage payment to a Rose \& Thistle bank account; and
(f) The Owned Properties have been charged significant interest and penalties in respect of late payment of amounts owing to, among others, City of Toronto, Toronto Hydro and Enbridge Inc., totalling \$308,400.
24. I swear this affidavit in support of an Application and Motion seeking to have Schonfeld Inc. appointed as inspector of the Projects and the records of Rose \& Thistle dealing with the Properties, Projects and Owner Companies, among other relief.

SWORN before me at the City of Toronto, in the Province of Ontario, this $1^{\text {st }}$ day of October, 2013.


A Commissioner for taking affidavits Shana N. Roy



This is Exhibit "A" referred to in the Affidavit of James Reitan sworn before me this $1^{\text {st }}$ day of October, 2013


A Commissioner for Taking Affidavits

## AGREEMENT

Between:

> Dr. Bernstein Diet Clinics Ltd. "Bernstein" - and Ron and Norma Walton - and -

Twin Dragons Corporation

> the "Company"

WHEREAS Bernstein and Walton intend to purchase 241 Spading Avenue, Toronto, Ontario (the "Property") on or about October 14, 2010 and put ownership of the Property in the Company's name;

AND WHEREAS Bernstein and Walton, or whomever Bernstein and Walton may direct, will each hold $1,120,500$ shares in the Company;

AND WHEREAS Bernstein and Walton will each provide the sum of $\$ 1,120,500$ to The Company for the purposes of purchasing, renovating, leasing and refinancing the Property (the "Project");

AND WHEREAS Walton will manage and supervise the Project and ensure it is completed according to the proposal attached as Exhibit "A" to this Agreement;

THEREFORE the parties agree as follows:

1. Walton has contracted to purchase the Property and the purchase is scheduled to close on October 14, 2010.
2. Walton has commenced pre-planning for the property renovations, to begin immediately after closing.
3. Walton intends to purchase, renovate, lease and refinance the Property between now and September 30, 2013 in accordance with Exhibit "A".
4. Bernstein wishes to own $50 \%$ of the shares in the Company in exchange for providing $50 \%$ of the equity required to complete the Project. The Company will issue sufficient shares such that Bernstein has $1,120,500$ and Walton has $1,120,500$ voting shares of the same class.
5. The ownership of the Company will be as follows:
a. $50 \%$ to Bernstein; and
b. $50 \%$ to Ron and Norma Walton as they may direct or alternatively to be held by a completely Walton-owned and controlled company.
6. Walton will be managing, supervising and completing the Project in accordance with the attached Exhibit "A".
7. Walton has already provided $\$ 300,000$ as a deposit to purchase the Property. Bernstein will provide to the Company the sum of $\$ 1,120,500$ on or before October 14, 2010. Walton will provide a further $\$ 820,500$ to the Company in a timely manner as required as the Project is completed.
8. Walton and Bernstein will each provide $50 \%$ of whatever additional capital over and above the $\$ 1,120,500$ each that is required to complete the Project, if any, in a timely manner.
9. In addition to managing, supervising and completing the Project, Walton will be responsible for renovation of the Property, hiring of all trades, payment of all trades, advertising for tenants, hiring designers and architects and engineers to complete the project, finance, bookkeeping, office administration, accounting, information technology provision, filing tax returns for the Company, and fulfilling all active roles required to complete the Project in accordance with Exhibit "A".
10. Bernstein will not be required to play an active role in completing the Project. Notwithstanding that, any decisions concerning refinancing or selling the Property will require his approval; any decisions requiring an increase in the total amount of equity required to complete the Project will require his approval; and any significant decisions that vary from the Project plan described in Exhibit "A" will require his approval.
11. Walton will provide to Bernstein the cost consultant's initial report analyzing the Project budget and timelines as soon as received by Walton but no later than October 10, 2010. Walton will subsequently provide a written report to Bernstein each month detailing the following:
a. the cost consultant's report for that month indicating progress to date and cost to complete with copies of invoices for work completed;
b. the bank statement for that month; and
c. if the bank statement does not have a copy of cancelled cheques, then Walton will also provide a complete listing of all cheques written, including payees, dates and amounts.
At Bernstein's request, Walton will provide whatever other back-up information he requests.
12. Once the Project is substantially completed to the point that a refinancing can be arranged, Bernstein may in its sole discretion opt to be paid out his capital plus profits in exchange for surrender of his shares in the Company. If Bernstein so opts, Walton would retain the property. The value of the property will be determined by taking the net income for the Property once it is fully leased and applying a capitalization rate of $7.5 \%$ to that net income, resulting in an end value for the Property once completed. If the end value obtained based on that process results in a value that one of the parties believes is not reasonably indicative of the actual value, then the parties will discuss and attempt to agree upon a value for such purchase and sale and failing such agreement, submit to mediation as set out in the within agreement. In accordance with the provisions of the within paragraph, payment to Bernstein shall be made immediately upon the completion of the refinancing of the Project.
13. The Board of Directors of the Company will be composed of two directors, being Bernstein and Norma Walton. The only shares to be issued in the Company will be as set out above, and neither party may transfer his or her shares to another party without the consent of all the other parties, which consent may be unreasonably withheld. If Bernstein opts to be paid out of the Project and thus surrenders his share certificate, he will concurrently resign from the Board of Directors and Norma Walton and the Company will accept such resignation. At such time Bernstein shall be released of all obligations and liability related to the Company and the Project and the Property.
14. Walton will provide a statutory declaration confirming the current status of the Company and that it is free and clear of all liabilities and obligations whatsoever and shall provide an Indemnity relating thereto to Bernstein prior to October 15, 2010. The Company will only be used to purchase, renovate, lease and refinance 241 Spadina Avenue, Toronto, Ontario or such other matters solely relating to the Project and the Property.
15. If the parties disagree on how to manage, supervise and complete the Project in accordance with Exhibit "A" and cannot reach agreement amongst themselves, each of them undertakes to attend a minimum of four hours of mediation in pursuit of reaching an agreement. After mediation, if there are any remaining issues to be determined, those issues in dispute shall be determined by a single arbitrator in as cost-effective a manner as possible, with no right of appeal. All costs of such mediation and/or arbitration will be borne equally by Bernstein and Walton.
16. The above represents all deal terms between the parties.

Dated at Toronto, Ontario this $24^{\text {th }}$ day of SEPTEMBER 2010


Dr. Bernstein Diet Clínics Ltd. Per A.S.O.


Ron Walton


# Appendix "A" 

## THE ROSE and THISTLE GROUP LTD.

30 Hazelton Avenue, Toronto, Ontario, M5R 2E2, (416) 489-9790 Fax: (416) 489-9973


## 241 Spadina Avenue

September 16, 2010
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## SECTION A:

## 1. THE OPPORTUNITY

The opportunity is to purchase $50 \%$ of the equity in Twin Dragons Corporation, a Rose and Thistle company that was formed to own 241 Spadina Avenue. 241 Spadina is a five storey heritage building originally built in 1910 for The Consolidated Plate Glass Company of Toronto. Situated between Dundas and Queen in the south end of Toronto's Chinatown, it comprises 42,000 square feet including basement and each floor is approximately 7,000 square feet. It has frontage on Spadina of 50 feet and is 140 feet in depth, backing onto a municipal laneway.

Rose and Thistle has been pursuing the acquisition of this property for the past five months. Initially there were ten bidders for this building and the building to the north, both being offered under power of sale through a Chinese bank. After much persistence, we convinced the vendor bank to sell 241 Spadina to us at very close to the original price we offered. It is a perfect project for Rose and Thistle's skill set, and is almost identical in project scope to 86 Parliament at Adelaide. 86 Parliament, known as The Old Telegram Building, is a 20,000 square foot heritage building that we successfully renovated between July 1, 2009 and June 30, 2010 and that is now fully leased.

We project the investment will earn a straight-line return of $99 \%$ within three years, resulting in a $25.8 \%$ compounded annual return. The plan is to complete our preconstruction planning between now and October 17, then to begin demolition followed by a gut renovation of the entire building. Once we have a floor to show to prospective tenants, we will advertise the space for lease and will build out the space for the tenants we attract, to their specifications. The project will end once the building is fully renovated and leased and we have refinanced and paid you out your capital plus profits. We anticipate this will occur within three years.

Unlike investments in stocks and bonds, carefully selected and well-located income properties have value secured by physical assets. Commercial buildings are also not subject to the wide fluctuations common to stock markets and when properly managed provide reliable, above average returns on investment.

## Building detail



## 2. THE INVESTMENT PARTICULARS

The details of the opportunity are as follows:
What: Common shares in Twin Dragons Corporation
Investment Amount: $\quad \$ 1,120,500$
Commencement date: $\quad$ Before September 30, 2010
Capital appreciation and return: Common shareholders will receive back their capital and profits in proportion to their ownership

Term:
36 months to September 30, 2013
The total capital is $\$ 8.541$ million, being $\$ 6.3$ million from mortgage, and the balance of $\$ 2,241,000$ from equity shareholders. The capital structure is as follows:


The building as it should look once we are completed renovations


## SECTION B:

## 1. THE PROPERTY

241 Spadina Avenue is located at the south end of Chinatown. Chinatown is changing rapidly, with many of the Chinese that traditionally lived and worked there moving to Markham and the Pacific Mall area. As a result, the Chinese markets and stores are slowly being replaced with upscale coffee shops and funky office users. A perfect example is directly north of 241 Spadina. Whereas for the past ten years there has been a sprawling Chinese grocery store in that building, encroaching onto the frontage of 241 Spadina and spilling onto the sidewalk with their wares, that grocery store's lease has been terminated and the new owners are in the midst of renovations to that space. It is likely the new tenant will not be Chinese.



View from the rooftop to the east looking onto the rooftops of the houses adjacent the laneway

View from the rooftop looking north up Spadina Avenue


The property was previously a hotel which was shut down by the city because the property is not zoned for a hotel. The property is zoned for commercial and residential use. Our plan is to make it $100 \%$ commercial on floors two to five, and retail at ground level and lower level.

Built in 1910 and substantially renovated in 1982, the property was built for the Consolidated Plate Glass Company of Toronto. It has intricate detailing on the exterior façade in front, including flowers and coats of arms. It has the potential to be an absolutely stunning building once cleaned up. The interior will offer tenants "loft" space with exposed brick and character in contrast to the more traditional office buildings on offer.

The building is vacant save for the bank who owned the property through power of sale occupying the retail level. They have leased their space for $\$ 50$ per square foot gross, resulting in net rent of $\$ 36$ per square foot.

The bank's retail frontage on Spadina


How the building should look once renovated and restored


## 2. THE PLAN

The plan, given Rose and Thistle's experience with similar buildings in its portfolio, is to gut renovate the property, taking it down to its shell, replacing all the systems with new, replacing or renovating and retrofitting the two elevators, one passenger and one freight, then building spaces out to suit the tenants we attract. Once that is completed, we will refinance the property and pay out your capital and profits and Rose and Thistle will keep the building as an income property. The following steps will be implemented to achieve this objective:

1. Have already begun pre-construction planning:
a. engaged our architect and engineers to begin preparing drawings;
b. apply for building permits;
c. arrange for our trades to provide quotes for the work required.

Timeline: 2 months to October 17, 2010
2. As of October 18 , roll out construction as follows:
a. begin demolition;
b. assess elevator and prepare drawings for retrofit or new;
c. begin rough-ins for new HVAC, plumbing, electrical and fire sprinkler systems;
d. replace roof, windows, skylights;
e. install steel and repair/sand blast brick where required;
f. install drywall, paint and flooring; and
g. create show suite to begin leasing process.

Estimated timeline: 12 months to October 18, 2011
3. Advertise for lease and as tenants contract with us, build out their spaces;

Estimated timeline: 12 months to October 18,2012
4. Refinance and pay out capital and profits to investors.

Estimated timeline: Immediately thereafter
CONTINGENCY: 10 months
Total project timeline: 36 months including contingency


First floor with mezzanine, with 20 foot ceilings once mezzanine is removed


Second floor with 15 foot ceilings, which will be incredibly bright once opened up to the light from the large windows in front and back and along the side


Back of building as it currently looks, with freight elevator to be retrofitted on the bottom left hand side

South corner of building with neighbour to south set back, giving good exposure for our building


## SECTION C:

## INVESTING IN TORONTO

A continental gateway and a crossroads for the world, Toronto is Canada's business capital. It ranks alongside economic powerhouses such as New York, Boston and Chicago. Toronto is annually rated as the most multi-cultural city in the world by the United Nations. Canada accepts approximately 300,000 new immigrants every year, and $43 \%$ of all immigrants to Canada settle in the Greater Toronto Area. This results in an annual population increase of more than 100,000 people. As a result, the demand for both residential and commercial real estate is strong and demographic trends strongly suggest that such demand will remain robust.


Toronto boasts a stable economic and political climate. Toronto commercial real estate has attracted worldwide investors, particularly from the United States, Great Britain, Israel and Germany. It has one of the five most diversified economies of any city-region in North America, and consistently ranks with Boston and Chicago as one of the best business cities in North America.

## Population

With 2.7 million residents, Toronto is the 5th largest city in North America. One-quarter of Canada's population is located within 160 km ( 100 mi .) of the city and more than $60 \%$ of the population of the USA is within a 90 -minute flight.



## Economy

The City of Toronto's economy comprises $11 \%$ of Canada's GDP, with Toronto's GDP topping $\$ 140$ billion in 2009. Toronto-based businesses export over $\$ 70$ billion in goods and services to every corner of the globe with retail sales of $\$ 47$ billion annually.

## Capital

Five of Canada's six largest banks have their headquarters in Toronto, near the country's busiest stock exchange. Toronto is North America's third largest financial services centre and $75 \%$ of Canada's foreign banks and $65 \%$ of the country's pension fund companies are located here.

## Competitive

Toronto has an excellent reputation as one of North America's leading economies while at the same time delivering overall business cost savings of $6.5 \%$ over large U.S. cities and $12.2 \%$ when compared to Asian and European centres.


## Workforce

Toronto's more than 76,000 businesses choose from a large, highly skilled, multilingual workforce of 1.4 million people - one-sixth of the country's labour force. More than 800,000 workers have university or college training and $58 \%$ have earned a post-secondary degree, diploma or certificate. Residents speak more than 135 languages and dialects.

## Education

Toronto's impressive range of post-secondary educational facilities includes three universities and five colleges offering training in virtually every discipline and skill. Toronto leads the country in the number of post-secondary schools and graduates, with more than 15,000 medical/biotech researchers, two top-ranked MBA schools and excellent programs in engineering, computer sciences and multi-media.


Location
Some 180 million customers and suppliers are within a one-day's drive from Toronto. Toronto's Pearson International Airport is within easy reach of the city's central business district and provides flights to over 300 destinations in 54 countries through 64 carriers.

## Connections

Toronto boasts an expansive local network of consultants, professional firms and specialty suppliers. The business services cluster is among North America's largest and growing. Toronto is home to 9 of Canada's 10 largest law practices, 9 of the top 10 accounting firms and all 10 top human resources and benefits firms.

## Transportation

With four major highways, multi-modal railway facilities, a Great Lakes port and an international airport handling over 30 million passengers and 350,000 tons of cargo annually, Toronto is a true North American gateway.

## Transit

Toronto's public transit system is the second largest in North America and has the highest per capita ridership rate on the continent. More than 2,400 subway vehicles, buses and streetcars make it easy for more than 1.4 million business riders to travel throughout the city daily.


## SECTION D:

## THE ROSE AND THISTLE GROUP LTD.

## A. EXPERIENCE

Over the past nine years, The Rose and Thistle Group has owned, managed and developed a total of $\$ 80$ million worth of properties, of which $\$ 45$ million remain under management and development.

Rose and Thistle is seeking out properties similar to the properties with which it has had success in the past. Since 2001, Rose and Thistle has owned, managed and developed the following properties, thirteen of which it continues to own and two of which it has under contract to purchase.

## Our heritage commercial buildings:



## 30 Hazelton Avenue

A heritage building in Yorkville with high-end luxury office and retail tenancies

Head office of The Rose and Thistle Group Ltd.

Severed one lot into two and renovated the heritage designated building into four luxury suites

## 30A Hazelton Avenue

A commercial building in Yorkville with high-end luxury office tenancies

Severed one lot into two and renovated the building into four luxury suites


## 65 Front Street East

A heritage corner building in Old Town built in the mid-1800s that has loft commercial office space

Renovated this heritage listed commercial loft building; improved the tenant mix, reduced costs, and increased profitability. Obtained approval to add a fourth storey to the building

## 86 Parliament Street



## The Old Telegram Building

A heritage corner building built in 1887 that used to house The Toronto Telegram, located in Cabbagetown, with retail and commercial space.

Gutted and renovated the property. Opened Urban Amish Interiors Furniture Gallery on floors one and two, and leased floors three and four to Sun Edison.


## 252 Carlton / 478 Parliament

A heritage corner building in Cabbagetown that has retail and commercial space.

Home to Ginger and Johnny G's restaurants

Currently gutting and renovating the second and third floors to house two new full floor tenants in September 2010.


## 110 Lombard Street

The Old Firehall
Toronto's first fire hall, built in 1886. The former home of Second City which launched the careers of Dan Ackroyd, John Candy, Mike Myers, Gilda Radner, Martin Short, etc.

Currently leased to Gilda's Club


## 66 Gerrard Street East

Toronto's original apothecary, built in the 1880 s , this beautiful building kitty corner Ryerson is currently under renovation by us to accommodate Starbucks as our anchor corner retail tenant. We are also installing an elevator and renovating the building generally while accommodating our existing tenants.


## 24 Cecil Street

A stunning corner property south of the University of Toronto that we have under contract to purchase and renovate

## Our commercial buildings:



## 185 Davenport Road

Fully converted an office building into five mixed use residential and commercial condominium suites and sold them.

355 Eglinton Avenue East


Commercial building, renovated for re-sale.

## 1246 Yonge Street

Commercial building converted to condominiums

Converted this office building into 28 mixed use condominiums, plus expanded the underground parking garage and then sold all 28 units.

## 17 Yorkville Avenue

Commercial building converted to condominiums

Converted this office building into six mixed use luxury condominiums then sold all six units


## 10-12 Bruce Park

Mixed-use building
Entered into an agreement to purchase this building then sold that right to another purchaser for a profit.

## Our residential apartment buildings:



## 19 Tennis Crescent

An 8-plex in Riverdale
Renovated five of the suites and significantly increased annual revenues when they were released. Are renovating other suites as they become available

## 646 Broadview Avenue

A 13-plex in Riverdale

Fully converted a
heritage-designated mansion into thirteen residential rental units.


## 648 Broadview Avenue:

A 10-plex in Riverdale
Renovated five of the suites and significantly increased annual revenues when they were re-leased. Are renovating other suites as they become available

Our infill residential housing:


## 78 Tisdale

Bought a vacant 1.5 acre parcel of land in North York; are completing all steps required to permit the construction of 40 townhouses which we will then build.

## 3771 and 3775 St. Clair Ave. E. <br> 17 luxury townhouses

Bought a vacant $2 / 3$ acre lot and completed all planning and development steps required to obtain approval to build 17 luxury townhouses on the site, then constructed and sold all seventeen to individual purchasers


346 Jarvis
6 luxury townhouses
Bought six partially completed townhouses and completed all planning and development steps required to sever and construct for sale; two remaining for sale

## 232-234 Galloway Road

Bought vacant land and are building sixteen townhouses for sale.

247 and 251 Ranee Avenue 7 luxury townhouses
Bought a vacant $2 / 3$ acre lot and obtained approval to build seven houses on the site before selling the site to Toronto Community Housing Corporation.


## 14 and 16 Montcrest Blvd.

2 luxury detached houses
Severed off two lots from our 646 Broadview property, and built two luxury detached houses and sold both. They have phenomenal views of the Toronto skyline, being just north of Riverdale park.



## 10-12 Market Street

Redevelopment site
Obtained approval to build a 10-storey luxury residential and retail condominium building on the site of the original Toronto fish market, a heritage site, before selling this site to another developer

## 9 Post Road

Infill housing site
Severed one lot into two and obtained approval and a building permit to construct a luxury mansion in the Bridle Path neighbourhood in Toronto, before selling the site to a builder. Note: photo is of the house we had approved. Builder built his own style.


## 118 and 120 Isabella

Mixed use houses
Renovated two houses for profitable resale

## 2 Park Lane

Infill housing site
Severed one lot into two and renovated the house on the property before selling the site to a builder. Note: photo is of the house we had approved. Builder built his own style.


## 2. HISTORIC RETURN ON INVESTMENT

Since 2001, the Rose and Thistle Group Ltd. has achieved impressive compounded annual returns.

| Average Retum by property* |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Property | Compounded annual return | Theethe |
| 17 properties in Toronto | 26.20\% | 7 years |
| * outher femowed ouder teews return up to 00:83\% compounded annualty |  |  |

The properties are listed from our highest compounded annual return to our lowest. We have thus far never lost money on a project.

| Property | Compounded annual return | Timeline |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10-12 Bruce Park | 785.00\% | 2 months |
| 19 Temnis Crescent: | 104.00\% | 6 months |
| 118 and 120 Isabella: | 84.75\% | 1 year |
| 185 Davenport Rioad | 36.36\% | 6 years |
| 30 A Hazelton Avenue: | 33.51\% | 7 years |
| 646 Broadriew Avente: | 26.46\% | 4 years |
| 30 Hazelton Avenue: | 25.16\% | 7 years |
| 65 Front Street East: | 21.90\% | 2 years |
| 355 Eglinton Avenue East: | 18.00\% | 9 months |
| 1246 Yonge Street | 16.87\% | 3 years |
| 17 Yorkvill Averme | 13.50\% | 3 years |
| 247 and 251 Rance Avenite: | 10.00\% | 5 years |
| 14.4 and 16 Montcrest Blvd.: | 8.00\% | 45 years |
| 9 Post Road: | 7.00\% | 3 years |
| 2 Park Lane: | 7.00\% | 3 years |
| 377183775 St. Clair Ave: 旦. | 4.50\% | 5 years |
| 10-12 Mafket Street: | 2.11\% | 2 years |

## 3. MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of Rose and Thistle Investments is to identify, acquire, manage and develop under-utilized commercial, residential and mixed-use buildings and vacant land that have the potential, when the requisite amount of time, skill and capital are applied, to achieve an above average return and provide our tenants and purchasers with homes or offices of which they are proud.

## 4. INVESTMENT CRITERIA AND STRATEGY

Rose and Thistle reviews potential acquisitions using an investment criteria which focuses primarily on return on equity, security of cash flow, potential for capital appreciation and the potential to increase value by more efficient management, including accessing capital for expansion and development.

We are "sticking to our knitting" by seeking opportunities similar to the properties with which we have had success in the past, namely the following three types of investments:

1. Medium-size commercial and mixed-use buildings that are well-located and well built where there is the possibility to:
a. sever off a portion of the land for redevelopment or to create multiple parcels where there is currently one;
b. subdivide the building into condominiums;
c. add onto or renovate the existing building; and/or
d. change the tenant mix and create operating efficiencies;
2. Medium-size apartment buildings that are well-located and well-built where there is the potential to:
a. sever off a portion of the land for redevelopment;
b. add onto the existing building; and/or
c. update the suites, improve the building, and thus change the tenant mix and increase rents; and
3. Medium size residential housing and development sites where the land is welllocated.

We are prudent investors who apply rigorous criteria when evaluating each potential real estate opportunity.

## 5. SERVICES

i. Real estate acquisition, disposition and financing

- Acquisition and syndication of residential, commercial, and retail real estate
- Assistance with property ownership transition that capitalizes on value created
- Research, investment analysis, due diligence, market and value assessment
- Financing and re-financing
- Access to capital through our network of contacts
ii. Construction and development
- Project management of re-developments, renovations and new developments for residential, commercial, and retail properties in urban and suburban markets
- Expertise in planning, obtaining zoning approvals, construction management, and operation start-up
- Experience working with government and regulatory agencies, business community leaders and investors to enhance project success
- Tarion-registered new home builder


## iii. Property management

- Operations and management of multi-unit small to medium commercial, residential and retail properties
- Short-term and long-term strategy to maximize return on investment
- Tenant relationship management through ongoing communications and reporting
- Tenant retention strategy and effectiveness measurement
- Administration of leases to optimize results
- Market research for competitive pricing and positioning
- Maintenance and management of the property
- Twenty four hour on-call emergency repair
- Rent collection and lease enforcement
- On-site staffing, if needed, according to owner approved budget
- Maintenance and capital improvement planning
- Regular property inspections


## iv. Leasing Services

- Obtaining tenants
- In-house leasing team with extensive industry contacts
- Advertising vacancies
- Negotiating new and renewal leases
- Marketing strategy to promote properties to prospective tenants and brokers through our network of contacts, Web sites, printed media and other channels of communication


## v. Legal and Accounting Support

- Drafting and filing legal documents
- Litigation
- The conversion of commercial rental units to commercial and/or residential condominium properties and the implementation of condominium sales programs
- Zoning, by-law and legislative compliance
- Severance and variance applications
- Representation at municipal zoning, fire, building and by-law hearings
- Insurance management and advice on appropriate coverage
- Centralized accounting and finance functions, including financial statements and audit, accounts receivable, accounts payable, payroll, cash and tax management
- Weekly, monthly or quarterly occupancy and collection reporting
- Weekly, monthly or quarterly financial report
- Annual budget preparation
- Unit turnover costs
- Capital expenditures
- Operating and labour costs
- Revenue
- Partnership distributions as directed


## 6. MANAGEMENT TEAM



Norma Walton, B.A., J.D., M.B.A.
Norma is a co-founder of The Rose and Thistle Group Ltd. She has considerable experience in all aspects of residential and commercial real estate, including acquisition, development, property management and financing.

Norma has a Bachelors Degree in French, a Bachelor of Laws Degree and an executive Master of Business Administration Degree all from the University of Western Ontario. She is a member in good standing of the Law Society of Upper Canada and is a licensed mortgage broker in the Province of Ontario. She is a published author and a sought after speaker having given in excess of two hundred speeches and has appeared on both television and radio.


Ronauld G. Walton, CPIM, J.D., LL.M., M.B.A.
Ron is a co-founder of The Rose and Thistle Group Ltd. He has a Bachelor of Laws Degree from the University of Western Ontario, a Master of Intellectual Property Laws Degree from York University, a Master of Business Administration Degree from the University of Liverpool, a Diploma in Marketing Management from Centennial College and is Certified in Production and Inventory Management by the American Production and Inventory Control Society.

Ron is a member of the Institute of Corporate Directors and the Law Society of Upper Canada. Ron is a registered trade-mark agent with the Government of Canada and a licensed mortgage broker in the Province of Ontario. He has been nominated for the

Premiers Award given by Province of Ontario for social and economic contributions.


## Carlos Carreiro, Director of Construction and Maintenance

Carlos has an extensive twenty-year background in real estate. He has been a real estate agent, a land developer, and a residential and commercial property renovator and builder. He is adept at interior design and renovation having studied architectural technology at Ryerson. He has an extensive network of industry contacts to call upon as the need arises. He is an exceptional manager of both construction sites and commercial buildings.


## Chief Financial Officer --. Mario R. Bucci, B.BM., C.M.A.

Mario provides leadership and co-ordination in the administrative, accounting and budgeting efforts of The Rose and Thistle Group. He creates and evaluates the financial programs and supporting information and control systems of the company in order to preserve company assets and report accurate and timely financial results.

Mario has over 25 years experience in finance. He has a Bachelor of Business Management Degree from Ryerson University and is a member of the Certified Management Accountants of Ontario.


Vice President of Operations --- Steve Williams
Steve has more than a decade of both project management and overall management experience. He is responsible for ensuring that cost effective operations and infrastructure are in place to support all of The Rose and Thistle's active real estate projects and oversees the operational budget for each project. He contracts and coordinates outside contractors to resolve operating difficulties and ensure project deadlines are completed on time. Steve has also been the Director of Production for our subsidiary company, Corporate Communications Interactive Inc, since 2002.


John Geikins, C.M.A., Senior Accounting Manager

John manages Rose and Thistle's finance staff and oversees the maintenance and accuracy of all financial records for The Rose and Thistle Group Ltd. and related companies. He has an Accounting and Finance Diploma from Seneca College and is a Certified Management Accountant with over twenty five years experience in accounting and income tax compliance. Prior to joining the Rose and Thistle Group, John was in upper management discharging considerable financial responsibility with one of Canada's largest corporations.

## John Rawlings, Vice President of Operations

John, an engineer by training, had thirty years experience with the Ford Motor Company in a variety of management positions. He has been on contract to The Rose and Thistle Group Ltd. for ten years. John has supervised seventeen hundred individuals including architects, engineers, electricians, plumbers, contractors and maintenance and repair workers. While on contract to Ford, John's most recent responsibilities included being in charge of the construction of two twenty million dollar facilities and a one hundred and fifty million dollar plant expansion at the Ford facilities in Oakville and St. Thomas. He has a vast array of cost consultants, appraisers, construction and maintenance personnel upon whom he can call.


Samantha comes from a project management background in health information. She has a diploma in Heath Information Technology as well as a Bachelors Degree in General Studies from the University of North Dakota.


## Jackie McKinlay, Associate

Jackie has over a decade of real estate law experience and is the hub through which all of our residential and commercial real estate deals flow. She co-ordinates condominium registration documents, real estate financings, interacts with lawyers, clients, architects, surveyors, conveyancers and City personnel, she coordinates the preparation and receipt of R plans, site plans, surveys and landscape surveys and all of the real estate acquisitions, sales and re-financings. Jackie is a graduate of The Ontario Law Clerks Association and is a registered mortgage agent.

Tom Trklja, B.A. in Law, F.Inst.L.C.O., Associate

Tom obtained his Law Degree from the University of Belgrade in 1987 after which he practiced law in Belgrade for several years. Subsequently he graduated on the President's Honour List from the Legal Assistant Program at Seneca College of Applied Arts and Technology in 1999. Through his legal training and practical experience Tom has been in the legal field for more than twenty one years. He has played a key role in multi-million dollar mergers and acquisitions, a variety of complex contract negotiations and all aspects of corporate law. He is also skilled in real estate development law and real estate financing. He is a member of the Institute of Law Clerks of Ontario.


Senior Accountant --- Kendra Menry-Curtis

Kendra studied accounting, information systems and computer programming and is an honours graduate of Centennial College with an Accountant/Programmer Analyst diploma. At present, she is completing the Certified General Accountant program and will soon have her CGA designation. She assists in the maintenance and preparation of financial records and statements.

## SECTION E:

## THE FINANCIAL PROJECTIONS

## ASSUMPTIONS

The financial assumptions used to generate the closing costs, renovation costs, projected rent roll and building valuation were specifically designed to be conservative in their estimates to mitigate identified potential risks. The key assumptions are as follows:

| Closing Costs | Rose and Thistle has vast experience in estimating closing costs. The largest component is the Ontario land transfer tax and the Toronto land transfer tax, which together total approximately $3 \%$ of the purchase price. The second largest is the fee of $2 \%$ of face value for arranging a mortgage to cover acquisition and construction. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Renovation Costs | Rose and Thistle has just completed the gut renovation of 86 Parliament and is renovating 66 Gerrard and 252 Carlton now hence has current information and great proxies for determining what 241 Spadina will cost. |
| Projected <br> Rent Roll | Rose and Thistle estimates that the operating costs for the property, called Additional Rent Expenses, will be approximately $\$ 14$ per square foot at most, making the assumption that the property taxes will be too high initially and will have to be reduced via assessment. <br> For net rents, Rose and Thistle is using its recent experience at 86 Parliament, 252 Carlton and 66 Gerrard to estimate rents. They recognize that for some tenants there will be a "Chinatown" discount from the rents that would otherwise be achieved. Mitigating that discount is the roof height of the first, second and fifth floors of the building. <br> Rose and Thistle is prepared to wait for the right tenant paying market rent. Rose and Thistle has been advised that market rent for the area is between $\$ 30$ and $\$ 35$ gross for office space ( $\$ 16$ to $\$ 21$ net) and $\$ 40$ to $\$ 55$ for retail space ( $\$ 26$ to $\$ 41$ net). Given the height of the first, second and fifth floors, Rose and Thistle feels the projected rental receipts are accurate. |
| Building valuation | Toronto's heritage-style commercial buildings have capitalization rates ranging from $5 \%$ to $9 \%$. Rose and Thistle is using $7.5 \%$ for this property, being a realistic capitalization rate given the location and nature of the property. That capitalization rate will be applied to the net income to determine property value upon completion of renovations and leasing. |

## RETURN ON INVESTMENT

Using the above assumptions, the following pre-tax returns have been calculated:

| Compounded annual return | $25.8 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Straight-line return | $99 \%$ |

## RISKS

Inherent with any investment there are associated risks. Rose and Thistle through their industry experience is aware of and has taken appropriate measures to mitigate the risk exposure to the investor. However, it is essential the investor be aware of some of the key risks involved in the project and more importantly, how these risks have been considered by Rose and Thistle.

| Risk | Discussion |
| :--- | :--- |
| Market condition for commercial <br> tenants | - Rose and Thistle cannot control the <br> economic environment in Toronto. <br> We are encouraged by the net <br> migration of approximately 100,000 <br> people a year to the area, which <br> historically has kept real estate <br> vibrant over the past two decades. <br> Nonetheless, there is a supply of <br> commercial office product coming to <br> market over the next two years that <br> will potentially increase vacancy <br> rates |
|  | Rose and Thistle recognizes that <br> Toronto's expenses and particularly <br> its commercial taxes are far higher <br> than those in the 905 belt. <br> Nonetheless, there are numerous <br> companies that choose Toronto for <br> their office location. Rose and |
| Thistle is confident, given its <br> experience with its seven other <br> Heritage buildings, that heritage <br> buildings when renovated properly <br> are extremely popular with a certain <br> type of tenant, and those tenants are <br> loyal and prepared to pay fair rent <br> and enter into long-term leases for <br> "loft" style space. |  |


|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Interest Rate Increases | - Rose and Thistle has locked in the <br> rates for the mortgage and <br> construction loan for a 24 month <br> term |
| General Investment Risk | - All investments with the exception <br> of sovereign bonds of major <br> industrial nations (eg. US treasury <br> bills, Canada savings bonds) carry <br> with them inherent risk. There are no <br> guarantees in life. The best one can <br> do, as Rose and Thistle believes it <br> has, is to acquire desirable assets, at a <br> reasonable price at a favourable <br> time. Investors in this real estate <br> transaction must be aware that it is <br> riskier than acquiring savings bonds. <br> Investors must be comfortable that <br> the return is not guaranteed, unlike <br> the return of such a bond. |

## SECTION F: TABLES

## TABLE 1: CAPITAL COSTS AND STRUCTURE




## TABLE 2: PROJECTED INCOME STATEMENT



## TABLE 3: PROJECTED BUILDING VALUATION



TABLE 4: PROJECTED PROFIT AND PROJECTED INVESTOR RETURN



## TABLE 5: SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS



AGREEMENT
Between:

Dr. Bernstein Diet Clinics Ltd.

"Bernstein"

- and -

Ron and Norma Walton
"Walton"

- and -

Skyline-1185 Eglinton Avenue Inc.
the "Company"
WHEREAS Bernstein and Walton intend to purchase 1185 Eglinton Avenue East, Toronto, Ontario (the "Property") on or about December 17, 2010 and put ownership of the Property in the Company's name;

AND WHEREAS Bernstein and Walton, or whomever Bernstein and Walton may direct, will each hold $2,501,900$ shares in the Company;

AND WHEREAS Bernstein and Walton will each provide the sum of $\$ 2,501,900$ to the Company for the purposes of demolishing the existing building on the Property and development-approving the Property for a residential condominium and stacked townhome development (the "Project");

AND WHEREAS Walton will manage and supervise the Project and ensure it is completed according to the proposal attached as Exhibit "A" to this Agreement;

THEREFORE the parties agree as follows:

1. Walton has contracted to purchase the Property and the purchase is scheduled to close on December 17, 2010.
2. Walton has commenced development approvals for the residential re-development plans for the Property.
3. Walton has engaged a consultant to prepare demolition specifications for the demolition of the building on the Property so that demolition job can be tendered through the Commercial News.
4. Walton has obtained an offer from Great Gulf Homes to partner with Walton and Bernstein in the development of the Property into approximately 110 townhomes and 400,000 of residential condominiums and Walton is expecting to receive an offer from Empire Communities to either purchase the Property or partner with Walton and Bernstein to develop the Property.
5. Walton intends to complete development approvals between now and November 15, 2012 in accordance with Exhibit "A".
6. Bernstein wishes to own $50 \%$ of the shares in the Company in exchange for providing $50 \%$ of the equity required to complete the Project. The Company will issue sufficient shares such that Bernstein has $2,501,900$ and Walton has $2,501,900$ voting shares of the same class.
7. The ownership of the Company will be as follows:
a. $50 \%$ to Bernstein; and
b. $50 \%$ to Ron and Norma Walton as they may direct between each other or alternatively to be held by a completely Walton-owned and controlled company, provided that all covenants and agreements of Walton herein shall continue in full force and effect.
8. Walton will be managing, supervising and completing the Project in accordance with the attached Exhibit "A".
9. Walton and Bernstein have each provided $1 / 2$ of the $\$ 300,000$ deposit to purchase the Property.
10. The balance of equity in the amount of $\$ 2,351,900$ each will be paid as follows:
a. Bernstein will provide to the Company the sum of $\$ 1,750,000$ on or before December 17, 2010;
b. Walton will provide the sum of $\$ 1,750,000$ to the Company in a timely manner as required as the Project is completed;
c. If and when the vendor take back mortgage of $\$ 500,000$ is required to be paid back prior to the completion of the Project, both Bernstein and Walton will provide a further $\$ 250,000$ each as required to pay out the vendor take back mortgage;
d. If and when the land transfer tax is required to be paid, Bernstein and Walton will each contribute the sum of $\$ 127,500$ or whatever amount equals $50 \%$ of the total amount due; and
e. Bernstein and Walton will provide the remaining sum of $\$ 224,400$ in a timely manner as required.
11. Walton and Bernstein will each provide $50 \%$ of whatever additional capital over and above the $\$ 2,501,900$ each that is required to complete the Project, if any, in a timely manner.
12. In addition to managing, supervising and completing the Project, Walton will be responsible for supervising the demolition of the building on the Property, hiring of all consultants, designers, architects and engineers to complete the Project, finance, bookkeeping, office administration, accounting, information technology provision, filing tax returns for the Company, and fulfilling all active roles required to complete the Project in accordance with Exhibit "A".
13. Bernstein will not be required to play an active role in completing the Project. Notwithstanding that, any decisions concerning partnering with a developer, the type of development, the selling or the refinancing of the Property will require his approval; any decisions requiring an increase in the total amount of equity required to complete the Project will require his approval; and any significant decisions that vary from the Project plan described in Exhibit "A" will require his approval.
14. Walton will provide to Bernstein ongoing reports at minimum monthly detailing all items related to the Property including the progress in moving the development approvals forward and any interest being obtained from developers to purchase the Property or partner with Bernstein and Walton to develop the Property.
15. Walton will provide a written report to Bernstein each month detailing the following:
a. copies of invoices for work completed;
b. the bank statement for that month; and
c. if the bank statement does not have a copy of cancelled cheques, then Walton will also provide a complete listing of all cheques written, including payees, dates and amounts.
At Bernstein's request, Walton will provide whatever other back-up information he requests. Any cheque or transfer over $\$ 50,000$ will require Bernstein's signature or written approval before being processed.
16. Once the Project is substantially completed to the point that all of the Property has been sold, both parties will be paid out their capital plus profits and Walton will retain the Company for potential future use.
17. The Board of Directors of the Company will be composed of two directors, being Bernstein and Norma Walton. The only shares to be issued in the Company will be as set out above, and neither party may transfer his or her shares to another party without the consent of all the other parties, which consent may be unreasonably withheld. Once Bernstein has been paid out his capital and profits from the Project, he will surrender his share certificate, he will concurrently resign from the Board of Directors and Norma Walton and the Company will accept such resignation. At such time Bernstein shall be released of all obligations and liability related to the Company and shall be indemnified by Walton with respect to all liabilities, claims and obligations whatsoever of the

Company up to the date at which Bernstein has been paid out his capital and profits from the Project.
18. Walton will obtain from Gil Blutricht as officer of Skyline a statutory declaration confirming the current status of the Company and that it is free and clear of all liabilities and obligations whatsoever and Gil Blutricht as officer of Skyline shall provide an Indemnity relating thereto to both Walton and Bernstein to or before December 17, 2010. The Company will only be used to purchase, development approve and sell 1185 Eglinton Avenue East, Toronto, Ontario or such other matters solely relating to the Project and the Property.
19. If the parties disagree on how to manage, supervise and complete the Project in accordance with Exhibit "A" and cannot reach agreement amongst themselves, each of them undertakes to attend a minimum of four hours of mediation in pursuit of reaching an agreement. After mediation, if there are any remaining issues to be determined, those issues in dispute shall be determined by a single arbitrator in as cost-effective a manner as possible, with no right of appeal. All costs of such mediation and/or arbitration will be borne equally by Bernstein and Walton.
20. Notwithstanding that Bernstein and Walton do not yet have the authority to execute the within agreement on behalf of the Company prior to the completion of the Purchase of the Property, all of the parties hereby acknowledge, agree and confirm that this Agreement shall be a valid and binding Agreement upon execution by Bernstein and Walton.
21. The above represents all deal terms between the parties.

Dated at Toronto, Ontario this


Dr. Bernstein Diet Clinics Ltd.
Per A.S.O.


Ron Walton
Norma Walton
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## SECTION A:

## 1. THE OPPORTUNITY

The opportunity is to purchase $50 \%$ of the equity in Skyline - 1185 Eglinton Avenue Inc., a soon-to-be Rose and Thistle company that owns 1185 Eglinton Avenue East. 1185 Eglinton is a 2.83 acre parcel of land at the southeast corner of Don Mills and Eglinton currently containing a nine storey office building and both surface and underground parking.

Skyline currently owns the property and they need to sell it because their capital is required for three other properties with which they are involved. The office building is currently vacant and it costs them $\$ 1.5$ million a year to carry. 1185 Eglinton was first listed for sale in 2008. It was successively tied up by five different groups between early 2008 and when we tied it up, at prices ranging from $\$ 13.5$ million to $\$ 10$ million. All of those groups wanted to demolish the office building and build residential condominiums. The city at that time was not prepared to agree to that proposal hence none of those five deals came to fruition.

We have now purchased the property for $\$ 8.5$ million, a far better price than we could have obtained in 2008. Further, we are the beneficiaries of the two and a half year planning process already undergone by Skyline and all five groups who had the site under contract. Although the city was not originally agreeable to a residential redevelopment on this site, now they are fully supportive and anxious to see it happen.

Hence our plan is to demolish the office building in the spring of 2011 and complete the development approvals for two condominium towers, a joint mid-rise podium and adjacent townhouses so we can sell the site to a condominium developer. We anticipate an investment of $\$ 2.5$ million prior to November 15,2010 would generate significant profits within two years.


## The Office Building



The nine storey office building was custom built in 1973 for Nestle Canada as their head office. It is 145,000 square feet of rentable area over ten floors including the lower level, and it has one level of underground parking that can accommodate 56 cars. Over-engineered, the building is a fortress and structurally could support double the storeys it currently has. We anticipate it will cost approximately $\$ 5.36$ per square foot to demolish. We intend to demolish it soon after taking ownership of the site as the cost to maintain it is approximately $\$ 1.5$ million annually.


## The Development Site



Page + Steele Architects have designed two stunning condominium towers to occupy the site, along with a mid-rise building and townhouses. The prior owners of 1185 Eglinton had already applied for approval of one condominium tower while retaining the office building. The original proposal was not agreeable to the city, but our revised proposal incorporating two condominium towers on a shared mid-rise podium with townhouses on site is agreeable to them. Development approvals for the site will take approximately eighteen to thirty months to obtain, but once the city confirms in writing they are agreeable, we can move to sell the site to a condominium developer who will finalize number and size of suites once they own the site and prior to final approvals. Alternatively we may partner with a developer to develop the site, which would extend the life of the project
to

approximately five years but would contemplate significant profit sharing upon project cash out.

## Summary

Rose and Thistle anticipates securing full development approval for the condominium site by November 2012. Rose and Thistle expects to list the site for sale in March of 2012 and have the purchaser close the purchase by November 2012. We have already made contact and have secured the interest of both Great Gulf Homes and Empire Communities, and both companies have expressed interest in partnering with us on the site or purchasing the site conditional on development approvals and for a certain purchase price per square foot of saleable area. We are confident the city will approve a minimum of 4 times site coverage, being a total of 490,000 square feet, and anticipate the approval will actually be for 4.5 times site coverage or 550,000 square feet. Best case would be 5 times site coverage or 615,000 square feet.

In speaking with both developers and realtors who sell this sort of product, the minimum price that is obtained for development-approved sites is $\$ 30$ per buildable square foot. In addition, the townhouses are worth more per buildable square foot because they are less expensive to build yet the end value is higher. To be conservative, we have valued the entire site at $\$ 30$ per buildable square foot.

If we do not partner with a developer up front and look to sell after we obtain our approvals, we will create a website with all of our due diligence material and provide the market six weeks to digest that information before the bid date for offers. We will price it at minimum $\$ 30$ per buildable foot and see if we manage to extract more than that depending on interest from the development community.

The project will end once the development site is sold and we have repaid capital and profits. We anticipate this will occur within two years of November 15, 2010.

Unlike investments in stocks and bonds, carefully selected and well-located properties have real value. When real property is purchased for the right price and properly managed, it provides reliable, above average returns on investment. In addition, given Toronto's growth each year by approximately 100,000 new immigrants, the need for new housing is ongoing. Condominium developers are hence always looking for new development sites, and our site provides significant scale to attract those large and medium-sized condominium developers.


## 2. THE INVESTMENT PARTICULARS

The details of the opportunity are as follows:
What: Common shares in Skyline - 1185 Eglinton Avenue Inc., the company that owns 1185 Eglinton Avenue East

Amount available: $\quad \$ 2,501,900$
Commencement date: Deposit of $\$ 150,000$ in November 2010; balance on or prior to December 17, 2010

Capital appreciation and return: Principal will be repaid then profits split equally
Term: $\quad 24$ months to November 15, 2012
The total capital is $\$ 13.2$ million, being $\$ 8.2$ million from mortgage and $\$ 5$ million in equity, of which Rose and Thistle will purchase $\$ 2.5$ million, leaving $\$ 2.5$ million available for purchase. The capital structure is as follows:


## SECTION B:

## 1. THE PROPERTY

1185 Eglinton Avenue East is located in Don Mills. Don Mills has been the recipient of a lot of financial investment recently:


* Cadillac Fairview has spent many hundreds of millions designing and building the Shops of Don Mills at Don Mills and Lawrence, a new concept outdoor mall with high end retailers and restaurants. Phase I is complete, and they are now pre-selling suites in Phase $I$, being six new condominium buildings and one retrofit of an existing building that will surround the Shops of Don Mills in the next few years with residences. The condominium suites are being pre-sold for $\$ 500$ per square foot.
* The Aga Khan Foundation is spending $\$ 200$ million to create an Ismaili Cultural Center, Museum and park between Wynford and Eglinton Avenue. Construction is underway. This will transform the area adjacent to the Don Valley Parkway at Eglinton and provide investment in the surrounding area by groups wishing to associate themselves with the Aga Khan.

* The former Inn on the Park site at Leslie and Eglinton now houses Toyota on the Park and Lexus on the Park, along with shops, services and an adult lifestyle retirement residence, with everything on the corner being new.
* Tridel is almost completely sold out of their Accolade condominiums between Eglinton and Wynford east of the Don Valley Parkway. The few remaining suites are selling for between $\$ 375$ and $\$ 450$ per square foot.


* The 56 acre Celestica site is under contract of sale, with the new owners likely looking to rezone the site to create retail and residential developments
* The LRT is proposing to make both Eglinton and Don Mills major arteries in their
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* Build Toronto owns the site immediately north of 1185 Eglinton Avenue, which is currently being used for surface parking but will no doubt be developed in the next decade.
* Loblaws Superstore replaced the Imperial Oil building a few years ago with a busy plaza with a Loblaws, LCBO, pharmacy, bank and ancillary retailers.

* The Ontario Science Center has been a fixture on the south west corner of Don Mills and Eglinton for more than 40 years.


All of the above will increase the appeal of 1185 Eglinton Avenue.

## 2. THE PLAN

The plan is two fold:

1. Demolish the office building currently on site; and
2. Complete development approvals for the residential condominium development so we can sell the site to a developer.

The following steps will be implemented to achieve this objective:

1. Have already begun pre-construction planning:
a. For the condominium development, we have:
i. Engaged our architect, planners and lawyers to revise the proposed development to address the city's concerns;
ii. Met with the city planners to obtain their approval, following which we'll submit the revised package for submission, and met with the city councillor for the area and secured his support; and
iii. Spoken with real estate professionals and developers and attracted one offer of partnership from a developer for the site.
b. For the office, we:
i. Have engaged demolition companies to prepare estimates for demolition; and
ii. Have engaged salvage experts to determine what can be salvaged for monies in the existing building.

Timeline: Now to December 17, 2010
2. Once we own the property, we will demolish the office building and complete the development approvals for the site, detailed as follows:
a. For the office building, salvage what is of value and demolish; and
b. For the development site:
i. Submit our revised plan for site plan and rezoning approvals; and
ii. Shepherd that plan through the city process.

Estimated timeline: 18 to 30 months, between May 15, 2012 to May 15, 2013
3. Sell to a condominium developer and pay out capital and profits to investors.

Total project timeline: 18 to 30 months, between May 15, 2012 and May 15, 2013.

## 3. FINANCIAL PROJECTIONS

The property was purchased for $\$ 8.5$ million. With closing costs it will have a cost base of $\$ 8.95$ million. The hard construction costs will run $\$ 850,000$ for demolition. The condominium development process will cost $\$ 1.76$ million for consultant's fees and city fees to develop-approve the site. Carrying costs will cost another $\$ 1.65$ million. Hence the total project cost will be $\$ 13.2$ million.

Rose and Thistle anticipates that within 24 months, being November 15, 2012, the site will be sold for a minimum of $\$ 15.75$ million, creating profits in excess of $\$ 2.65$ million.

Hence it is projected that an investment of $\$ 2,500,000$ on November 15, 2010 would provide a total return of more than $\$ 1,250,000$ within 24 months. This $53 \%$ straight line projected return equates to a $23 \%$ compounded annual return. We refer you to the Financial Projections section of this proposal for expenditure, revenue and profit details.


Office building to be demolished
Development site to be sold

## SECTION C:

## INVESTING IN TORONTO

A continental gateway and a crossroads for the world, Toronto is Canada's business capital. It ranks alongside economic powerhouses such as New York, Boston and Chicago. Toronto is annually rated as the most multi-cultural city in the world by the United Nations. Canada accepts approximately 300,000 new immigrants every year, and $43 \%$ of all immigrants to Canada settle in the Greater Toronto Area. This results in an annual population increase of more than 100,000 people. As a result, the demand for both residential and commercial real estate is strong and demographic trends strongly suggest that such demand will remain robust.


Toronto boasts a stable economic and political climate. Toronto commercial real estate has attracted worldwide investors, particularly from the United States, Great Britain, Israel and Germany. It has one of the five most diversified economies of any city-region in North America, and consistently ranks with Boston and Chicago as one of the best business cities in North America.

## Population

With 2.7 million residents, Toronto is the 5th largest city in North America. One-quarter of Canada's population is located within 160 km ( 100 mi .) of the city and more than $60 \%$ of the population of the USA is within a 90 -minute flight.



## Economy

The City of Toronto's economy comprises $11 \%$ of Canada's GDP, with Toronto's GDP topping $\$ 140$ billion in 2009. Toronto-based businesses export over $\$ 70$ billion in goods and services to every corner of the globe with retail sales of $\$ 47$ billion annually.

## Capital

Five of Canada's six largest banks have their headquarters in Toronto, near the country's busiest stock exchange. Toronto is North America's third largest financial services centre and $75 \%$ of Canada's foreign banks and $65 \%$ of the country's pension fund companies are located here.

## Competitive

Toronto has an excellent reputation as one of North America's leading economies while at the same time delivering overall business cost savings of $6.5 \%$ over large U.S. cities and $12.2 \%$ when compared to Asian and European centres.


Workforce
Toronto's more than 76,000
businesses choose from a large, highly skilled, multilingual workforce of 1.4 million people - one-sixth of the country's labour force. More than 800,000 workers have university or college training and $58 \%$ have earned a post-secondary degree, diploma or certificate. Residents speak more than 135 languages and dialects.

## Education

Toronto's impressive range of post-secondary educational facilities includes three universities and five colleges offering training in virtually every discipline and skill. Toronto leads the country in the number of post-secondary schools and graduates, with more than 15,000 medical/biotech researchers, two top-ranked MBA schools and excellent programs in engineering, computer sciences and multi-media.


Location


## Connections

Toronto boasts an expansive local network of consultants, professional firms and specialty suppliers. The business services cluster is among North America's largest and growing. Toronto is home to 9 of Canada's 10 largest law practices, 9 of the top 10 accounting firms and all 10 top human resources and benefits firms.

## Transportation

With four major highways, multi-modal railway facilities, a Great Lakes port and an international airport handling over 30 million passengers and 350,000 tons of cargo annually, Toronto is a true North American gateway.

## Transit

Toronto's public transit system is the second largest in North America and has the highest per capita ridership rate on the continent. More than 2,400 subway vehicles, buses and streetcars make it easy for more than 1.4 million business riders to travel throughout the city daily.


## SECTIOND:

## THE ROSE AND THISTLE GROUP LTD.

## A. EXPERIENCE

Over the past nine years, The Rose and Thistle Group has owned, managed and developed a total of $\$ 85$ million worth of properties, of which $\$ 50$ million remain under management and development.

Rose and Thistle is seeking out properties similar to the properties with which it has had success in the past. Since 2001, Rose and Thistle has owned, managed and developed the following properties, thirteen of which it continues to own and two of which it has under contract to purchase.

## Our heritage commercial buildings:



## 30 Hazelton Avenue

A heritage building in Yorkville with high-end luxury office and retail tenancies

Head office of The Rose and Thistle Group Ltd.

Severed one lot into two and renovated the heritage designated building into four luxury suites



86 Parliament Street
The Old Telegram Building
A heritage corner building built in 1887 that used to house The Toronto Telegram, located in Cabbagetown, with retail and commercial space.

Gutted and renovated the property. Opened Urban Amish Interiors Furniture Gallery on floors one and two, and leased floors three and four to Sun Edison.


## 252 Carlton / 478 Parliament

A heritage corner building in Cabbagetown that has retail and commercial space.

Home to Ginger and Johnny G's restaurants

Currently gutting and renovating the second and third floors to house two new full floor tenants in September 2010.


## 110 Lombard Street

## The Old Firehall

Toronto's first fire hall, built in 1886. The former home of Second City which launched the careers of Dan Ackroyd, John Candy, Mike Myers, Gilda Radner, Martin Short, etc.

Currently leased to Gilda's Club


66 Gerrard Street East
Toronto's original apothecary, built in the 1880s, this beautiful building kitty corner Ryerson is currently under renovation by us to accommodate Starbucks as our anchor corner retail tenant. We are also installing an elevator and renovating the building generally while
accommodating our existing tenants.


## 24 Cecil Street

A stumning corner property south of the University of Toronto that we have under contract to purchase and renovate


## 241 Spadina Avenue

We have recently purchased this beautiful heritage building, originally built in 1910 for The Consolidated Plate Glass Company of Toronto. We will be extensively renovating it and leasing it to commercial tenants over the next three years.

Our commercial buildings:


## 185 Davenport Road

Fully converted an office building into five mixed use residential and commercial condominium suites and sold them.

355 Eglinton Avenue East
Commercial building, renovated for re-sale.



## 17 Yorkville Avenue

Commercial building converted condominiums

Converted this office building into six mixed use luxury condominiums then sold all six units


## 10-12 Bruce Park

Mixed-use building
Entered into an agreement to purchase this building then sold that right to another purchaser for a profit.

## Our residential apartment buildings:



19 Tennis Crescent
An 8-plex in Riverdale
Renovated five of the suites and significantly increased annual revenues when they were released. Are renovating other suites as they become available

646 Broadview Avenue
A 13-plex in Riverdale

Fully converted a
heritage-designated mansion into
thirteen residential rental units.


648 Broadview Avenue:

A 10-plex in Riverdale
Renovated five of the suites and significantly increased annual revenues when they were re-leased. Are renovating other suites as they become available

## Our infill residential housing:



## 78 Tisdale

Bought a vacant 1.5 acre parcel of land in North York; are completing all steps required to permit the construction of 40 townhouses which we will then build.

3771 and 3775 St. Clair Ave. E. 17 luxury townhouses
Bought a vacant $2 / 3$ acre lot and completed all planning and development steps required to obtain approval to build 17 luxury townhouses on the site, then constructed and sold all seventeen to individual purchasers


346 Jarvis
6 luxury townhouses
Bought six partially completed townhouses and completed all planning and development steps required to sever and construct for sale; two remaining for sale


## 232-234 Galloway Road

Bought vacant land and are building sixteen townhouses for sale.

## 247 and 251 Ranee Avenue 7 luxury townhouses

Bought a vacant $2 / 3$ acre lot and obtained approval to build seven houses on the site before selling the site to Toronto Community Housing Corporation.


## 14 and 16 Montcrest Blvd.

2 luxury detached houses
Severed off two lots from our 646 Broadview property, and built two luxury detached houses and sold both. They have phenomenal views of the Toronto skyline, being just north of Riverdale park.



10-12 Market Street
Redevelopment site
Obtained approval to build a 10-storey luxury residential and retail condominium building on the site of the original Toronto fish market, a heritage site, before selling this site to another developer


## 9 Post Road

Infill housing site
Severed one lot into two and obtained approval and a building permit to construct a luxury mansion in the Bridle Path neighbourhood


118 and 120 Isabella
Mixed use houses
Renovated two houses for profitable resale in Toronto, before selling the site to a builder

## 2 Park Lane

Infill housing site
Severed one lot into two and renovated the house on the property before selling the site to a builder


## 2. HISTORIC RETURN ON INVESTMENT

Since 2001, the Rose and Thistle Group Ltd. has achieved impressive compounded annual returns.


The properties are listed from our highest compounded annual return to our lowest. We have thus far never lost money on a project.


## 3. MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of Rose and Thistle Investments is to identify, acquire, manage and develop under-utilized commercial, residential and mixed-use buildings and vacant land that have the potential, when the requisite amount of time, skill and capital are applied, to achieve an above average return and provide our tenants and purchasers with homes or offices of which they are proud.

## 4. INVESTMENT CRITERIA AND STRATEGY

Rose and Thistle reviews potential acquisitions using an investment criteria which focuses primarily on return on equity, security of cash flow, potential for capital appreciation and the potential to increase value by more efficient management, including accessing capital for expansion and development.

We are "sticking to our knitting" by seeking opportunities similar to the properties with which we have had success in the past, namely the following three types of investments:

1. Medium-size commercial and mixed-use buildings that are well-located and well built where there is the possibility to:
a. sever off a portion of the land for redevelopment or to create multiple parcels where there is currently one;
b. subdivide the building into condominiums;
c. add onto or renovate the existing building; and/or
d. change the tenant mix and create operating efficiencies;
2. Medium-size apartment buildings that are well-located and well-built where there is the potential to:
a. sever off a portion of the land for redevelopment;
b. add onto the existing building; and/or
c. update the suites, improve the building, and thus change the tenant mix and increase rents; and
3. Medium size residential housing and development sites where the land is welllocated.

We are prudent investors who apply rigorous criteria when evaluating each potential real estate opportunity.

## 5. SERVICES

i. Real estate acquisition, disposition and financing

- Acquisition and syndication of residential, commercial, and retail real estate
- Assistance with property ownership transition that capitalizes on value created
- Research, investment analysis, due diligence, market and value assessment
- Financing and re-financing
- Access to capital through our network of contacts
ii. Construction and development
- Project management of re-developments, renovations and new developments for residential, commercial, and retail properties in urban and suburban markets
- Expertise in planning, obtaining zoning approvals, construction management, and operation start-up
- Experience working with government and regulatory agencies, business community leaders and investors to enhance project success
- Tarion-registered new home builder


## iii. Property management

- Operations and management of multi-unit small to medium commercial, residential and retail properties
- Short-term and long-term strategy to maximize return on investment
- Tenant relationship management through ongoing communications and reporting
- Tenant retention strategy and effectiveness measurement
- Administration of leases to optimize results
- Market research for competitive pricing and positioning
- Maintenance and management of the property
- Twenty four hour on-call emergency repair
- Rent collection and lease enforcement
- On-site staffing, if needed, according to owner approved budget
- Maintenance and capital improvement planning
- Regular property inspections


## iv. Leasing Services

- Obtaining tenants
- In-house leasing team with extensive industry contacts
- Advertising vacancies
- Negotiating new and renewal leases
- Marketing strategy to promote properties to prospective tenants and brokers through our network of contacts, Web sites, printed media and other channels of communication


## v. Legal and Accounting Support

- Drafting and filing legal documents
- Litigation
- The conversion of commercial rental units to commercial and/or residential condominium properties and the implementation of condominium sales programs
- Zoning, by-law and legislative compliance
- Severance and variance applications
- Representation at municipal zoning, fire, building and by-law hearings
- Insurance management and advice on appropriate coverage
- Centralized accounting and finance functions, including financial statements and audit, accounts receivable, accounts payable, payroll, cash and tax management
- Weekly, monthly or quarterly occupancy and collection reporting
- Weekly, monthly or quarterly financial report
- Annual budget preparation
- Unit turnover costs
- Capital expenditures
- Operating and labour costs
- Revenue
- Partnership distributions as directed


Norma Walton, E.A., J.D., M.B.A.
Norma is a co-founder of The Rose and Thistle Group Ltd. She has considerable experience in all aspects of residential and commercial real estate, including acquisition, development, property management and financing.

Norma has a Bachelors Degree in French, a Bachelor of Laws Degree and an executive Master of Business Administration Degree all from the University of Western Ontario. She is a member in good standing of the Law Society of Upper Canada and is a licensed mortgage broker in the Province of Ontario. She is a published author and a sought after speaker having given in excess of two hundred speeches and has appeared on both television and radio.


Ronauld G. Walton, CPIM, J.D., LL.M., M.B.A.
Ron is a co-founder of The Rose and Thistle Group Ltd. He has a Bachelor of Laws Degree from the University of Western Ontario, a Master of Intellectual Property Laws Degree from York University, a Master of Business Administration Degree from the University of Liverpool, a Diploma in Marketing Management from Centennial College and is Certified in Production and Inventory Management by the American Production and Inventory Control Society.

Ron is a member of the Institute of Corporate Directors and the Law Society of Upper Canada. Ron is a registered trade-mark agent with the Government of Canada and a licensed mortgage broker in the Province of Ontario. He has been nominated for the Premiers Award given by Province of Ontario for social and economic contributions.


## Carlos Carreiro, Director of Construction and Maintenance

Carlos has an extensive twenty-year background in real estate. He has been a real estate-agent, a land developer, and-a residential and commercial property renovator and builder. He is adept at interior design and renovation having studied architectural technology at Ryerson. He has an extensive network of industry contacts to call upon as the need arises. He is an exceptional manager of both construction sites and commercial buildings.


Chief Financial Officer --- Mario R. Bucci, B.BM., C.M.A.
Mario provides leadership and co-ordination in the administrative, accounting and budgeting efforts of The Rose and Thistle Group. He creates and evaluates the financial programs and supporting information and control systems of the company in order to preserve company assets and report accurate and timely financial results.

Mario has over 25 years experience in finance. He has a Bachelor of Business Management Degree from Ryerson University and is a member of the Certified Management Accountants of Ontario.


Vice President of Operations -- Steve Williams
Steve has more than a decade of both project management and overall management experience. He is responsible for ensuring that cost effective operations and infrastructure are in place to support all of The Rose and Thistle's active real estate projects and oversees the operational budget for each project. He contracts and coordinates outside contractors to resolve operating difficulties and ensure project deadlines are completed on time.


## John Geikins, C.M.A., Senior Accounting Manager

John manages Rose and Thistle's finance staff and oversees the maintenance and accuracy of all financial records for The Rose and Thistle Group Ltd. and related companies. He has an Accounting and Finance Diploma from Seneca College and is a Certified Management Accountant with over twenty five years experience in accounting and income tax compliance. Prior to joining the Rose and Thistle Group, John was in upper management discharging considerable financial responsibility with one of Canada's largest corporations.


## John Rawlings, Vice President of Operations

John, an engineer by training, had thirty years experience with the Ford Motor Company in a variety of management positions. He has been on contract to The Rose and Thistle Group Ltd. for ten years. John has supervised seventeen hundred individuals including architects, engineers, electricians, plumbers, contractors and maintenance and repair workers. While on contract to Ford, John's most recent responsibilities included being in charge of the construction of two twenty million dollar facilities and a one hundred and fifty million dollar plant expansion at the Ford facilities in Oakville and St. Thomas. He has a vast array of cost consultants, appraisers, construction and maintenance personnel upon whom he can call.


Property and Leasing Manager --- Samantha Slemko, B.GS
Samantha joined us in 2006 as a project manager for our subsidiary company, CCI. In that capacity she managed some of CCI's largest technology projects and was responsible for meeting client goals, deadines and budgets. She currently oversees the rental of all Rose and Thistle properties, tenant relations, lease negotiations, building repair and maintenance all with the goal of increasing asset value.

Samantha comes from a project management background in health information. She has a diploma in Heath Information Technology as well as a Bachelors Degree in General Studies from the University of North Dakota.


## Jackie McKinlay, Associate

Jackie has over a decade of real estate law experience and is the hub through which all of our residential and commercial real estate deals flow. She co-ordinates condominium registration documents, real estate financings, interacts with lawyers, clients, architects, surveyors, conveyancers and City personnel, she coordinates the preparation and receipt of R plans, site plans, surveys and landscape surveys and all of the real estate acquisitions, sales and re-financings. Jackie is a graduate of The Ontario Law Clerks Association and is a registered mortgage agent.


Tom Trklja, B.A. in Law, F.Inst.L.C.O., Associate
Tom obtained his Law Degree from the University of Belgrade in 1987 after which he practiced law in Belgrade for several years. Subsequently he graduated on the President's Honour List from the Legal Assistant Program at Seneca College of Applied Arts and Technology in 1999. Through his legal training and practical experience Tom has been in the legal field for more than twenty three years. He has played a key role in multi-million dollar mergers and acquisitions, a variety of complex contract negotiations and all aspects of corporate law. He is also skilled in real estate development law and real estate financing. He is a member of the Institute of Law Clerks of Ontario.


## Senior Accountant --- Kendra Henry-Curtis

Kendra studied accounting, information systems and computer programming and is an honours graduate of Centennial College with an Accountant/Programmer Analyst diploma. At present, she is completing the Certified General Accountant program and will soon have her CGA designation. She assists in the maintenance and preparation of financial records and statements.

## SECTION E:

## THE FINANCIAL PROJECTIONS

## ASSUMPTIONS

The financial assumptions used to generate the closing costs, renovation costs, projected rent roll and building valuation were specifically designed to be conservative in their estimates to mitigate identified potential risks. The key assumptions are as follows:

| Closing <br> Costs | Rose and Thistle has vast experience in estimating closing <br> costs. The largest component is the Ontario land transfer tax <br> and the Toronto land transfer tax, which together total <br> approximately 3\% of the purchase price. The second largest is <br> the fee of $2 \%$ of face value for arranging a mortgage to cover <br> acquisition and construction. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Demolition <br> Costs | Rose and Thistle is obtaining quotes from demolition and <br> salvage companies to find the most cost effective method of <br> demolishing the building. |
| Site <br> valuation | Condominium developers pay a minimum of $\$ 30$ per buildable <br> foot for approved density. Townhouses are worth more <br> because they cost less to build and sell for more. We are using <br> $\$ 30$ for the entire site, anticipating that we may do better when <br> it is actually sold. |

## RETURN ON INVESTMENT

Using the above assumptions, the following pre-tax returns have been calculated:

| Compounded annual return | $23 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Straight-line return | $53 \%$ |

## RISKS

Inherent with any investment there are associated risks. Rose and Thistle through their industry experience is aware of and has taken appropriate measures to mitigate the risk exposure to the investor. However, it is essential the investor be aware of some of the key risks involved in the project and more importantly, how these risks have been considered by Rose and Thistle.

| Risk | Discussion |
| :--- | :--- |
| Market condition for condominium <br> developers | - Rose and Thistle cannot control the <br> economic environment in Toronto. <br> We are encouraged by the net <br> migration of approximately 100,000 <br> people a year to the area, which <br> historically has kept real estate <br> vibrant over the past two decades. <br> Nonetheless, there is a continual <br> supply of residential condominium <br> product coming to market and prices <br> for buildable density may vary <br> significantly year over year <br> depending on interest rates and <br> demand. Rose and Thistle is thus <br> using the minimum price of $\$ 30$ per <br> buildable foot given this reality. |
| Interest Rate Increases | - Rose and Thistle will lock in the <br> rates for the mortgage and <br> construction loan for the 24 month <br> term |
| General Investment Risk | - All investments with the exception <br> of sovereign bonds of major <br> industrial nations (eg. US treasury <br> bills, Canada savings bonds) carry <br> with them inherent risk. There are no <br> guarantees in life. The best one can <br> do, as Rose and Thistle believes it <br> has, isto acquire desirabteassets, at a <br> reasonable price at a favourable <br> time. Investors in this real estate <br> transaction must be aware that it is <br> riskier than acquiring savings bonds. <br> Investors must be comfortable that <br> the return is not guaranteed, unlike <br> the return of such a bond. |

## SECTION F: TABLES -- TABLE 1: CAPITAL COSTS AND STRUCTURE



TABLE 2: PROJECTED SITE VALUATION


## TABLE 3: PROJECTED PROFIT AND INVESTOR RETURN



## TABLE 4: SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS



## AGREEMENT

Between:
A new company to be incorporated
"Bernstein"

- and -

Ron and Norma Walton
"Walton"

- and -

Riverdale Mansion Ltd.
the "Company"

WHEREAS Bernstein and Walton intend to purchase 450 Pape Avenue, Toronto, Ontario (the "Property") on or about July 4, 2011 and put ownership of the Property in the Company's name;

AND WHEREAS Bernstein and Walton, or whomever Bernstein and Walton may direct in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 5 herein, will each hold 470,473 shares in the Company;

AND WHEREAS Bernstein and Walton will each provide the sum of $\$ 470,473$ to the Company for the purposes of purchasing the property, renovating the mansion, constructing the townhouses, and obtaining city approvals to sever and sell off the mansion and the townhouses to separate purchasers (the "Project");

AND WHEREAS Walton will manage and supervise the Project and ensure it is completed according to the excel spreadsheet attached as Exhibit "A" to this Agreement;

THEREFORE the parties agree as follows:

1. Walton has contracted to purchase the Property and the purchase is scheduled to close-on July-4, 2011.
2. Walton has commenced discussions with the city and the councilor to obtain their approval for the plan for the property; with trades to complete construction of the townhouses; with trades to complete the renovations on the mansion; and with planning and other consultants to arrange to sever off and sell the different components to separate purchasers.
3. Walton intends to renovate and sell the mansion and convert the newer section of the building into six separate townhouses, each with condominium title, to be sold to six separate purchasers between now and June 30, 2013 in accordance with Exhibit "A".
4. Bernstein wishes to own $50 \%$ of the shares in the Company in exchange for providing $50 \%$ of the equity required to complete the Project. The Company will issue sufficient shares such that Bernstein has 470,473 and Walton has 470,473 voting shares of the same class.
5. The ownership of the Company will be as follows:
a. $50 \%$ to Bernstein; and
b. $50 \%$ to Ron and Norma Walton as they may direct between each other or alternatively to be held by a completely Walton-owned and controlled company, provided that all covenants and agreements of Walton herein shall continue in full force and effect and such company executes an agreement to be bound by the provisions of the within Agreement.
6. Walton will be managing, supervising and completing the Project in accordance with the attached Exhibit "A".
7. Walton has provided the $\$ 75,000$ deposit to purchase the Property, which amount will form part of Walton's equity contributions.
8. The balance of equity in the amount of $\$ 865,946$ will be paid as follows:
a. Bernstein will provide to the Company the sum of $\$ 470,473$ on or before July 4, 2011; and
b. Walton will provide the sum of $\$ 395,473$ to the Company in a timely manner as required as the Project is completed.
9. Walton and Bernstein will each provide $50 \%$ of whatever additional capital over and above the $\$ 470,473$ each that is required to complete the Project, if any, in a timely manner.
10. In addition to managing, supervising and completing the Project, Walton will be responsible for supervising the renovations of the building on the Property, hiring of all consultants, designers, architects and engineers to complete the Project, finance, bookkeeping, offiee administration, aceounting, information technology provision, filing tax returns for the Company, and fulfilling all active roles required to complete the Project in accordance with Exhibit "A".
11. Bernstein will not be required to play an active role in completing the Project. Notwithstanding that, any decisions concerning the selling or the refinancing of the Property will require his approval; any decisions requiring an increase in the total amount of equity required to complete the Project will require his approval;
and any significant decisions that vary from the Project plan described in Exhibit "A" will require his approval.
12. Walton will provide to Bernstein ongoing reports at minimum monthly detailing all items related to the Property including the progress in moving the plan forward.
13. Walton will provide a written report to Bernstein each month detailing the following:
a. copies of invoices for work completed;
b. the bank statement for that month; and
c. if the bank statement does not have a copy of cancelled cheques, then Walton will also provide a complete listing of all cheques written, including payees, dates and amounts.
At Bernstein's request, Walton will provide whatever other back-up information he requests. Any cheque or transfer over $\$ 50,000$ will require Bernstein's signature or written approval before being processed.
14. Once the Project is substantially completed to the point that all of the Property has been sold, both parties will be paid out their capital plus profitṣ and Walton will retain the Company for potential future use.
15. The Board of Directors of the Company will be composed of two directors, being Bernstein and Norma Walton. The only shares to be issued in the Company will be as set out above, and neither party may transfer his or her shares to another party without the consent of all the other parties, which consent may be unreasonably withheld. Bernstein shall have the option of being paid out his share of capital and profits from the Project and once he has been paid out in full, he will surrender his share certificate, he will concurrently resign from the Board of Directors and Norma Walton and the Company will accept such resignation. At such time Bernstein shall be released of all obligations and liability related to the Company and shall be indemnified by Walton with respect to all liabilities, claims and obligations whatsoever of the Company up to the date at which Bernstein has been paid out his capital and profits from the Project.
16. The Company will only be used to purchase, renovate and construct, and sell the property at 450 Pape Avenue, Toronto, Ontario or such other matters solely relating to the Project-and the Property.
17. If the parties disagree on how to manage, supervise and complete the Project in accordance with Exhibit "A" and cannot reach agreement amongst themselves, each of them undertakes to attend a minimum of four hours of mediation in pursuit of reaching an agreement. After mediation, if there are any remaining issues to be determined, those issues in dispute shall be determined by a single arbitrator in as cost-effective a manner as possible, with no right of appeal. All
costs of such mediation and/or arbitration will be borne equally by Bernstein and Walton.
18. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in the within Agreement, in consideration of the sum of $\$ 10.00$ and other good and valuable consideration paid to Walton and the Company (the receipt and sufficiency of which is hereby acknowledged), Walton and the Company hereby acknowledge, agree and confirm that Bernstein shall not be liable, responsible for or obligated with respect to any amounts or extent whatsoever with respect to the compliance, performance or observance of any terms or provisions with respect to any Charges / Mortgage of Land (and any agreements or documentation given as additional security therefor) registered against title to the Property or any part thereof in favour of 368230 Ontario Limited including, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the payment of any principal, interest, costs or any other monies thereunder and Walton and the Company hereby further agree and covenant to indemnify and save Bernstein harmless with respect to any losses, damages or costs suffered or incurred by Bernstein with respect to such Charge / Mortgage of Land.
19. The above represents all deal terms between the parties.

Dated at Toronto, Ontario this 27 day of JUNE 2011


Bernstein company to be incorporated Per A.S.O.


Ron Walton


Norma Walton

## AGREEMENT

Between:
DBDC Global Mills Ltd.

# "Bernstein" <br> - and - <br> Ron and Norma Walton <br> "Walton" <br> - and - 

Global Mills Inc.
the "Company"

WHEREAS Bernstein and Walton intend to purchase 1450 Don Mills Road, Toronto, Ontario (the "Property") on or about October 12, 2012 and put ownership of the Property in the Company's name;

AND WHEREAS Bernstein and Walton, or whomever Bernstein and Walton may direct in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 5 herein, will each hold $6,510,313$ shares in the Company;

AND WHEREAS Bernstein and Walton will each provide the sum of $\$ 6,510,313$ to the Company for the purposes of purchasing, renovating and build out space for tenants (the "Project");

AND WHEREAS Walton will manage and supervise the Project and ensure it is completed according to the excel spreadsheet attached as Exhibit "A" to this Agreement;

THEREFORE the parties agree as follows:

1. Walton has contracted to purchase the Property and the purchase is scheduled to close on October 12, 2012.
2. Walton has commenced discussions with the city to obtain their approval for the plan for the property; with trades to complete the renovations.
3. Walton intends to renovate and improve the building in accordance with Exhibit "A".
4. Bernstein wishes to own $50 \%$ of the shares in the Company in exchange for providing $50 \%$ of the equity required to complete the Project. The Company will issue sufficient shares such that Bernstein has $6,510,313$ and Walton has $6,510,313$ voting shares of the same class.
5. The ownership of the Company will be as follows:
a. $50 \%$ to Bernstein; and
b. $50 \%$ to Ron and Norma Walton as they may direct between each other or alternatively to be held by a completely Walton-owned and controlled company, provided that all covenants and agreements of Walton herein shall continue in full force and effect and such company executes an agreement to be bound by the provisions of the within Agreement.
6. Walton will be managing, supervising and completing the Project in accordance with the attached Exhibit "A".
7. Each party has provided the sum of $\$ 982,500$ towards deposits and due diligence expenses, which amounts will form part of each party's equity contributions.
8. The balance of equity in the amount of $\$ 11,055,626$ will be paid as follows:
a. Bernstein will provide to the Company the sum of $\$ 5,527,813$ on or before October 12, 2012; and
b. Walton will provide the sum of $\$ 5,527,813$ to the Company in a timely manner as required as the Project is completed.
9. Walton and Bernstein will each provide $50 \%$ of whatever additional capital over and above the $\$ 6,510,313$ each that is required to complete the Project, if any, in a timely manner.
10. In addition to managing, supervising and completing the Project, Walton will be responsible for supervising the tenancy of the building, hiring of all consultants, designers, architects and engineers to complete the Project, finance, bookkeeping, office administration, accounting, information technology provision, filing tax returns for the Company, and fulfilling all active roles required to complete the Project in accordance with Exhibit "A".
11. Bernstein will not be required to play an active role in completing the Project. Notwithstanding that, any decisions-concerning the selling or the refinancing of the Property will require his approval; any decisions requiring an increase in the total amount of equity required to complete the Project will require his approval; and any significant decisions that vary from the Project plan described in Exhibit "A" will require his approval.
12. Walton will provide to Bernstein ongoing reports at minimum monthly detailing all items related to the Property including the progress in moving the plan forward.

13. Walton will provide a written report to Bernstein each month detailing the following:
a. copies of invoices for work completed;
b. the bank statement for that month; and
c. if the bank statement does not have a copy of cancelled cheques, then Walton will also provide a complete listing of all cheques written, including payees, dates and amounts.
At Bernstein's request, Walton will provide whatever other back-up information he requests. Any cheque or transfer over $\$ 50,000$ will require Bernstein's signature or written approval before being processed.
14. Once the Project is substantially completed to the point that all of the Property has been sold, both parties will be paid out their capital plus profits and Walton will retain the Company for potential future use.
15. The Board of Directors of the Company will be composed of two directors, being Bernstein and Norma Walton. The only shares to be issued in the Company will be as set out above, and neither party may transfer his or her shares to another party without the consent of all the other parties, which consent may be unreasonably withheld. Bernstein shall have the option of being paid out his share of capital and profits from the Project and once he has been paid out in full, he will surrender his share certificate, he will concurrently resign from the Board of Directors and Norma Walton and the Company will accept such resignation. At such time Bernstein shall be released of all obligations and liability related to the Company and shall be indemnified by Walton with respect to all liabilities, claims and obligations whatsoever of the Company up to the date at which Bernstein has been paid out his capital and profits from the Project.
16. The Company will only be used to purchase, renovate and sell the property at 1450 Don Mills Road, Toronto, Ontario or such other matters solely relating to the Project and the Property.
17. If the parties disagree on how to manage, supervise and complete the Project in accordance with Exhibit "A" and cannot reach agreement amongst themselves, each of them undertakes to attend a minimum of four hours of mediation in pursuit of reaching an agreement. After mediation, if there are any remaining issues to be determined, those issues in dispute shall be determined by a single arbitrator in as eost-effective a manner as possible, with no right of appeal. All costs of such mediation and/or arbitration will be borne equally by Bernstein and Walton.

18. The above represents all deal terms between the parties.

Dated at Toronto, Ontario this 4 day of SEPTEMBER 2012


DBDC Global Mills Ltd.
Per A.S.O.


Ron Walton


|  | Anticipated Profit |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Building Value: |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\mathbf{3 5 , 5 3 8 , 4 6 2}$ |  |
| Plus payment from Liberty Group for right of way to access Don Mills Road | $\$$ | $\mathbf{2 , 0 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ |  |
|  |  | $\$$ | $31,020,625$ |
| Less Project Cost: |  | $\$$ |  |
|  |  | $\$, 517,837$ |  |
| Projected Profit: |  | $\$$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |



## 1450 Don Mills Road CAPITAL REQUIRED

| Purchase Costs |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Purchase Price | 24,000,000 |  |  |  |  |
| Mortgage fee | 270,000 |  |  |  |  |
| Lender's legal fee | 30,000 |  |  |  |  |
| Ontario Land Transfer Tax | 420,000 |  |  |  |  |
| Municipal Land Transfer Tax | 420,000 |  |  |  |  |
| Other fees and disbursements for appraisal, reliance letters for environmental reports, municipal enquiries and fees, etc. | 50,000 |  |  |  |  |
| Total Purchase Price |  |  |  | \$ | 25,190,000 |
| New tenant improvement costs |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assume $\$ 25$ PSF x 165,000 SF | \$ | 4,125,000 |  |  |  |
| Project management fee | \$ | 412,500 |  |  |  |
| Total Tenant Improvement Costs: |  |  |  | \$ | 4,537,500 |
| Tenant Rent, months 1 to 18 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net Rent | \$ | $(3,316,875)$ |  |  |  |
| Mortgage carrying costs | \$ | 2,380,000 |  |  |  |
| Carrying Costs, months 19 to 30 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Property tax | \$ | 310,000 |  |  |  |
| Interest on mortgage | \$ | 1,530,000 |  |  |  |
| Utilities and maintenance | \$ | 330,000 |  |  |  |
| Insurance | \$ | 60,000 |  |  |  |
| Total Net Carrying Costs: |  |  |  | \$ | 1,293,125 |
| Total Capital Required |  |  |  | \$ | 31,020,625 |
| Mortgage, Trez Capital: | 58.03\% |  | 8.50\% | \$ | 18,000,000 |
| Dr. Bernstein: | 20.99\% |  |  | \$ | 6,510,313 |
| Ron and Norma Walton: | 20.99\% |  |  | \$ | 6,510,313 |



$\qquad$

## AGREEMENT

Between:
DBDC Donalda Developments Ltd.
"Bernstein"

- and -

Ron and Norma Walton
"Walton"

- and -

Donalda Developments Ltd.
the "Company"

WHEREAS Bernstein and Walton intend to purchase 1500 Don Mills Road, Toronto, Ontario (the "Property") on or about October 9, 2012 and put ownership of the Property in the Company's name;

AND WHEREAS Bernstein and Walton, or whomever Bernstein and Walton may direct in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 5 herein, will each hold 11,211,954 shares in the Company;

AND WHEREAS Bernstein and Walton will each provide the sum of $\$ 11,211,954$ to the Company for the purposes of purchasing, renovating and build out space for tenants (the "Project");

AND WHEREAS Walton will manage and supervise the Project and ensure it is completed according to the excel spreadsheet attached as Exhibit "A" to this Agreement;

THEREFORE the parties agree as follows:

1. Walton has contracted to purchase the Property and the purchase is scheduled to close on October 9, 2012.
2. Walton has met with neighbours and consultants with the objective of rezoning the property from Employment Zone to Mixed Use to facilitate increased density on the site over time.
3. Walton intends to renovate and improve the building and the site in accordance with Exhibit "A".

4. Bernstein wishes to own $50 \%$ of the shares in the Company in exchange for providing $50 \%$ of the equity required to complete the Project. The Company will issue sufficient shares such that Bernstein has $11,211,954$ and Walton has $11,211,954$ voting shares of the same class.
5. The ownership of the Company will be as follows:
a. $50 \%$ to Bernstein; and
b. $50 \%$ to Ron and Norma Walton as they may direct between each other or alternatively to be held by a completely Walton-owned and controlled company, provided that all covenants and agreements of Walton herein shall continue in full force and effect and such company executes an agreement to be bound by the provisions of the within Agreement.
6. Walton will be managing, supervising and completing the Project in accordance with the attached Exhibit "A".
7. Each party has provided the sum of $\$ 1,926,000$ towards the deposits and due diligence expenses required, which amounts will form part of each of their equity contributions.
8. The balance of equity in the amount of $\$ 18,571,908$ will be paid as follows:
a. Bernstein will provide to the Company the sum of $\$ 9,285,954$ on or before October 9, 2012; and
b. Walton will provide the sum of $\$ 9,285,954$ to the Company in a timely manner as required as the Project is completed.
9. Walton and Bernstein will each provide $50 \%$ of whatever additional capital over and above the $\$ 11,211,954$ each that is required to complete the Project, if any, in a timely manner.
10. In addition to managing, supervising and completing the Project, Walton will be responsible for supervising the tenancy of the building, hiring of all consultants, designers, architects and engineers to complete the Project, finance, bookkeeping, office administration, accounting, information technology provision, filing tax returns for the Company, and fulfilling all active roles required to complete the Project in accordance with Exhibit "A".
11. Bernstein will not be required to play an active role in completing the Project. Notwithstanding that, any decisions concerning the selling or the refinancing of the Property will require his approval; any decisions requiring an increase in the total amount of equity required to complete the Project will require his approval; and any significant decisions that vary from the Project plan described in Exhibit "A" will require his approval.

12. Walton will provide to Bernstein ongoing reports at minimum monthly detailing all items related to the Property including the progress in moving the plan forward.
13. Walton will provide a written report to Bernstein each month detailing the following:
a. copies of invoices for work completed;
b. the bank statement for that month; and
c. if the bank statement does not have a copy of cancelled cheques, then Walton will also provide a complete listing of all cheques written, including payees, dates and amounts.
At Bernstein's request, Walton will provide whatever other back-up information he requests. Any cheque or transfer over $\$ 50,000$ will require Bernstein's signature or written approval before being processed.
14. Once the Project is substantially completed to the point that all of the Property has been sold, both parties will be paid out their capital plus profits and Walton will retain the Company for potential future use.
15. The Board of Directors of the Company will be composed of two directors, being Bernstein and Norma Walton. The only shares to be issued in the Company will be as set out above, and neither party may transfer his or her shares to another party without the consent of all the other parties, which consent may be unreasonably withheld. Bernstein shall have the option of being paid out his share of capital and profits from the Project and once he has been paid out in full, he will surrender his share certificate, he will concurrently resign from the Board of Directors and Norma Walton and the Company will accept such resignation. At such time Bernstein shall be released of all obligations and liability related to the Company and shall be indemnified by Walton with respect to all liabilities, claims and obligations whatsoever of the Company up to the date at which Bernstein has been paid out his capital and profits from the Project.
16. The Company will only be used to purchase, renovate and sell the property at 1500 Don Mills Road, Toronto, Ontario or such other matters solely relating to the Project and the Property.
17. If the parties disagree on how to manage, supervise and complete the Project in accordance with Exhibit " A " and cannot reach agreement amongst themselves, each of them undertakes to attend a minimum of four hours of mediation in pursuit of reaching an agreement. After mediation, if there are any remaining issues to be determined, those issues in dispute shall be determined by a single arbitrator in as cost-effective a manner as possible, with no right of appeal. All costs of such mediation and/or arbitration will be borne equally by Bernstein and Walton.

18. The above represents all deal terms between the parties.

Dated at Toronto, Ontario this 4 day of SEPTEMBER 2012


| 1500 Don Mills Road CAPITAL REQUIRED |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Purchase Costs |  |  |  |  |  |
| Purchase Price |  | 43,000,000 |  |  |  |
| Mortgage fee |  | 602,000 |  |  |  |
| Lender's legal fee |  | 40,000 |  |  |  |
| Ontario Land Transfer Tax |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Municipal Land Transfer Tax |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Other fees and disbursements |  | 60,000 |  |  |  |
| for appraisal, reliance letters for environmental reports, municipal enquiries and fees, etc. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Purchase Price |  |  |  | \$ | 43,702,000 |
| Capital improvements to building years 1 to 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assume \$20 PSF $\times 235,000 \mathrm{SF}$ | \$ | 4,700,000 |  |  |  |
| Parking garage construction | \$ | 6,000,000 |  |  |  |
| Project management fee | \$ | 1,070,000 |  |  |  |
| Total Capital Improvement Costs: |  |  |  | \$ | 11,770,000 |
| Development Approval Costs |  |  |  |  |  |
| Change zoning from employment lands to mixed use |  |  |  |  |  |
| Planning reports, consultant's fees, lobbying costs |  |  |  |  |  |
| Severance and sale of part of land to developer | \$ | 1,500,000 |  |  |  |
| Total Development Approval Costs |  |  |  | \$ | 1,500,000 |
| Tenant Rent Receipts |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net Rent | \$ | (2,761,328) |  |  |  |
| First mortgage carrying costs | \$ | 2,204,736 |  |  |  |
| Second mortgage carrying costs | \$ | 408,500 |  |  |  |
| Total Net Carrying Costs: |  |  |  | \$ | $(148,092)$ |
| Total Capital Required |  |  |  | \$ | 56,823,908 |
| Mortgage, OTERA |  | 52.97\% | 5.50\% | \$ | 30,100,000 |
| Mortgage, ELAD |  | 7.57\% | 9.50\% | \$ | 4,300,000 |
| Dr. Bernstein: |  | 19.73\% |  | \$ | 11,211,954 |
| Ron and Norma Walton: |  | 19.73\% |  | \$ | 11,211,954 |




## AGREEMENT

- and .

Ron and Norma Walton
"Walton"

- and -

Richmond Row Holdings Ltd.
the "Company"
WHEREAS Bernstein and Walton intend to purchase 620-624 Richmond Street West 165 Bathurst Street, Toronto, Ontario (the "Property") on or about June 27, 2013 and put ownership of the Property in the Company's name;

AND WHEREAS Bernstein and Walton, or whoever Bernstein and Walton may direct will each hold 100 shares in the Company;

AND WHEREAS Bernstein and Walton will each provide the sum of $\$ 5,820,388$ to the Company for the purposes of purchasing, renovating, leasing and then refinancing the property (the "Project");

AND WHEREAS Walton will manage and supervise the Project and ensure it is completed according to the excel spreadsheet attached as Fxhibit "A" to this Agreement;

THEREFORE the parties agree as follows:

1. Walton has contracted to purchase the Property and the purchase is scheduled to close on June 27, 2013.
2. Walton has commenced pre-planning for the securing of new retail tenants; the securing of commercial tenants; the renovation of the common areas and creation of a model suite to attract those commercial tenants; vacating of the live-work tenants; renovation of the property to design-buitd for-the new-eommereiat and retail tenants; followed by refinancing of the property once the new tenants are in occupancy.
3. Walton intends to purchase, renovate, lease and refinance the Property in accordance with Exhibit "A".


4. Walton anticipates that each party will need to provide the sum of $\$ 5,820,388$ in shareholders loans to the Company to complete the project. Shareholders loans will attract interest of $10 \%$ compounded monthly. Shareholders loans will be paid back at the time of project refinancing, sale or completion, before any profits are distributed.
5. Bernstein wishes to own $50 \%$ of the shares in the Company in exchange for providing $50 \%$ of the equity and his portion of the shareholder's loan required to complete the Project. The Company will issue sufficient shares such that Bernstein has 100 and Walton has 100 voting shares of the same class, and Bernstein and Walton will each pay $\$ 100$ for those 100 shares.
6. The ownership of the Company will be as follows:
a. $50 \%$ to Bernstein; and
b. $50 \%$ to Ron and Norma Walton as they may direct between each other or alternatively to be held by a completely Walton-owned and controlled company, provided that all covenants and agreements of Walton herein shall continue in full force and effect and such company exccutes an agreement to be bound by the provisions of the within Agreement.
7. Walton will be managing, supervising and completing the Project in accordance with the attached Exhibit "A".
8. Bernstein has provided the sum of $\$ 650,000$ cover the deposit costs, mortgage fees, and due diligence expenses to purchase the Property. This amount is a shareholders loan. Bernstein will provide on June 27, 2013 the sum of $\$ 3,200,000$ as a further shareholders loan, whieh loan will also attract interest of $10 \%$ calculated semi annually MONTAVY. (8y) was.
9. Bernstein will provide the remaining sum of $\$ 1,970,388$ as a shareholders loan once a commercial tenant has been secured or once the building renovations begin.
10. Walton will provide the sum of $\$ 5,820,388$ in shareholders loans thereafter as the project requires.
11. Walton and Bernstein will each provide $50 \%$ of whatever additional shareholder loans over and above the $\$ 5,820,388$ each that is required to complete the Project, if any, in a timely manner.
12. In addition to managing, supervising and completing-the Project, Watton will-be responsible for supervising the renovations of the building on the Property, hiring of all consultants, designers, architects and engineers to complete the Project, finance, bookkeeping, office administration, accounting, information technology provision, filing tax returns for the Company, and fulfilling all active roles required to complete the Project in accordance with Exhibit "A".

13. Bernstein will not be required to play an active role in completing the Project. Notwithstanding that, any decisions concerning the selling or the refinancing of the Property will require his approval: any decisions requiring an increase in the total amount of equity required to complete the Project will require his approval; and any significant decisions that vary from the Project plan described in Exhibit "A" will require his approval.
14. Walton will provide to Bernstein ongoing reports at minimum monthly detailing all items related to the Property including the progress in moving the plan forward.
15. Walton will provide a written report to Bernstein each month detailing the following:
a. copies of invoices for work completed;
b. the bank statement for that month; and
c. if the bank statement does not have a copy of cancelled cheques, then Walton will also provide a complete listing of all cheques written, including payees; dates and amounts.
At Bernstein ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{s}$ request, Walton will provide whatever other back up information he requests. Any cheque or transfer over $\$ 50,000$ will require Bernstein's signature or written approval before being processed.
16. Once the Project is substantially completed to the point that all of the Property has been leased and refinanced andior sold, both parties will be paid out their shareholders loan capital plus interest then profits will be distributed in accordance with ownership. Once the property is sold, Walton will retain the Company for potential future use.
17. The Board of Directors of the Company will be composed of two directors, being Bernstein and Norma Walton, provided that initially the two directors will be Norma and Ron Walton until the financing is in place and the purchase has closed. The only shares to be issued in the Company will be as set out above, and neither party may transfer his or her shares to another party without the consent of all the other parties, which consent may be unreasonably withheld. Bernstein shall have the option of being paid out his share of capital and profits from the Project and once he has been paid out in full, he will surrender his share certificate, he will concurrently resign from the Board of Directors and Norma Walton and the Company will accept such resignation. At such time Bernstein shall be released of all obligations and liability related to the Company and shall be indemnified by Watton with respect-to-atl-labilities, claims-and obtigations whatsoever of the Company up to the date at which Bernstein has been paid out his capital and profits from the Project.


18. The Company will only be used to purchase, renovate, lease and refinance the property at 620-624 Richmond Street West / 165 Bathurst Street, Toronto, Ontario or such other matters solely relating to the Project and the Property.
19. If the parties disagree on how to manage, supervise and complete the Project in accordance with Exhibit " A " and cannot reach agreement amongst themselves, each of them undertakes to attend a minimum of four hours of mediation in pursuit of reaching an agreement. After mediation, if there are any remaining issues to be determined, those issues in dispute shall be determined by a single arbitrator in as cost-effective a manner as possible, with no right of appeal. All costs of such mediation andior arbitration will be borne equally by Bernstein and Walton.
20. The above represents all deal terms between the parkies.

Dated at Toronto, Ontario this 27 day of JUNE 2013


DBDC Richmond Row Holdings Ltd. Per A.S.O.


Ron Walton



Richmond Row foldings La. Per A.S.O.


## 620 Richmond Street West / 165 Bathurst Street

 CAPITAL REQUIRED| Purchase Costs |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Purchase Price | 14,500,000 |  |  |  |  |
| Mortgage fee | 30,000 |  |  |  |  |
| Broker's fee | 120,000 |  |  |  |  |
| Lender's legal fee | 25,000 |  |  |  |  |
| Ontario Land Transfer Tax | 253,750 |  |  |  |  |
| Municipal Land Transfer Tax | 253,750 |  |  |  |  |
| Other fees and disbursements | 25,000 |  |  |  |  |
| for appraisal, reliance letters for environmental reports, municipal enquiries and fees, etc. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Purchase Price |  |  |  | \$ | 15,207,500 |
| Renovation Costs |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60,000 SF @ \$100 PSF to design build | \$ | 6,000,000 |  |  |  |
| Project management fee | \$ | 600,000 |  |  |  |
| Total Renovation Costs: |  |  |  | \$ | 6,600,000 |
| Professional Fees |  |  |  |  |  |
| Architectural plans | \$ | 80,000 |  |  |  |
| Engineering fees | \$ | 35,000 |  |  |  |
| Interior design fees | \$ | 15,000 |  |  |  |
| Surveyor's fees | \$ | 15,000 |  |  |  |
| Permit fees | \$ | 20,000 |  |  |  |
| Total Professional Fees: |  |  |  | \$ | 165,000 |
| Carrying Costs |  |  |  |  |  |
| Annual rent for two years | \$ | (1,350,000) |  |  |  |
| Interest on first mortgage for three years | \$ | 752,076 |  |  |  |
| Interest on second mortgage for three years | \$ | 466,200 |  |  |  |
| Utilities and maintenance for three years | \$ | 630,000 |  |  |  |
| Insurance for three years | \$ | 45,000 |  |  |  |
| Total Carrying Costs: $\mathbf{L}^{\text {543,276 }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Capital Required |  |  |  | \$ | 22,515,776 |
| First Mortgage - First National: |  | 19.54\% | 2.97\% | \$ | 4,400,000 |
| Second Mortgage - VTB |  | 28.76\% | 4.00\% | \$ | 6,475,000 |
| Dr. Bernstein: |  | 25.85\% |  | \$ | 5,820,388 |
| Ron and Norma Walton: |  | 25.85\% |  | \$ | 5,820,388 |



Tab B

This is Exhibit "B" referred to in the Affidavit of James Reitan sworn before me this $1^{\text {st }}$ day of October, 2013


A Commissioner for Taking Affidavits

| Lorna Groves |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| From: | Jim Reitan [Jim@drbdiet.com](mailto:Jim@drbdiet.com) |
| Sent: | Friday, June 07,2013 12:04 PM |
| To: | Norma Walton |
| Cc: | Mario Bucci; Dr. Stanley Bernstein |
| Subject: | RE: Meeting |
| Attachments: | Bernstein-Walton Review Letter 2011 130607.pdf |

It was my intention to deliver this information in person so that we could walk through our concerns and recommendations in an interactive format. Being we are unable to organize a meeting until next Friday, we thought it best to make you aware of our concerns in writing.

Please review the letter and join us in setting resolution of the issues raised herein the highest priority so that we insure a suitable approach for all going forward. I am confident that sorting this out now by leveraging our strengths will reap long term benefits for both parties.

We look forward to hearing from you.
Best regards,
Jim

Jim Reitan
Director of Accounting \& Finance
Dr. Bernstein Diet \& Health Clinics
21 Kem Rd., Toronto, ON, M3B 1S9
ph: 416-447-3438 ext. 228
fax: 416-447-0750
email: jim@drbdiet.com
"Be like a knight and do it right!"

## Mike the Knight

The information contained in this e-mail and any attachments is intended only for the personal and confidential use of the designated recipients named herein. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or an agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have teceived this documentation and its attachments in error, and that any review, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender and return and delete the original message immediately.

From: Jim Reitan
Sent: Thursday, June 06, 2013 2:38 PM
To: 'Norma Walton'
Cc: Mario Bucci; Dr. Stanley Bernstein
Subject: RE: Meeting
Hi Norma,
Hope all is well. I can understand the challenges your new "employee" brings. We understood you would be in the office tomorrow catching up.

Unfortunately, it is important for us to get together without delay so that we can discuss our concerns and bring forward resolutions which will enable us all to continue in a positive manner. I can tell you, in such cases sooner is always better than later.

We would like you to find a way to accommodate our meeting tomorrow. We surely can come to your offices. Please call my cell phone at 416-845-8603.

Best regards,
lim

Jim Reitan
Director of Accounting $\&$ Finance
Dr. Bemstein Diet \& Health Clinics
21 Kern Rd., Toronto, ON, M3B 159
ph: 416-447-3438 ext. 228
fax: 416-447-0750
email: jim@drbdiet.com
"Be like a knight and do it right!"
Whe the Knight

The information contained in this e-mall and any attachments is intended only for the personal and confidential use of the designated recipients named herein. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or an agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this documentation and its attachments in error, and that any review, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender and return and delete the original message immediately.

From: Norma Walton [mailto:nwalton@roseandthistle.ca]
Sent: Thursday, June 06, 2013 1:33 PM
To: Dr. Stanley Bernstein; Jim Reitan
Cc: Mario Bucci; Katie Brooks
Subject: Meeting
Dear Stan and Jim,
I cannot meet tomorrow unfortunately as I don't have child care in the office tomorrow. I am available between 10:30 am and $1: 30 \mathrm{pm}$ next Friday if that suits? Let me know.

Thanks,
Norma

June 7, 2013

Norma Walton
The Rose and Thistle Group LTD.
30 Hazelton Avenue
Toronto, ON
M5R 2E2

RE: Bernstein/Walton Projects

Norma:

Dr. Bernstein (Bernstein) requested I undertake a review of the activities of equity investments (the "Projects") that are owned jointly with Norman and Ron Walton ("Walton"). The Projects are owned and operated by numerous corporations that are each jointly owned by Bernstein and Walton. My review was limited to the Projects up to December 31, 2011, the latest date for which financial records for the Projects have been made available to me by Walton. This is a compilation of findings, conclusions, and recommendations resulting from that review.

Bernstein has relied on Walton's knowledge and representations of the Projects when considering investment terms. There is a general understanding that the Bernstein investments are secured by sound assets that will in time be sold at a profit. This review focused on the various agreements (the "Agreements") and historical information for 2011 financial statement purposes. There has been no attempt to confirm market values or anticipated revenues, nor did I undertake an audit of the Projects, both of which would have been outside the scope of my review. Nevertheless, I believe my review indicates significant cause for concern and action on Bernstein's part to protect his investments, which at the time of this letter, total approximately $\$ 110$ million on a cash basis.

## Summary

The following is a summary of conclusions:

1) Walton is not making her own equity investments in the Projects in equal proportion to Bernstein despite an understanding that she was to do so.
2) Walton is taking on third party investors, which is expressly prohibited in the Agreements.
3) Walton has significant related party transactions with the Projects, the magnitude of which Bernstein had not been made aware of.
4) Project expenditures have not been presented for approval by Bernstein, as required in the Agreements.
5) Lack of reporting has limited the ability to assess historical information in an effort to improve our understanding of same and affect Project outcomes.
6) Project properties were sold without the required pay down of associated mortgages.

There is interrelated support for this in the following areas:

1) Equity
2) Mortgages
3) Fees
4) Business Plan
5) Reporting \& Control

It is my recommendation that:

1) Walton responds to the satisfaction of Bernstein to concerns herein.
2) Equity and mortgage deficiencies are rectified.
3) Responsibility for Financial and Corporation Administration for the projects is moved to Bernstein.
4) Projects are jointly managed by Walton and Bernstein, with Bernstein approval required at any and all steps and for all expenditures.

The next several pages are GENERAL INDICATIONS, DETAILED FINDINGS, and CONCLUSIONS for each area. The last page herein contains detailed RECOMMENDATIONS.

Resolution of the issues and implementation of the recommendations is my highest priority. Please contact me immediately so that we can move forward in an expeditious manner.

Very truly,


James O. Reitan
Director of Accounting and Finance

## 1) Equity

a. General Indications:
i. At December 31, 2011, the equity investment split was $79 \%$ Bernstein and $21 \%$ Walton.

| Equity | rempany | Bernstein | Walton | Grand Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1185 Eglinton | Bannockburn Lands inc. | 2,225,000 | 73.717 | 2,298,717 |
| 18 Wynford | Wynford Professional Centre Lid. | 1,034,830 | 0 | 1,034,830 |
| 241 Spadina | Twin Dragons Corporation | 1.120,500 | 350,000 | 1,470.500 |
| 32 Atantic | Liberty Village Lands inc. | 396,736 | 0 | 396,736 |
|  | Liberty Village Properties Ltd. | 1,851,434 | 839.266 | 2.690,700 |
| 450 Pape | Riverdale Mansion Ltd. | 470.473 | 250,021 | 720.494 |
| 577015780 Hwy 7 West | Royal Agincourt Corp | 2,257.500 | 987.800 | 3245300 |
| Grand Total |  | 9.356 .473 | 2.500 .803 | 11.857.276 |

b. Detailed Findings - It should be noted that the findings are as based on the Projects' records. If deposit for purchase of property or equity contributions have in some way been made outside Project records, and is not reflected in the Project general ledger, it will not be taken into account in these comments. I am unaware of any such deposits or contributions.
i. 18 Wynford; Wynford Professional Centre Ltd. ("Wynford")

- The agreement calls for equity contributions from the partners as follows:

7. Walton and Bernstein have each provided $1 / 2$ of the $\$ 450,000$ deposit to purchase the Property.
8. The balance of equity in the amount of $\$ 4,659,180$ each will be paid as follows:
a. Bernstein will provide to the Company the sum of $\$ 1,700,000$ on or before February 3, 2011;
b. Walton will provide the sum of $\$ 1,700,000$ to the Company in a timely manner as required as the Project is completed; and
 timely manner as required.

- Equity contributions to February 4, 2011 were as follows:

|  |  | Bernstein | Walton |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Deposit | 1110110 | \$225.000 |  |
| Bernstein due 2/311; Walton due on a timely basis | $0203 / 11$ | 1,700,000 |  |
| Remaining sum due from each partner at $50 \%$ | 0204111 | 300,000 |  |
| Total Equity Investment |  | \$2,225,000 | $\$ 0$ |

Walton has not made the equity contributions as required. Bernstein is into the third level of funding with no equity investment by Walton.
ii. 241 Spadina; Twin Dragons Corporation

- The agreement calls for equity contributions from the partners as follow:





 texty menat.

As of December 31, 2011, equity contributions are as follows:

|  |  | Bunctein | biatten |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Giteons Irene Leviam | 98301113 |  | 50,003 |
| Ange Boudte | 093040 |  | 50.000 |
| mital Seposit | 1015:10 | 1,120,500 |  |
| - Eresa s Joe hamme | 1022:10 |  | 109,000 |
| Suncan Coopland | 10123:10 |  | 150,900 |
|  |  | 1.120,500 | 350.030 |

The equity applied to Walton was received from third parties after execution of the agreement. In one instance the memo on the cheque states:

## IRGNE FGIOENVLBVYAFM <br> NEMO INVEAHANT $\mathbb{N} 241$ SPADINA

iii. 1185 Eglinton; Bannockburn Lands, Inc./Skyline

- The agreement calls for equity contributions from the partners as follows:

De Draper:














As of December 31, 2011, equity contributions are as follows:

|  |  | Eemstein | 最atton |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Deposit | 11012013 | 5150000 |  |
| 12a instalment | 12172312 | 1.7E0.60 |  |
| Depost | 12:312015 |  | ses. 50.4 |
| 10.6 instsiment | 23:32011 | 325.80 |  |
| Deposit | 12312011 |  | $12.91 \%$ |
|  |  | 32,225.063 | 573,718 |

[^0]iv. 32 Atlantic; Liberty Village Lands Inc \& Liberty Village Properties Inc.

- The agreement calls for equity contributions from the partners as follows:

7. Walton originally provided the origimal deposit and Bumsein has rembursed Watron steh that each paty has now provided 6 of the 5300,000 deposit to purchase the Propery, wheh amoum will form pare of the equigy eontributions.
8. The babace of equity in the amomion $54,196,340$ will be paid as tolows:
a. Benstem will provide to the Company the sum of $\$ 2,098,170$ on or befire August 20, 2011; and
h. Waton will provide the sum of $82,098,170$ to the Company in a timely mamer as requined as the Projed is completed.

- As of December 31, 2011, equity contributions are as follows:

|  |  | Benstein | Walton |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Deposit | $01.01 / 2010$ |  | $\$ 100$ |
| Deposit | 111102010 | 150.000 .00 |  |
| Due 629111 | $08: 22,2011$ | 246.336 .00 |  |
| Due 8/2911 | $08: 222011$ | 1,851.434.00 |  |
| Deposit \& due on timely basis | 12/31/2011 |  | 039.165 .69 |
|  |  | 32,240,170 | 5839256 |

Walton has not completed the equity deposit as required by the agreement on a timely basis.
V. 450 Pape; Riverdale Mansion Ltd.

- The agreement calls for equity contributions from the partners as follows:

7. Walton has provided the 575,000 deposil to purchase the Properiy, which amount will form part of Walton's equily contributions.
8. The batane of equity in the amonn of $\$ 865,946$ will be paid as follows:
a. Bemstein will provide to the Company the sum of $8,40,473$ on or before July 4, 2011; and
b. Walton will provide the sum of 595,473 to the Company in a timely manner as required as the Projed is completed.

- As of December 31, 2011, equity contributions are as follows:

|  |  | Eernstein | Maton |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Instalment | 6272011 | 5470,473 |  |
| Depositimevinstalment | 12312011 |  | 5250.021 |

Walton has not completed the equity deposit as required by the agreement on a timely basis.
vi. 5770/5780 Hwy 7 West; Royal Agincourt Corp.

- The agreement calls for equity contributions from the partners as follows:
 itucs.

 S. Sot 10 ab
 as the Prgece is comored.

 fimesy mather.
- Equity ownership is limited to Bernstein \& Walton.

a. Sot to Bernstinit end





- As of December 31, 2011, equity contributions are as follows:

|  | Eernstin |  | Wenton |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Seposit | 11/2ct1 | 5475,300 |  |
| Fands due 1215911 | 1205014 | 1,782.530 |  |
| Preferred Snares? |  |  |  |
|  | 12311 |  | 100,000 |
| 1738371 Oniario inc. | 1231\% |  | 100,000 |
| Barcara Haglie | 123\%11 |  | 100.000 |
| Cary ミiber | 12:31:11 |  | 53,000 |
| Grace and Ksn Bugy | 1231:11 |  | 100.000 |
| Joel 5 Renes Schashter | 123611 |  | 175.000 |
| Jobn Rochs and luchete Pang | 1291314 |  | 82.803 |
| Omaby frestment Lmilicd | 123111 |  | 100.000 |
| Stochton \% Eush Piditho | 123111 |  | 100,000 |
| Yane Flesse | 123191 |  | 109000 |
|  |  | 32,257,500 | 3087,200 |

## Walton's equity appears to be funded by $3^{r d}$ parties and appear to be made after Bernstein's deposit and 8.a. installment

## C. Conclusions

i. Walton has not made deposit equity contributions as required by the Agreements.
ii. Walton has not made progress equity contributions as required by the Agreements to be made in a timely manner.
iii. Walton appears to be funding equity requirements using third party investments directly into the projects in violation of the Agreements.
iv. The lack of balance between shareholders of funds invested is significant and consistent throughout the group companies.

## 2) Mortgages

a. General Indications
i. A sale occurred without mortgage pay off.
b. Detailed Findings
i. 18 Wynford; Wynford Professional Centre Ltd.

- The mortgage for this property was held by 368230 Ontario Ltd (a Bernstein controlled company).
- A sale in the amount of $\$ 3,100,000$ for a number of suites was closed in 2011. The mortgage agreement for this property states the following:
SALE BY CRARGOR:
In the evant of the Chargor(s) selfag, conveying, transfexring on entering into any agrement of sale or transfer of the title of the said lands, or te the chargor is a corporation, the sale, transfer or assignment of any shates of the corporation, co any
purchaser, grantee, bcansferte, or assignee, all montes herety secured, together with all
acenod interest and prepayment penasty set out above, shall forthwith become due and
payabie, at the option of the chargee(s).
- The mortgage became due and payable as a result of the sale.

Equity was returned to Bernstein and credited against Walton's receivable rather than paid down against the mortgage. This is a violation of the mortgage terms.
c. Conclusion
i. Mortgage terms are not being followed.

## 3) Fees

a. General Indications
i. Services for build out and management charges are provided by Walton. The build out charges are billed by type of expense with the exception of Wynford, which was a square foot charge for the project. Charges by company and type are as follows:

| Row Labels | Eannockburn Lands | Liberty Village Properties | Riverdale Mansion | Twin Dragons Corporation | Wynford Protessiona 1 Centre | Grand Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Actualsq. Ft. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Labour |  |  |  |  | 3,550,000 | 3,550,000 |
| Management Fees |  |  |  |  | 355:000 | 355,000 |
| Actual-Breakdown |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Labour |  | 537.000 | 220,777 | 103,131 |  | 860,908 |
| Doors |  |  |  |  | 12,321 | 12,321 |
| Painting |  |  |  |  | 1.500 | 1,500 |
| Demolition |  | 350,000 |  |  |  | 350,000 |
| Electrical |  | 208,500 |  |  |  | 208,500 |
| Elevator |  | 102,500 |  |  |  | 102.500 |
| Fire System |  | 262,500 |  |  |  | 262,500 |
| Flooring |  | 77.500 |  |  |  | 77,500 |
| Framing |  | 310,000 | 125,390 |  |  | 435,390 |
| HVAC |  | 198,000 |  |  |  | 198,000 |
| Plumbing |  | 167.500 |  |  |  | 167,500 |
| Roofing |  | 97,500 | 38.500 |  |  | 136,000 |
| Wincows instaliation |  | 159.000 |  |  |  | 159,000 |
| Advertising and Promotion |  |  | 800 |  |  | 800 |
| Brickwork |  |  | 34,500 |  |  | 34,500 |
| Management Fees | 9.177 | 91,500 | 114,632 | 115,000 |  | 330,310 |
| Landscaping |  |  | 7.702 |  |  | 7,702 |
| Materials |  |  | 275.846 |  |  | 275,846 |
| Professional Fees:Architectural |  |  | 295,000 |  |  | 295,000 |
| Professional Fees:Consulting Fees | 90,300 |  | 71.000 | 2,500 |  | 163.800 |
| Grand Total | 99,477 | 2,561,500 | 1,184,147 | 220,631 | 3,918,821 | 7,984,576 |

b. Detailed Findings
i. 18 Wynford; Wynford Professional Centre Ltd.

- Fees charged by Walton to the partnership during the period were:

|  | Cost of Sale-ON Lung | Capitalized | Total | Plan |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Build out | \$313,821 | \$3,250,000 | \$3,563,821 | \$2,525,000 |
| Management | 30,000 | 325,000 | 355,000 | 252,500 |
|  | \$343,821 | \$3,575,000 | \$3,918,821 | \$2,777,500 |

- Management fees are billed to the partnership at $10 \%$ of build out.

Although the build out fee is at $\$ 50 /$ sf appears reasonable, there are several issues here:

- Was the arrangement of Walton providing these services approved by Bernstein as required by the Agreements?
- What exactly is the role of Walton's company in providing these services?
- Who is performing the work, Walton, or sub-contractors?
- Are there third party invoices supporting these charges?
- What is the method of invoicing, i.e.: cost plus, per sf based on market rates?
- Why did management charges increase automatically with the cost of build out?
c. Conclusions
i. Significant related party transactions are occurring without proper approval.


## 4) Business Plan

a. General Indications
i. Differences between the Business Plans as set forth in the Agreements and the actual results are not explained but they appear to indicate that the original budgets were inflated to maximize Bernstein's investment and eliminate a need for equal investments by Walton.
b. Detailed Findings
i. 18 Wynford; Wynford Professional Centre Ltd.

The Business Plan summarizes anticipated profits as follows:

|  | Anticipated Profit |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Value of 18 Wynford: | $\$$ | $19,904,370$ |  |
| Less Project Cost: | $\$$ | $14,709,980$ |  |
| Projected Profit: |  | 5 | $5,95,190$ |

The Business Plan details show the following capital requirements:

| Purchase | \$9,045,000 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Renovation net cost |  |
| Tenant improvements/inducements/allowances | 2,777,500 |
| Total capital required | \$11,822,500 |
| Less: Projected operating income | (8896,84) |
| Net capital | \$10,926,469 |

- The partner equity investment requirements appear to be based on:

Project Costs
Less: Existing mortgage
Partner Equity Investment Requirement Total
Partner Equity Investment RequirementSplit
$\$ 14,709,180$
9,600,000
\$5,109,180
$\$ 2,554,590$

The Project costs $(\$ 14,709,180)$ are significantly in excess of the Total Capital Required $(\$ 11,822,500)$. Based on the method of shareholder accounting, the excessive Project cost projection in the plan ( $\$ 2,886,680$ ) results in Share Subscription Receivable (unfunded equity investment) from Walton (\$2,554,590).
ii. 241 Spadina; Twin Dragons Corporation

- The following are results through 12/31/11 compared to plan capital requirements:

|  | Actual | Plan |
| :--- | :---: | ---: |
| Purchase | $\$ 4,722,128$ | $\$ 4,791,000$ |
| Professional fees | inc | 160,000 |
| Renovation costs | $2,713,989$ | $2,550,000$ |
| Carrying costs | - | $1,040,000$ |
| Total capital required | $\$ 7,436,117$ | $\$ 8,541,000$ |

- The partner equity investment requirements appear to be based on:

| Project Costs | $\$ 8,541,000$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Less: Mortgage | $6,300,000$ |
| Partner Equity Investment Requirement Total | $\$ 2,241,000$ |
| Partner Equity Investment Requirement Split | $\$ 1,120,500$ |

The Total Capital Required ( $\$ 8,541,000$ ) appears to be excessive in as much as Walton has contributed $\$ 350,000$ through the end of 2012.
iii. 1185 Eglinton; Bannockburn Lanks, Inc./Skyline

- The following are results through 12/31/11 compared to plan capital requirements:

|  | Actual | Plan |
| :--- | :---: | ---: |
| Purchase | $\$ 11,833,355$ | $\$ 8,949,000$ |
| Demolition | Inc. | 854,920 |
| Development | Inc. | $1,760,000$ |
| Carrying costs | Inc. | $1,639,880$ |
| Total capital required | $\$ 11,833,355$ | $\$ 13,203,800$ |

- The partner equity investment requirements appear to be based on:

| Project Costs | $\$ 13,203,800$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Less: Mortgage | $8,200,000$ |
| Parner Equity Investment Requirement Total | $\$ 5,003,800$ |
| Partner Equity Investment Requirement Split | $\$ 2,501,900$ |

The Total Capital Required $(\$ 13,203,800)$ appears to be exaggerated in as much as Walton has contributed $\$ 73,717$ through the end of 2012.
iv. 32 Atlantic; Liberty Village Lands Inc \& Liberty Village Properties Inc.

The Business Plan details show the following capital requirements:

|  | Actual | Plan |
| :--- | :---: | ---: |
| Purchase | $\$ 12,350,596$ | $\$ 9,038,500$ |
| Professional Fees | inc | 515,000 |
| Development | inc | $4,500,000$ |
| Carrying costs | inc | $1,742,840$ |
| Total capital required | $\$ 12,350,596$ | $\$ 15,796,340$ |

The partner equity investment requirements appear to be based on:

| Project Costs | $\$ 15,796,340$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Less: Mortgage | $11,300,000$ |
| Partner Equity Investment Requirement Total | $\$ 4,496,340$ |
| Partner Equity Investment Requirement Split | $\$ 2,248,170$ |

The Total Capital Required $(\$ 15,796,340)$ appears to be exaggerated in as much as Walton has contributed \$839,266 through the end of 2012.
V. $5770 / 5780$ Hwy 7 West; Royal Agincourt Corp.

- The Business Plan details show the following capital requirements:

|  | Actual | Plan |
| :--- | :---: | ---: |
| Purchase | $\$ 14,983,000$ | $\$ 14,974,500$ |
| Professional fees | hoc. | 575,202 |
| Tenant fixtures | Inc. | 440,000 |
| Carrying costs $1 / 1 / 12$ to $4 / 30 / 12$ |  | 125,298 |
| Total Capital Required | $\$ 14,983,000$ | $\$ 16,115,000$ |

- The partner equity investment requirements appear to be based on:

| Project Costs | $\$ 16,115,000$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Less: Existing mortgage | $11,500,000$ |
| Partner Equity Investment Requirement Total | $\$ 4,515,000$ |
| Partner Equity Investment Requirement Split | $\$ 2,257,500$ |

The Total Capital Required $(\$ 16,115,000)$ appears to be exaggerated in as much as Walton has contributed $\$ 1,127,800$ through the end of 2012 (assuming you accept "Preferred Share" contributions to be Walton's.
c. Conclusions
i. There is an appearance of effort to manipulate the equity requirements and business plan representations in the agreements such that Walton capital requirements are minimized. This may be a reason the difference between the business plans and the actual results have not been explained.

## 5) Reporting \& Control

a. General Indications
i. Reporting is not being performed on a timely basis.
ii. Bank reconciliations are not being performed on a timely basis.
iii. Approvals are not being performed.
b. Detailed Findings
i. The following clause is generally stated in each company's agreement.
 to kovice

Is the bant ghement he the monte, and
 Watme will aloo motide somplow hane of all cheques writon. incladiae paycos deles ard momins.



There has been no reporting or approvals as required by this clause.
ii. 241 Spadina; Twin Dragons Corporation.
v. Legal and Accounting Support

- Drafting and filing legal documents
- Litigation
- The conversion of commercial rental units to commercial and/or residential condominium properties and the implementation of condominium sales programs
- Zoning, by-law and legislative compliance
- Severance and variance applications
- Representation at municipal zoning, fire, building and by-law hearings
- Insurance management and advice on appropriate coverage
- Centralized accounting and finance functions, including financial statements and audit, accounts teceivable, accounts payable, payroll, cash and tax management
- Weekly, monthly or quarterly occupancy and collection reporting
- Weekly, monthly or quarterly financial repori
- Annual budget preparation
- Unit turnover costs
- Capital expenditures
- Operating and labour cosis


## - Revenie

- Pattnetship distributions as directed

> - With the exception of late, notice to reader Balance Sheets and Statement of Operations, there has been no reporting of the above after what were initially requests, which progressed to demands for same.
c. Conclusions
i. Lack of reporting and control has resulted in unauthorized payments and no ability to assess historical information in an effort to improve our understanding of and have effect on Project outcomes.

## Recommendations

The following recommendations should be put into effect immediately.

1) Walton must provide response through clarification and if appropriate, actions to these concerns:
a. Clarification of the status of these outside investors.
b. Correction of mortgages.
c. Rectification of equity in the projects to reflect actual equity invested.
d. All related party transactions are documented and approved in advance.
2) Leverage the strengths of investors by dividing responsibilities.
a. Walton retain responsibility for:
i. Business development
ii. Project administration
iii. Property administration
b. Bernstein takes control of:
i. Corporate Books
ii. Accounting
iii. Finance administration
1. Cheques signed by Dr Bernstein or Warren Bernstein
iv. Legal affairs
3) Walton makes recommendations, Bernstein retains authority to act.
4) Reporting requirements previously imposed on Walton will be imposed on both Walton and Bernstein.
5) The terms of agreements should be modified to reflect the above.

## Tab C

This is Exhibit "C" referred to in the Affidavit of James Reitan sworn before me this $1^{\text {st }}$ day of October, 2013


A Commissioner for Taking Affidavits

## Lorna Groves

| From: | Norma Walton [nwalton@roseandthistle.ca](mailto:nwalton@roseandthistle.ca) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Thursday, June 13, 2013 2:43 PM |
| To: | Jim Reitan |
| Cc: | Dr. Stanley Bernstein; Warren Bernstein; Mario Bucci |
| Subject: | Response to May 7th letter |
| Attachments: | walton response to bernstein.pdf |

Dear Jim,
Attached is our response to your May $7^{\text {th }}$ letter. See you and Warren tomorrow at 10:30 am.

Regards,
Norma
Norma Walton B.A., J.D., M.B.A.
THE ROSE AND THISTLE GROUP LTD.
30 Hazelton Avenue
Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5R 2E2
Tel: (416) 489-9790 Ext. 103
Fax: (416) 489-9973
www.roseandthistlegroup.com

The Rose and Thistle Group Ltd. is a privately held asset management company that is the parent company of Rose and Thistle Properties, Rose and Thistle Construction, Rose and Thistle Homes, Rose and Thistle Media, Plexor Plastics Corp., Handy Home Products Inc., Palmer Productions Inc., Corporate Communications Interactive Inc., Urban Amish Interiors Inc., Loft Raum Inc. and is affiliated with the law firm of Walton Advocates.

June 13, 2013

Mr. Jim Reitan<br>Director of Accounting and Finance<br>Dr. Bernstein Diet and Health Clinics<br>21 Kern Road<br>Toronto, ON M3B 1S9

Dear Jim,
Re: Joint Bernstein-Walton Portfolio
In reviewing your 13 page litany of complaints provided to us on Friday, June 7, it struck me that you do not appreciate the role we play in this partnership. Your comment that Dr. Bernstein has cause for concern and action on his part to protect his investment is wholly offensive. We own 57 properties in Toronto, of which 32 are jointly owned with Dr. Bernstein. We have approximately 50 full-time staff and another 25 to 40 subcontractors and trades on regular pay to complete the joint project mandates for these projects. We spend every hour of every weekday of every week of every month of every year ensuring that the portfolio is performing at or above pro forma. We challenge you to point to any investment or business in Toronto or Canada or the world for that matter that has returned the $30 \%$ plus ROE that this portfolio has thus far returned with its completed projects. Furthermore, those returns are accelerating as evidenced by how our 1 Royal Gate project is tracking. That investment by Dr. Bernstein of $\$ 5$ million is tracking to be worth double that inside of twelve months from date of investment. How can you beat that, and how can you complain about our performance given those realities?

The joint portfolio is worth in excess of $\$ 330$ million and a number of projects are poised to cash out with stellar returns above the $30 \%$ threshold in the next twelve months. Within that context, I would suggest that the issues you raise, even if they were accurate which they largely are not, are minor in nature. Dr. Bernstein has been well served to date by this partnership as have we. We have done an outstanding job of performing our role within this partnership, with the only area where improvement is needed being the area of financial reporting. For you to focus solely on that area without any acknowledgement or appreciation of how phenomenally well we have managed the joint portfolio is blinkered in the extreme.

We are known in the city of Toronto as proven money makers in real estate. The Rose and Thistle Group have a reputation for delivering the best returns in the business over the past three years. We are the envy of the real estate street and as a result we have a queue of investors looking to pariner with us to make them money in real estate like we have with Dr. Bernstein. We have declined to engage them because we understand and appreciate Dr. Bernstein's role within our partnership and are loyal to him as a result. We expect the same from him, otherwise this partnership is not going to thrive going forward. We have performed exceptionally well and it would be a tragedy if the tenor and tone taken in your correspondence ruins what should continue to provide outsized returns going forward, particularly given how well it has done to date and the momentum it currently enjoys.

Within the partnership we provide the following services:

1. We find the properties;
2. We negotiate the agreements of purchase and sale;
3. We arrange financing;
4. We personally guarantee financing as required and protect Dr . Bernstein from exposure in this regard;
5. We prepare the project plan;
6. We deal with lawyers to close the purchase;
7. We implement the project plan, which may include:
a. Engaging architects, engineers, interior designers, surveyors, cost consultants, planners, and various other consultants;
b. Obtaining rezoning, severance, condominium registration, and building permits as required;
c. Performing ourselves or supervising construction and renovation of the properties in question;
d. Negotiating prices and contracts with and paying all employees and trades engaged in fulfilling the project plan;
e. Engaging the city of Toronto for all municipal approvals required, including attending numerous meetings with the city politicians and staff to ensure our project plans are approved;
f. Creating marketing material and sales material to attract tenants and purchasers to our projects;
g. Meeting with real estate brokers to negotiate deals with prospective tenants and purchasers;
h. Fulfilling all conditions to close those deals;
i. Arranging refinancing of the properties once the project plan is implemented;
j. Repaying debt and equity upon project completion;
8. Managing and maintaining the property going forward;
9. Performing all administration, financial and accounting services required by the joint portfolio;
10. Reporting to Dr. Bernstein on a daily, weekly and monthly basis as to the status of all investments; and
11. Any and everything else required to ensure the portfolio thrives.

We are not prepared to change the contract terms to cede control of accounting and finance as you have suggested. We are prepared, as we've already indicated, to provide you and Anjela and anyone else you wish unfettered access to the accounting records and books related to our joint portfolio as they are updated and checked for accuracy so you can report to Dr. Bernstein as frequently as desired how the portfolio is doing. In that vein, we are looking to change the corporate structure of the joint portfolio to make this task easier and also purchase software to make reporting on a current basis easier.

You have raised a number of allegations, some of which are accurate and some of which are not. Let me address those:

1. We share funds across the joint portfolio to smooth out cash flow. That is in keeping with the joint objective of creating one financial vehicle, whether a private REIT or some other entity, to permit the most efficient tax planning to occur and to simplify and streamline our portfolio's operations to everyone's benefit. In that vein, we are focused on completing our 2012 financial statements and then meeting with your accountant and ours along with legal tax experts to ensure this structure functions effectively. Despite the sharing of funds, we account for each property separately so property performance can be assessed accurately for each joint investment;
2. Dr. Bernstein is contractually obligated to provide his cash first, with our cash to be provided as the project requires. Hence your comment that as of December 31, 2011 we have not put in as much cash as Dr. Bernstein is accurate. That is in keeping with the arrangement we've negotiated. Undoubtedly those numbers will become closer to even in 2012 and beyond because we began to invest together in 2010 and most of our projects have 30 to 36 month timelines. Eglinton is a good example of this. We invest $\$ 150,000$ per month to carry Eglinton pending our successfully completing rezoning and sale of that property. Dr. Bernstein has no further obligation to invest in Eglinton so his equity will not increase, whereas ours increases every month;
3. Your comment that we inflate our project pro formas to extract maximum money from Dr. Bernstein up front and thus reduce our financial obligation is both offensive and completely uninformed. You have neither the real estate expertise nor property experience that we have. You have no basis for your views other than your comment that we have beat our pro formas in some of our projects. First of all, all of those projects are not yet completed and secondly, if that is the case, that event should be celebrated, not criticized. We prepare project pro formas at the time we negotiate to purchase the properties. We use our vast real estate expertise to as accurately as possible prepare the pro forma. We never want to have to come back to Dr. Bernstein to increase his equity beyond what we initially forecast, and we take that responsibility very seriously. The fact that unlike most pro formas, we have been able to better some of ours in reality is a fabulous track record and shows our ability to outperform our own expectations. Please don't criticize us in areas where we have far more experience than you and you are merely postulating a premise that is wholly inaccurate and frankly quite offensive;
4. We do not have outside investors in the properties we jointly own with Dr. Bernstein. As Mario explained, before Dr. Bernstein became a $50 \%$ owner of Spadina and Highway 7, we had attracted investment from third parties. The moment he became an investor, we shifted all of those responsibilities over to The Rose and Thistle Group Ltd. and that is where they currently remain. We would not dilute ownership in a project with Dr. Bernstein.
5. Your comment about Wynford's mortgage not being properly discharged in the OLA transaction has been explained to you. I don't know if Dr. Bernstein ever signed the Acknowledgements to Discharge, but I am certain that we advised him of our intention to discharge his mortgages and divide the $\$ 3.1$ million as equity reimbursement instead of mortgage pay-down and he agreed. We have subsequently refinanced that property and fully paid out Dr. Bernstein for this loan, so I am not sure why you continue to harp on this issue. Further, we now run all such transactions through Devry Smith so that they can fully protect Dr. Bernstein's interests and fully report to him on those transactions, so if this ever was an issue, it has been resolved going forward;
6. Your comment about us using The Rose and Thistle Group Ltd. to provide services to our joint portfolio is $100 \%$ accurate and fully disclosed and expected. We are able to perform construction and renovation at wholesale prices. Even after we add a project management fee, we are far under market for these services, to the significant benefit of the joint properties and the pro formas. Further, we always pay to Dr. Bernstein at least fair market value for his mortgage services, being $8 \%$ interest on first mortgages with a $2 \%$ fee, and $1 \%$ on second mortgage with a $2 \%$ fee. Hence both The Rose and Thistle Group Ltd. and 3658230 Ontario Limited benefit from the joint portfolio, which is as it should be.
7. We are fully on board with providing Anjela access to the full joint portfolio as evidenced by our actions to date, and in fact we have her doing a lot more than just reviewing. In fact, she is now booking purchases, reconciling property tax, and obtaining access to more and more of the joint portfolio as the books and records are updated.

The only area where we have not been able to comply with our contractual obligations to Dr. Bernstein relates to the provision of accounting records on a monthly basis and the expense approvals set out in the earlier agreements. We are working to rectify this by providing the access he desires and by amending the terms of the agreements to reflect the current reality given the size and scope of our joint portfolio. That is why we changed the wording of that clause in the Dewhurst and Eddystone agreements to better reflect the financial reporting access and expense oversight that was in reality occurring. We are open to your comments on our proposed changes to those clauses, but the original clauses in the agreements are not feasible now given the size of the portfolio.

We thoroughly enjoy being in business with Dr. Bernstein. Together we have had very good fortune in business thus far, and the momentum appears to be only accelerating. We have appreciated your involvement with our business thus far and look forward to together making our financial reporting systems better going forward. We are happy to respond to your queries and questions on an ongoing basis so you and Dr. Bernstein has an accurate an understanding as possible about our joint portfolio. We keep Dr. Bernstein apprised of all goings on with the portfolio on a daily, weekly and monthly basis and we are confident with your and Anjela's involvement, his understanding will only improve and become more fulsome as he layers in detailed financial knowledge of what is happening on the ground.

We would like to hit $\$ 1$ billion in joint properties together over the next five years. If that is to occur, each of us needs to respect and appreciate what the other brings to the partnership. We are hopeful that is Dr. Bernstein's desire as well, and if so look forward to many more years of successful partnership and collaboration to mutual benefit.

Yours truly,
THE ROSE AND THISTLE GROUP


Norma Walton
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This is Exhibit " $F$ " referred to in the Affidavit of James Reitan sworn before me this $1^{\text {st }}$ day of October, 2013


A Commissioner for Taking Affidavits

# BY COURIER <br> PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL 

Norma Walton<br>The Rose and Thisule Group Ltd.<br>30 Hazelton Avenue<br>Toronto, ON<br>M5R 2E2

## RE: Bernstein / Walton Joint Venture Projects

Dear Ms. Walton:
We have been retained by Dr. Stanley Bemstein in connection with various joint venture real estate projects, in which you and/or Ron Walton and 368230 Ontario Ltd. (a company owmed by Dr. Bernstein) are partners.

Dr. Bernstein remains concerned about the issues about which he recently became aware and which were communicated to you by way of letter dated June 7, 2013 from Jim Reitan. Dr. Bernstein does not make any allegations of wrongdoing, but needs to better understand his investment in the various joint ventures.

To that end, Dr. Bernstein requires confirmation by noon on Thursday, September 19, 2013 that he will be permitted access to the books and records of the various joint venture projects and any The Rose and Thistle Group Ltd.'s books and records related thereto beginning at 9 am on Friday, September 20, 2013. This includes but is not limited to the reporting you are contractually required to provide to Dr. Bernstein:
a) Accounting documents, including an accounting of the amounts invested by 368230 Ontario L.td. and by you and/or Ron Walton;
b) Bank statements;
c) Cancelled cheques or details of cheques written or amounts withdrawn, including details of payees, dates and amounts;
d) Copies of invoices for work completed in respect of the properties, including as rendered by The Rose and Thistle Group Ltd. or any other company related to you (and/or Ron W/alton);
e) Lending and mortgage documents; and

Norma Walton
September 17, 2013
Page 2
f) A detailed report on the status of each property, including revenues earned from rents and other sources.

Dr. Bernstein also requires further documents and information to satisfy him as to:
a) The status of other potential investors in the joint venture projects and an explanation for why cheques were written to them from one or more of the joint venture accounts; and
b) The additional mortgages registered by you on title of the properties at 1450 Don Mills Rd. and 1500 Don Mills Rd., and the use of those proceeds, including by whom they were obtained and for what purpose.

Once Dr. Bernstein has received this information and had a chance to review it, certain changes will need to be made to make the operation of the various joint ventures more transparent and provide proper access to Dr. Bernstein.

If the documents and information requested are not provided to Dr. Bernstein within the time specified, a third party appointed by Dr. Bernstein will (by court order if required) be engaged to review the status of the joint venture projects, obtain the information sought and impose proper reporting and corporate governance. 1 trust that will not be necessary.

cc. Dr. Stanley Bemstein

Warren Bernstein
Daniel Bernstein
Jim Reitan
Shara Roy

## Shara N. Roy

| From: | Guillermo Schible [guillermo@schiblelaw.com](mailto:guillermo@schiblelaw.com) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Thursday, September 19, 2013 11:51 AM |
| To: | Peter Griffin |
| Subject: | Dr. Bernstein and Walton |

Dear Mr. Griffin:
I act for Norma Walton and Ron Walton. I have your letter dated September 17, 2013.
I understand that Ms. Walton, especially, and a team of accountants, have been working hard to address your client's stated concerns. I also understand that these concerns arose only in the last few months of a three-year business relationship in which your client, expressly, did not want to play an active role.

I understand that your client now has an accountant working full-time at my clients' premises and that your client now has a fulsome up-to-date glimpse into the operations of 16 of 34 properties. I understand that your client has been told that a fulsome up-to-date glimpse into the operations of the remaining 18 properties will be possible by the second week of October, that is, in virtually no time at all, considering the circumstances.

The issue of access to bank accounts is more difficult. I understand that Ron and Norma Walton own 21 properties in which your client does not have any interest. I have not been able to, in the last 36 hours, delve into what difficulties, if any, this may present.

I further understand that your client and mine entered into an arms-length investment relationship (and not a partnership) that contractually requires mediation and arbitration. If your client would like to mediate at this time, please advise. Otherwise, I understand that Ms. Walton has never objected to meeting with your client and is willing to do so now, although your client's accountant is abrasive at times.

My sense of the situation so far is this; and again, I have only had 36 hours. My clients for the last three years have been focused on making money for themselves and for your client, and your client is not, at this time, complaining about the results. At the same time that we discuss what level of involvement your client now wishes to have, we need to discuss whether this relationship should continue. It seems that the relationship could come to an amicable end, if that is what the parties wish. One cannot make money and count it at the same time.

I am hoping to meet with Ms. Walton next week, after which I will be able to speak a bit more intelligently about this matter. In the meantime, Ms. Walton and a number of accountants will continue working diligently to address your client's concerns.

## Yours truly,

Guillermo Schible, $\quad, \quad$.

## Schible

[^2]BY EMAIL
Guillermo Schible
181 University Avenue, Suite 2200
Toronto, ON
MS 3M7

## RE: Bernstein / Walton Joint Venture Projects

Dear Mr. Schible:
Thank you for your email this morning. While we do not agree with a number the assertions contained therein, we can agree that the agreements between 368230 Ontario Ltd. and Norma and/or Ron Walton permit Stanley Bernstein access to the joint venture companies' books and records.

To that end, Dr. Bernstein has engaged Schonfeld Inc, to conduct such a review. Harlan Schonfeld and Jim Merryweather along with Jim Reitan will attend at the offices of The Rose and Thistle Group tomorrow morning at Yam to commence that review.

Ms. Walton may and should continue her work to answer the specific inquiries that have been made of her.

At this stage, the mediation and arbitration clause of the contracts is not engaged. Dr. Bernstein simply seeks the access contractually available to him.

Yours very truly,


[^3]$\qquad$

## Shara N. Roy

| From: | Guillermo Schible [guillermo@schiblelaw.com](mailto:guillermo@schiblelaw.com) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Thursclay, September 19, 2013 7:24 PM |
| To: | Shara N. Roy |
| Cc: | Peter Griffin |
| Subject: | Re: Bernstein / Walton Properties |

Dear Mis. Roy,

There is no "joint venture", as referred to in Mr. Griffin's letter of today, the books and records to which your client has access.

The three individuals referred to in your letter may attend tomorrow and they will have access to the same information that your client's fourth accountant has had access to already, in relation to the 16 properties referred to in my email today.

Yours truly,

Guillermo Schible
Schible Law

Sent from my BlackBerry 10 smartphone on the Rogers network.
From: Shara N. Roy
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2013 4:59 PM
To: Guillermo Schible
Cc: Peter Griffin; Norma Walton
Subject: Bernstein / Walton Properties

Please see attached.

Shara N. Roy

T 416-865-2942
F 416-865-3973
sroy@litigate.com
Lenczner Slaght
130 Adelaide St W
Suite 2600
Toronto, ON
Canada M5H 3P5
www.litigate.com

| 130 Adelaide St W | r $416-865-9500$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Suite 2600 | F $416-865-9010$ |
| Toronto, OM | www.litigate.com |
| Canada M5H3P5 |  |

September 25, 2013

Peter Griffin
Direct line: $\quad 416 \times 865-2921$
Direct fax: $\quad 416-865-3558$
Email: pgriffingligate.com

## SENT BY EMALL

Guillermo Schible

Schible Law
Suite 2200
181 University Avenue
Toronto, ON M5H 3M7

Dear Mr. Schible:

## RE: Dr. Stanley Bernsteim and Norma Walton et al Our File No.: 44696

I am writing further to our correspondence of last week and the attendances at your clients, premises by Mr. Schonfeld and his team.

From their attendance and review of the material that has been made available to them, the following is becoming apparent:

1. They are not receiving timely access to all of the material that they should have, most especially records which reflect the full dealings with the properties and realization of revenue and income;
2. Your clients have co-mingled funds from the properties with the accounts of Rose \& Thistle Group Ltd., something which they had no authority to do;
3. Substantial amounts had been charged to the properties, including most recently, for various fees both well in excess of justifiable amounts and in excess of the $\$ 50,000$ threshold requiring co-signing by Dr. Bernstein;
4. The properties have been encumbered or further encumbered without Dr. Bernstein's approval, which is required;
5. We have yet to receive an answer to the question of where the proceeds of the $\$ 6$ Million of additional mortgaging on 1450 and 1500 Don Mills Road went;
6. Your clients have extracted $\$ 2.2$ Million in return of amounts paid by them as deposits on various of the purchases and those monies seem to have travelled to Rose \& Thistle. Where are those monies?;

Guillermo Schible
Page 2
7. Your clients have failed to make the equity contributions that the various agreements call for; and
8. The purchase of 165 Bathurst Street and 624 Richmond Street appear to be stock purchases rather than asset purchases, unbeknownst to our clients.

We are at the point where the disclosure which has been made is dismaying to our client and the extent and timing of disclosure unsatisfactory.

We are proposing a meeting on Friday morning with Mr. Schonfeld, yourself and your clients and ourselves and our clients to see if we can, as a last ditch effort, come to an agreement as to providing a full disclosure, failing which we are going to be forced to take other steps.

Could you please get back to me in confirmation of this meeting at your clients' premises as soon as possible?

In the interim, we note the request with respect to the new mortgage proposed for 140/150 Queen's Plate. Dr. Bernstein is prepared to consider the remortgaging of this property after:

1. Your clients' full equity contribution is made; and
2. The $\$ 482,000$ in fees charged against this non-revenue producing property are returned.

The property can then be mortgaged on a basis which reflects the proper performance of your clients' obligations.

Lastly, please confirm that no further payments or transactions are to be made by your clients for amounts in excess of $\$ 50,000$ without our clients' specific written consent, that no further comingling of property funds shall occur and that each property (jv) account will reflect the revenue and expenses relative to those properties only.

I look forward to hearing from you.


## Cc: Shara Roy

Shara N. Roy

## From:

Sent:
To:
Cc:
Subject:

Guillermo Schible [guillermo@schiblelaw.com](mailto:guillermo@schiblelaw.com)
Thursday, September 26, 2013 12:08 PM
Peter Griffin
Shara N. Roy
RE: Dr Stanley Bernstein and Norma Walton et al

Dear Mr. Griffin:
A meeting tomorrow is impossible. Not only have I not met with my clients yet, whom as you know have been busy responding to your client's four accountants now, but also, the issues raised in your letter make clear that your client is not just looking for information. information he has, and he keeps getting.

Your client is already dismayed and unsatisfied, so there is little point sitting down together without a mediator. My clients disagree with the assertions and suggestions your client's representatives are making. A third party's assistance is necessary to determine how to divide the properties in question.

Subject to conflict check clearance, my clients propose that we mediate with Gary M. Caplan, Leslie Dizgun, or Larry Banack. Please get back to me in this regard.

Yours truly,
Guillermo Schible
Schible Law

From: Janet Larocque [mailto:JLarocque@litigate.com] On Behalf Of Peter Griffin
Sent: September 25, 2013 3:48 PM
To: Guillermo Schible (guillermo@schiblelaw.com)
Cc: Shara N. Roy
Subject: Dr Stanley Bernstein and Norma Walton et al

Please see attached correspondence.

Janet Larocque
Assistant to Peter Griffin
T 416-865-9500 Ext. 227
F 416-865-3558
jlarocque@litigate.com
Lenczner Slaght
130 Adelaide St W
Suite 2600
Toronto, ON
Canada M5H 3P5
www.litigate.com This e-mail may contain legally privileged or confidential information. This message is intended only for the recipient(s) named in the message. If you are not an intended-
recipient and this e-mail was received in error, please notify us by reply e-mail and delete the original message immediately. Thank you. Lenczner Slaght Royce smith Griffin LLP.

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 130AdelaideStW | $\mathrm{T} 476-865-9500$ |
| Suite 2600 | $\mathrm{~F} 416-865-9010$ |
| Toronto, ON | wWw.litigate.com |
| Canada MSH3PS |  |

September 26, 2013

Peter Griffin
Direct line; 416-865-2921
Direct fax: 416-865-3558
Email: pgriffin@litigate.com

## SENT BY EMALL

Guillermo Schible
Schible Law
Suite 2200
181 University Avenue
Toronto, ON M5H 3M7

Dear Mr. Schible:

## RE: Dr. Stanley Bernstein and Norma Walton et al Our File No.: 44696

Thank you for your email.
Even if our clients were prepared at this point to see that a mediation could be constructive, nothing can be done in that context without proper and adequate disclosure and forthright answers to the fundamental questions that we have asked repeatedly and for which no answer has been provided.

Mr. Schonfeld and Mr. Reitan will meet with your client tomorrow. Please recommend to her that she come forward with immediate answers to the fundamental questions which have been repeatedly asked and an acceptable schedule for the provision of the balance of the information which we have requested.

Failing that, and knowing that there is nothing in the various agreements that militates otherwise, we will be before a Commercial List judge at 9:30 on Monday morning to set a schedule for the relief which we are seeking.

Guillermo Schible
Page 2

You are welcome to attend then or we will let you know what schedule we achieve.
Yours very truly,


PHG/j 1

Cc: Shara Roy

| From: | Guillermo Schible < guillermo@schiblelaw.com> |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Friday, September 27, 2013 10:46 AM |
| To: | Peter Griffin |
| Cc: | Shara N. Roy |
| Subject: | RE: Dr Stanley Bernstein and Norma Walton et al |

Dear Mr. Griffin,

As you know, my clients' position is that our clients are bound re: (private) arbitration preceded by (privileged) mediation. So please provide me with the courtesy of a heads up with respect to what material you intend to file with the court. My clients are concerned not to decrease what the properties in question might obtain in an open market.

If you are, at this time, only requesting a scheduling appointment (and filing no material), I should see that 9:30am request form and sign it as well.

I am prepared to attend court, expressly without prejudice to my clients' position above; that is, only to submit that, what should be scheduled first, if anything is scheduled at all, is a motion to send this matter to arbitration preceded by mediation.

I confirm that I have already indicated in writing that my clients wish to start that process and even proposed three individuals to you.

Yours truly,
Guillermo Schible
Schible Law

From: Janet Larocque [mailto:]Larocque@litigate.com] On Behalf Of Peter Griffin
Sent: September 26, 2013 3:41 PM
To: Guillermo Schible
Cc: Shara N. Roy
Subject: RE: Dr Stanley Bernstein and Norma Walton et al

Please see attached correspondence.

From: Guillermo Schible [mailto:guillermo@schiblelaw.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2013 12:08 PM
To: Peter Griffin
Cc: Shara N. Roy
Subject: RE: Dr Stanley Bernstein and Norma Walton et al
Dear Mr. Griffin:

A meeting tomorrow is impossible. Not only have I not met with my clients yet, whom as you know have been busy responding to your client's four accountants now, but also, the issues raised in your letter make clear that your client is not just looking for information. Information he has, and he keeps geting.

Your chen is already dismayed and unsatisfied, so there is little point sitting down together without a mediator. My clients disagree with the assertions and suggestions your client's representatives are making. A third party's assistance is necessary to determine how to divide the properties in question.

Subject to conflict check clearance, my clients propose that we mediate with Gary M. Caplan, Leslie Dizgun, or Larry Banack. Please get back to me in this regard.

Yours truly,

Guillermo Schible
Schible Law

From: Janet Larocque [mailto:JLarocque@litigate.com] On Behalf Of Peter Griffin
Sent: September 25, 2013 3:48 PM
To: Guillermo Schible (guillermo@schiblelaw.com)
Cc: Shara N. Roy
Subject: Dr Stanley Bernstein and Norma Walton et al

Please see attached correspondence.

## Janet Larocque

Assistant to Peter Griffin
T 416-865-9500 Ext. 227
F 416-865-3558
ilarocque@litigate.com
Lenczner Slaght
130 Adelaide St W
Suite 2600
Toronto, ON
Canada M5H 3P5
www.litigate.com

This e-mail may contain legally privileged or confidential information. This message is intended only for the recipients) named in the message. If you are not an intended recipient and this e-mail was received in error, please notify us by reply e-mail and delete the original message Immediately. Thank you. Lenczner Slaght Royce Smith Griffin LLB.

From: Janet Larocque on behalf of Peter Griffin
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 12:03 PM
To:
Guillermo Schible (guillermo@schiblelaw.com)
Cc:
Shara N. Roy
Subject:
Dr Stanley Bernstein and Norma Walton et al
Attachments:
Document.pdf
Importance:
High

Thank you for your email of earlier this morning.
Here is the Request Form for scheduling of the inspectorship motion.
I do not believe that we have the type of disagreement reflected in the form of agreements prepared by your clients and accordingly the mediation and arbitration provisions in my view are likely not applicable.

In any event, they do not deal with the type of relief we are dealing with here.
As you can see, lam only dealing with scheduling at the moment and from a point of view of the issue you have identified you are of course free to argue it when we get to the motion.

Please sign and return.

Peter Griffin.

## Janet Larocque

Assistant to Peter Griffin
T 416-865-9500 Ext. 227
F 416-865-3558
ilarocque@litigate.com
Lenczner Slaght
130 Adelaide St W
Suite 2600
Toronto, ON
Canada M5H 3P5
www. litigate.com

| Commercial List File Number: | [Not yet commenced] |
| :--- | :---: |
| Civil File Number: | [Not yet commenced] |

Date: September 27, 2013

## SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE - COMMERCIAL LIST 9:30 A.M. HEARING REQUEST FORM

| A | PLEASE NOTE: The 9:30 hearing procedure is only for "ex parte, urgent, scheduling and consent matters which take no longer than 10 minutes" (Practice Direction, (2002), 57 O.R. ( $\left.3^{\text {rd }}\right) 97$; paragraph 25). This restriction will be enforced. This matter is (tick one or more); <br> [.] exparte [X] urgent [X]scheduling 1] consent []other (explain) |
| :---: | :---: |
| B | Short Title of Proceeding: <br> DBDC Investment Spadina Ltd. et al v. Norman Walton, Ronald Walton and Rose \& Thistle Group Lid. ef al |
| C | Date(s) Requested: <br> September 30,2013 at 9:30 a.m. |
| D | The following is a brief description of the matter to be considered at the 9:30 appointment: Scheduling of a motion to appoint an inspector. |
| E | The following materials will be necessary for the matter to be considered. (it is the responsibility of counsel to confirm that the proper materials are available for the Court.) |
| F | Is any Judge seized of these matters or any judicial conflicts? $\square$ No |


| COUNSEL FOR APPLICANT/MOVING PARTY. |  | COUNSEL FOR OTHER PARTX |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Party | Plaintiffs | Party | Defendants |
| Counsel |  | Counsel | Guillermo Schible PRINT AND SIGN OR INITIAL |
| Address | LENCZNER SLAGHT ROYCE <br> SMITH GRIFFIN LLP Barristers Suite 2600 130 Adelaide Street West Toronto ON M5H 3P5 | Address | Schible Law <br> Suite 2200 <br> 181 University Avenue Toronto, ON M5H 3M7 |
| Phone | (416) 865-9500 | Phone | (416) 601-6813 |
| Fax | (416) 865-9010 | Fax | (116) $352-5154$ |
| E-Mail | pgriffin@litigate.com | E-Mail | guillermo@schiblelaw.com |

To be submitted to: Commercial List Office, 330 University Ave, $7^{\text {th }}$ Floor Canada Life Building, Toronto Ontario Fax to: (416) 327.6228 You may also convert to PDF and email to Toronto.Commerciallist@jus.goy.on.ca Endorsement/Disposition $\square$ See attached Yellow Endorsement Form.

## Tab G

This is Exhibit "G" referred to in the Affidavit of James Reitan sworn before me this $1^{\text {st }}$ day of October, 2013


From: Norma Walton [nwalton@roseandthistle.ca]
Sent: September-20-13 9:32 PM
To: Dr. Stanley Bernstein
Subject: 1450 and 1500 Don Mills second mortgages
Dear Stan,
Harlan asked me today why I put the mortgages on 1450 and 1500 Don Mills.
You'll recall that back in July you told me you wanted to extract a minimum of $\$ 2$ million from the joint portfolio or from mortgage payback to purchase a home for your son in New York. You asked me to keep that information confidential which I have. You indicated you absolutely needed the money by July $31^{\text {st }}$. At that time, I put the wheels in motion on the two mortgages to ensure we had money available to provide to you so you would not lose the house. I had both on the go as I was not sure which one would pan out.

As it turned out, St. Clair closed before 1450 and 1500 and when that money was paid back to you, you indicated you were fine. Almost immediately thereafter both 1450 and 1500 did come through. Right around the same time, Jim became increasingly aggressive in his tone and disrespectful in his emails, copying your entire family, so I decided to sit on the money for a few weeks to see how the situation unfolded. We still have the money and I advised you of the mortgages last Friday night in my update regarding 1450 and 1500

Once your accountants complete the review and once you determine your intentions with the joint portfolio going forward, we can then determine together whether to pay that money to you as pay-down of part of your equity in each project; whether to pay you part and keep part in the projects; whether to pay the morigages off; or whether to invest all the

[^4]I did not disclose the above to Harlan because I was not sure how much of the above you wanted me to discuss.
Regards,
Norma

From: Dr. Stanley Bernstein
Sent: Monday, September 23, 2013 6:54 AM
To: norma@waltonadvocates.com
Cc: Jim Reitan
Subject: Re: Harlan

Dear Norma,
I have delegated full investigative authority to Harlan and to his team and to Jim and there are no issues of confidentiality.

Thanks,
Stan

## Tab H

This is Exhibit "H" referred to in the Affidavit of James Reitan sworn before me this $1^{\text {st }}$ day of October, 2013


A Commissioner for Taking Affidavits
----------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Norma Walton [nwalton@roseandthistle.ca](mailto:nwalton@roseandthistle.ca)
Date: Fri, Sep 27, 2013 at 2:39 PM
Subject: RE: Deliverables
To: Harlan Schonfeld [harlan@schonfeldinc.com](mailto:harlan@schonfeldinc.com)
Cc: Jim Reitan[Jim@drbdiet.com](mailto:Jim@drbdiet.com)

Dear Harlan,

You asked that I not lecture you yet you feel free to lecture me. My email was neutral; yours was not. I thought we had a very civil meeting and fail to see how your email betow-permits a level- of mutual respect going forward -as we satisfy-your request for documents.

As agreed, we will also provide the mortgage documents for 1450 and 1500 mortgages by end of day Monday. As discussed, I don't yet have the reporting letters so cannot provide what I don't have. I will follow up with Devry Smith to ask them to prepare them and upon receipt will give you a copy. As to the funds, you saw my note below regarding our intentions with the money, and Dr. Bernstein received the revised pro formas at the time we advised of the existence of the mortgages showing that each project is going to need significantly more money than anticipated, but with a corresponding profit that will be significantly larger than originally expected.

Norma

From: Harlan Schonfeld [mailto:harlan@schonfeldinc.com
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 2:09 PM
To: Norma Walton
Cc: Jim Reitan
Subject: Re: Deliverables

Norma -

Thank you for your note following our meeting.
The one thing that you did not address in your note was what you told us about the $\$ 6$ Million in further mortgaging or the reporting letter. You told us that you would provide the mortgage documents by the end of Monday, but refused to provide evidence of the existence of the $\$ 6$ Million or the reporting letters. You told us that the funds are in the control of you and Ronauld and that you are holding them pending what you understand is a mediation to take place. You told us that as part of the mediation you would provide evidence.

That is wholly unsatisfactory. We need to know where the money is, that it exists, who is holding it and a proper accounting, including documentation of what supports it.

## S. Harlan Schonfeld, CPA, CA CIRP

SCHONFELD INC. Receivers + Trustees
438 University Avenue, 21st Floor
Toronto, ON M5G 2 K 8
Tel $416.862,7785$
Cell 416.254 .1992
Fax 416.862 .2136

## Experience acquired. Experience applied.

This email may contain confidential information and no rights to privilege have been waived. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify us immediately. Thank you.

On Fri, Sep 27, 2013 at 12:26 PM, Norma Walton [nwalton@roseandthistle.ca](mailto:nwalton@roseandthistle.ca) wrote:
Dear Harlan and Jim,

As discussed this morning during our meeting, I confirm the following:

1. Trudy will deliver the leases on a memory stick end of day Monday for your review. She has already delivered the rent roll in both PDF and excel format
2. We will deliver access to Dewhurst, Dupont, Eddystone and Heward by end of day Monday, updated to that date. You already have access to 16 properties so that will bring you up to 20;
3. We will provide access to the remaining 14 properties updated to present day over the next three weeks as they are updated;
4. We are meeting with Meridian upon Mario's return October $8^{\text {th }}$ to arrange with them to separate out the entities we own with Dr. Bernstein from our other entities. Hence we anticipate we'll have the ability to provide him with access to the bank accounts online as of October $15^{\text {th }}$;
5. As it concerns the new 1450 Don Mills mortgage, we anticipate we will need that money and more to complete the project. In the meantime, though, our original intent was to pay it out to Dr. Bernstein as temporary return of capital, subject to understanding his plans with regard to 1450 Don Mills and whether he wishes to remain invested in that project or to exit that project;
6. As it concerns the new 1500 Don Mills mortgage, we anticipate that project is going to require far more money that just the additional $\$ 3$ million so we plan to discharge that mortgage. It was obtained as a fail safe if the 1450 mortgage had not come through to ensure we had money to provide to Dr. Bernstein. First, though, we would like to determine if Dr. Bernstein wishes to remain invested in that property because if he wishes to exit, the $\$ 3$ million can be part of that payment. If he wishes to stay invested, we'll discuss with him the options for raising the money needed going forward;
7. You have requested the following information:
a. All bank account statements for each of the properties we own with Dr. Bernstein;
b. All invoices for each of the properties we own with Dr. Bernstein; and
c. All Rose and Thistle invoices with details and back up.

I will arrange for Sarita to pull the bank statements for the properties starting this afternoon. Once those are provided, l'll have her move to providing invoices, then Rose and Thistle invoices with back up.
8. I will arrange for you to begin touring all 33 properties (we sold 1131) in the month of October with our building operators.

Let me know if I have missed anything I agreed to provide.

Regards,
Norma
Tab I

This is Exhibit " I " referred to in the Affidavit of James Reitan sworn before me this $1^{\text {st }}$ day of October, 2013


A Commissioner for Taking Affidavits

| From: | harlan@schonfeldinc.com |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Tuesday, October 01, 2013 7:42 AM |
| To: | Shara N. Roy |
| Subject: | FW: Bank statements |

Sent wirelessly from my BlackBerry device on the Bell network.
Envoyé sans fill par mon terminal mobile BlackBerry sur le réseau de Bell.
From: Norma Walton [nwalton@roseandthistle.ca](mailto:nwalton@roseandthistle.ca)
Date: Mon, 30 Sep 2013 20:49:22 +0000
To: harlan@schonfeldinc.com[harlan@schonfeldinc.com](mailto:harlan@schonfeldinc.com)
Cc: Jim Reitan[Jim@drbdiet.com](mailto:Jim@drbdiet.com)
Subject: RE: Bank statements
It may be your day's end but is not yet ours. Kendra will unlock access to the four entities when she leaves; Trudy will leave the memory stick in the downstairs boardroom when she leaves; I will leave copies of the mortgage documents in the downstairs boardroom when I leave; and Sarita will continue scanning and sending you bank statements this week.

Regards,
Norma

From: harlan@schonfeldinc.com [mailto:harlan@schonfeldinc.com]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 4:46 PM
To: Norma Walton
Cc: Jim Reitan
Subject: Re: Bank statements
Norma:
Days end is upon us. I am downstairs.
Might I have today's promised materials?
Should I come to your office to get them?
Sent-wirelessly from-my-BlackBerry device -on the -Bell network.
Envoyé sans fil par mon terminal mobile BlackBerry sur le réseau de Bell.
From: Norma Walton [nwalton@roseandthistle.ca](mailto:nwalton@roseandthistle.ca)
Date: Mon, 30 Sep 2013 18:01:41+0000
To: Harlan Schonfeld<harlan $@$ schonfeldinc.com>
Cc: Jim Reitan[Jim@drbdiet.com](mailto:Jim@drbdiet.com)
Subject: RE: Bank statements
Dear Harlan,
Yes
Trudy is working on providing you with all leases as agreed.

Tom and I will chase down and send the mortgage documents for 1450 and 1500 before day's end.
Sarita is scanning all bank statements first then will roll to invoices.
Kendra and $I$ are updating the four entities with a view to providing access.
Regards,
Norma
From: Harlan Schonfeld [mailto:harlan@schonfeldinc.com]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 1:57 PM
To: Norma Walton
Cc: Jim Reitan
Subject: Re: Bank statements
Norma:
And I expect to receive today mortgage documents for the 2 Don Mills properties ( 1450 and 1500 ) that relate to $\$ 6$ million in increased mortgages; and copies of all of the property leases.

You also said you would let us know (within 2 hours) about us getting access to the files for supporting documents and provide 4 more entities records.
S.Harlan Schonfeld, CPA, CA CIRP

SCHONFELD INC. Receivers + Trustees
438 University Avenue, 21st Floor
Toronto, ON M5G2K8
Tel 416.862.7785
Cell 416.254.1992
Fax 416.862 .2136
$\boldsymbol{x}$

## Experience acquired. Experience applied.

This email may contain confidential information and no rights to privilege have been waived. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify us immediately. Thank you

On Mon, Sep 30, 2013 at 12:56 PM, Norma Walton [nwalton@roseandthistle.ca](mailto:nwalton@roseandthistle.ca) wrote:
Dear Jim and Harlan,

You had requested bank statements on Friday. Sarita provided you with Global Mills bank statements on Friday afternoon and will provide the remainder of statements this week.

Regards,
Norma

## Tab J

This is Exhibit " J " referred to in the Affidavit of James Reitan sworn before me this $1^{\text {st }}$ day of October, 2013


A Commissioner for Taking Affidavits
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10/03/2011 13:20:45 Marisa
















## 






| 26 Bill Pmt-Cheque | 03/23/20:2 16:16:48 Temp |
| :---: | :---: |
| 251 Transfer | 03/16/2012 12:23:51 Kendra |
| 58 Bill Pmt-Cheque | 08/18/2011 14:55:45 kendra |
| 107 Deposit | 07/03/2012 12:13:14 Kendra |
| 252 Transfer | 03/16/2012 12:24:14 Kendra |
| 276 Transfer | 03/16/2012 15:56:09 kendra |
| 253 Transfer | 03/16/2012 22:28:45 Kendra |
| 109 Bill Pmt-Cheque | 03/21/2012 13:42:11 Temp |
| 254 Transfer | 03/16/2012 12:28:58 Kendra |
| 121 Bill Pmt-Cheque | 03/20/2012 16:52:08 Temp |
| 122 Bill Pmt Cheque | 03/21/2012 9:29:24 Temp |
| 123 bill Pmt -cheque | 03/21/2012 9:29:24 Temp |
| 124 Bill Pmt-Cheque | 11/01/2011 18:10:08 Mario (Admin) |
| 129 Bill Pmt-Cheque | 03/21/2012 9:29:24 Temp |
| 130 Bill Prnt-Cheque | 03/21/2012 9:29:24 Temp |
| 131 Biil Pmt-Chegue | 11/01/2011 18:10:09 Mario (Admin) |
| 138 Bill Pmt-Cheque | 11/01/2011 18:01:17 Mario (Admin) |
| 139 Bill Pmt-Cheque | 11/01/2011 18:00:17 Mario (Admin) |
| 140 Bill Pmt -Cheque | 03/20/2012 16:52:08 Temp |
| 141 Bill Pmt -Cheque | 03/21/20129:29:24 Temp |
| 142 Blilpmt-Cheque | 11/01/2011 18:01:18 Mario (Admin) |
| 143 Bill Pmt -Cheque | 11/01/2011 18:10:09 Mario (Admin) |
| 145 Bill Pmt-Cheque | 11/01/20:11 18:01:19 Mario (Admin) |
| 277 Cheque | 03/16/2012 15:57:05 Kendra |
| 27 Blll Pmt-Cheque | 03/23/2012 16:16:48 Temp |
| 255 Transfer | 03/16/2012 12:29:43 Kendra |
| 147 Blll Pmt -Cheque | 11/02/2011 13:26:28 Mario (Admin) |
| $2 \mathrm{LS6}$ Transfer | 03/16/2012 12:30:08 Kendra |
| 148 Deposit | 03/23/2012 16:16:48 Tmmp |
| 257 Transfer | 03/16/2012 12:30:22 Kendra |
| 150 Bill Pmt -Cheque | 03/20/2012 16:52:08 Temp |
| 258 Transfer | 03/16/2012 12:30: 53 Kendra |
| 259 Transfer | 03/16/2012 12:31:03 Kendra |
| 278 Cheque | 03/16/2012 15:59:00 Kendra |
| 28 Bili Pmt-Cheque | 03/23/2012 16:16:48 Temp |
| 260 Transfer | 03/15/2012 12:31:36 Kendra |
| 15s bill Pmt Cheque | 12/02/2012 14:15:49 Marisa |
| 157 Bill Pmt -Cheque | 12/02/2011 14:38:09 Marisa |
| 261 Transfer | 03/16/2012 12:31:51 Kendra |
| 159 Blll Pmt-Cheque | 03/21/2012 13:42:11 Temp |
| 262 Transfer | 03/15/2012 12:31:S9 Kendra |
| 163 Bill Pmt-Cheque | 03/20/2012 16:52:08 Temp |
| 263 Transfer | 03/16/2012 12:32-39 Kendira |
| 264 Transfer | 03/16/2012 12:32:41 Kendra |
| 280 Daposit | 03/23/2012 16:16:48 Temp |
| 160 Ball Pmt -Cheque | 12/09/2011 12:10:37 Marisa |
| 265 Transfer | 03/16/2012 12:33:57 Kendra |
| 266 Transfer | 03/16/2012 12:34:26 kendra |
| 281 Cheque | 03/16/2012 16:07:11 Kendra |
| 393 Generat Journal | 07/03/2012 15:37:48 kendra |
| 394 General Journal | 07/03/2012 15:38:19 Kendra |
| 168 Bill Prnt-Cheque | 01/03/2012 9:33:56 Marisa |
| 171 Bill Pmt-Cheque | 03/23/2012 16:16:48 Temp |
| 274 Bill Pmt-Cheque | 01/03/2012 13:29:29 Marisa |
| 173 sill Pmt-Cheque | 01/D3/2012 9:37:51 Marisa |
| 161 Bill Pmt-Cheque | 12/09/2011 12:12:29 Marisa |
| 166 Bill Pmt -Cheque | 12/29/2011 14:00:48 Marisa |
| 282 Transfer | 03/16/2012 16:07:51 Kendra |
| 283 Transfer | 03/16/2012 16:08:00 Kendra |

[^5]
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| 3.Jul 13 |  | Funds Transfer |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5.Jut-13 164 | 368230 Ontario cimited |  |
| 5-Jul-13 172 | Jedd Jones Architect L.t.d. |  |
| $5-\mathrm{HuL} 13$ |  | Funds Transfer |
| 10.Jul-13 |  | Funds Trensfer |
| 10-Jum13 |  | funds Transfer |
| 15-Jul-3 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | Funds Transfer |
| 22-Jul-13 |  | Funds Transfer |
| 31-Jut-13 |  | Service Charge |
| 1-Aug-13 Debit | Toronto Hydro Electric Syste | acc \#700680000 meter 10768767 |
| 1-Aug-13 |  | Funds Transfer |
| S-Aus-13 165 | 368230 Ontario Limited |  |
| 5-Aus-13 171 | Jedd Jones Arctitect Lid. |  |
| 5 -Aus-23 173 | HKME HUE international LIm | Invoice\# 398743 |
| 31-Aug-13 |  | Service Charge |
| 5-Sep-13 166 | 368230 Ontario Limited |  |
| 5-5ep-13 174 | Jedd Jones Architect Ltd. |  |
| 16-5ep-13 178 | Adam J. Brown Professional | Corporation |
| 16-5ep-13 179 | Bousfields Inc. |  |
| 16-Sep-13 180 | HKMB HUS International Lin | nited |
| 16-Sep-43 181 | Krause Edwards Insurance Br | c policy \#bndr 130514 -550 Pape |
| 16-5ep-13 182 | Nexus Protective Servies 4 |  |
| 16-Sep-1 183 | OHE Consultants |  |
| 16-5ep-13 184 | Dptitimum Waste \& Recycling | S Invoice \#55513 |
| 16-Sep-13 185 | SandBox Design Manageme | nt tinc. |
| 16-5ep-13 186 | UniStar Stone \& Constructio |  |
| 5-Oct-13 | 368230 Ontario Limited | voib: dupicate |
| 5-Ot-13 167 | 368230 Orta ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Limited |  |
| $5-00 t-13175$ | Jedd Jones Architect tud. |  |
| 5-Nov-13168 | 368230 Ontario Limited |  |
| 5-Nov-13 176 | Jedd Jones Architect tid. |  |
| 5-Dec-13 169 | 368230 Ontario Limited |  |
| S-Dee-13 177 | Jedd Jones Architect Lud. |  |
| 10-Mar-11 8636 | CB Richard Ellis sted. in trust |  |
| 30-Mar-11 8677 | National Malilbox |  |
| 19-Apr-11 8774 | Minister of finance |  |
| 19APP-11 8773 | Willam N. Greer |  |
| 26-Apr-11 |  | Funds Transfer |
| 9-May-11 8842 | Samantha Siemko |  |
| 13-May-11 8864 | William Holman |  |
| 27-May-11 |  | Funds Transfer |
| 2.Jun-11 |  | Funds Transter |
| 7-Jun-11 |  | Funds Transfer |
| 14-Jun-11 |  | Funds Transfer |
| 28-Jun-11 |  | Funds Transer |
| 30,-40-11 | . . ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | Funds Transfer |
| 4-Jul-11 |  | Funds Transter |
| 6-Ju-11 |  | Funds Transfer |
| 22-Jul-31 |  | Funds Transter |
| 2-Aus-11 |  | Funds Transfer |
| S.Aug-11 |  | Funds 7ransfer |
| 19-Aug-11 |  | Funds Transfer |
| 1-5ep-11 |  | Funds Transer |
| $6.5 \mathrm{Se}-11$ |  | Funds Transter |
| 9.Sep-11 |  | Funds Transfer |
| 30-5ep-11 |  | Funds Transter |
| 3-Cet-11 |  | Funds Transter |
| -0at-11 |  | Funds Trensfer |
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## Tab K

This is Exhibit "K" referred to in the Affidavit of James Reitan sworn before me this $1^{\text {st }}$ day of October, 2013


A Commissioner for Taking Affidavits



| 3:26 PM | Liberty Village Properties Lid |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 89/03/13 | Transaction Journal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | All Transactions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trans ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ | Type | Enteredilast Mocffed | Last modified by | Date | Num | Name | Memo | Ascours | Debit | Creofit |
| 1517 | Ceneral Journal | 08/20/2013 10:40:37 | Marlo (Admin) | 1/1/2012 | 109/12 2R | The Rose and Thistle Grou.... The Rose and Thistle Grou.... | Reverse of G3E J09112-29 - To net agalrst balarce due on December 31, 2011 ... To net agatnst balance die on Decenber 31, 2011 imuice | 20000 - Accounts P... Share Subscription ... | 327,814.69 | 827.814.69 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 827.814 .69 | 827.814 .69 |
| total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{827,814.69}$ | 827,814.68 |

Liberty Village Properties Ltd
Transaction Journal
All Transactions

| Trans \# | Type | Date | Num | Name | Memo | Account | Debit | Credit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 775 | General Journal | 12/31/2011 | J12/11-19 | The Rose and Thistle ... The Rose and Thistle ... | To net against balance due on December 31, 2011 invoice To net against balance due on Decenber 31, 2011 invoice | 20000 - Accounts Pa.. <br> Share Subscription R... | 827,814.69 | 827,814.69 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 827,814.69 | 827.814 .69 |
| total |  |  |  |  |  |  | 827,814,69 | 827,814.69 |




Transaction Journal
All Transactions

| Trans \# | Type | Date | Num | Name | Memo | Account | Class | Debit | Credit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 384 | General Journal | 12/31/2011 | 312/11-31 |  | To record Pref share liability assumption by The Rose An... | 1607544 Ontario Inc. (Ansarl) |  | 100,000.00 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | To record Pref share liabiity assumption by The Rose An... | 1788371 Ontario inc. |  | 100,000.00 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | To record Pret share liability assumplion by The Rose An... | Barbara Naglie |  | 100,000.00 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | To record Pref share liability assumption by The Rose An... | Cary Silber |  | 50,000.00 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | To record Pref share liability assumption by The Rose An... | Grace and Ken Bugg |  | 100,000.00 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | To record Pref share liaility assumption by The Rose An... | Joel \& Renee Schachter |  | 175,000.00 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | To record Pref share liability assumption by The Rose An... To record Pref share liabily assumption by The Rose An... | John Rocha and Michele Peng Ormsby Inve stment L Limited |  | $62,800.00$ $100,000.00$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | To record Pref share liability assumption by The Rose An... | Stockton \& Bush P.M.I. inc |  | 100,000.00 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | To record Pref share liability assumption by The Rose An... To record Pref share liability assumption by The Rose An... | Vane Plesse <br> Share Subscription Receivable |  | 100,000.00 | 987,800.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 987,800.00 | 987,800.00 |
| total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 987,800.00 | 987,800.00 |

Royal Agincourt Corp
|
菈

Last modified by
4
$\frac{0}{3}$
$\frac{0}{3}$
子unoosb

8
0
0
0
0
0
0
0


| Debit |
| :---: |
| $987,700.00$ |
| $987,700.00$ |
| $987,700.00$ |


Tab L

This is Exhibit "L" referred to in the Affidavit of James Reitan sworn before me this $1^{\text {st }}$ day of October, 2013


A Commissioner for Taking Affidavits

The Rose and Thistle Group Limited
Invoice
30 Hazelton Avenue
Toronto, Ontario
M5R 2E2

| Date | Invoice \# |
| :---: | :---: |
| $8 / 15 / 2013$ | 162 |


| Invoice To |
| :--- |
| Royal Agincourt Corp |
| 30 Hazelton Ave. |
| Toronto, ON |
| M5R 2E2 |
|  |




THE ROSE and THISTLE GROUP LTD LAND and INVESTMENTS

To: Royal Agincourt Corp.

Re: Property management and maintenance services 5770 and 5780 Highway 7 West, Vaughan, Ontario

Fee: For services provided from January to August 15, 2013
Property management services ( $4 \%$ of gross revenues) $\$ 33,008.33$
Property maintenance services ( $\$ 10,000$ per month $) \quad \$ 85,000.00$
TOTAL:
\$118,008.33
HST:
TOTAL:

The Rose and Thistle Group Limited
30 Hazelton Avenue
Toronto, Ontario
M5R 2E2
$\cdots$
Invoice

| Date | invoice \# |
| :---: | :---: |
| $8 / 15 / 2013$ | 170 |


| Invoice To |
| :--- |
| Ciberty Village Properties Ltd. <br> 30 Hazelton Ave. <br> Toronto, ON <br> MSR 2E2 |



To: Liberty Village Properties Inc.
Re: Property management and maintenance services 32 Atlantic Avenue, Toronto, Ontario

Fee: For services provided from January 1 to August 15, 2013
Property management services ( $4 \%$ of gross revenues) $\$ 45,800.83$
Property maintenance services ( $\$ 10,000$ per month) $\$ 85,000.00$

HST:
$\$ 130,800.83$
\$17,004.11
TOTAL:

The Rose and Thistle Group Limited
30 Hazelton Avenue
Toronto, Ontario
M5R 2E2

| Date | Invoice \# |
| :---: | :---: |
| $9 / 15 / 2013$ | 183 |


| Invoice To |
| :--- |
| Lesliebrook Holdings Ltd. |
| 30 Hazelton Ave. |
| Toronto, ON |
| MSR 2E2 |
|  |



September 15, 2013

To: Lesliebrook Holdings Ltd.
Re: Property management and maintenance services 1131 A Leslie Street, Toronto, Ontario

Fee: For services provided from January to September 15, 2013
Property management services ( $4 \%$ of gross revenues)
$\$ 25,005.52$
Property maintenance services ( $\$ 8,500$ per month)

TOTAL: \$105,755.52
HST:
TOTAL:
\$13,748.22
$\$ 119,503.74$

The Rose and Thistle Group Limited
Invoice
30 Hazelton Avenue
Toronto, Ontario
M5R 2E2

| Date | Invoice \# |
| :---: | :---: |
| $8 / 15 / 2013$ | 165 |


| Invoice To |
| :--- |
| Donalda Developments Inc. |
| 30 Hazelton Ave. |
| Toronto, ON |
| M5R 2E2 |
|  |




August 15, 2013

To: Donalda Developments Inc.
Re: Property management and maintenance services 1500 Don Mills Road, Toronto, Ontario

Fee: For services provided from December 2012 to Augus 15, 2013 Property management services ( $4 \%$ of gross revenues) $\quad \$ 190,000.00$ Property maintenance services $(\$ 25,000$ per month $\quad \$ 237,500.00$

| TOTAL: | $\$ 427,500.00$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| HST: | $\$ 55,575.00$ |
| TOTAL: | $\$ 483,075.00$ |

## Tab M

This is Exhibit "M" referred to in the Affidavit of James Reitan sworn before me this $1^{\text {st }}$ day of October, 2013


A Commissioner for Taking Affidavits

January 2013 - Preauthorized payment made to Trez Capital


Whershotamen





Statement Perfod Ending: Whwary 31. 2013 Account Numbers: Segsent Number af Cheques: 2


Statemant Pofod Emong wama
Account Num
alinal 4y $=$ In:
30 Ha<ncter hoe



$$
1459 \text { bor wibe }
$$

## Deposil Actoumts

Chequing 0. solobal mills ma

| Date | Account Actwisy | Withdrawals 1 | Deposits 0 | Batantes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 H -0cc-2012 | Enamase formary |  |  | 127,624.47 |
| 07. Jan-2013 | Prematnorized Hagot | -12750060 |  | 124.47 |
|  | TREZ CAFITAI. |  |  |  |

February 2013 - Preauthorized payment made to Trez Capital

| OSAFOW2013 |  | - 29.406 | 100.58 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | THEZ CAMTMAL |  |  |

March 2013 - Preauthorized payment made to Trez Capital


April 2013 - Preauthorized payment made to Trez Capital

| 05 An-213 |  | -127.300.09 | 13.54 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TFEC CAP葹 |  |  |

May 2013 - Preauthorized payment made to Trez Capital

| 06-6ay-2013 | Pre-kuthoreat ${ }^{\text {gech }}$ | -127.500.00 | 9.881.68 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TRFZ CAPITAL |  |  |

June 2013 - Preauthorized payment made to Trez Capital

| \%3-4viny-cus | vatanks \% wisweas |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 96-3m-2013 |  | $\cdot 27.500 .007$ | 10251 |

July 2013 - Preauthorized payment made to Trez Capital
 1206799300

August 2013 - Transfer out to 7311954 wellesy cheq (R\&T account)

## Meridian

## Transaction History

Member Number: 9595206
Account: Chequing o
Current Balancer S232.13

| Date | Description | Amount | Balanco |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ang 20, 2013 | Transfer ts from 7870017 wallesy mexi | \% 1000 | \$232.13 |
| Ang 0\%. 2013 | Transfor Ou to 731954 selesy chea Other Reference 13094328500 | -\$127,500.00 | \$132.13 |

Tab 4

Court File No.

# ONTARIO <br> SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE COMMERCIAL LIST 

BETWEEN:
DBDC SPADINA LTD., AND THOSE CORPORATIONS LISTED ON SCHEDULE A HERETO

Applicants
and

NORMA WALTON, RONAULD WALTON, THE ROSE \& THISTLE GROUP
LTD. and EGLINTON CASTLE INC.

Respondents
and

THOSE CORPORATIONS LISTED ON SCHEDULE B HERETO, TO BE BOUND BY THE RESULT

## AFFIDAVIT OF DR. STANLEY K. BERNSTEIN

I, Dr. Stanley K. Bernstein, of the City of Toronto, in the Province of Ontario, MAKE OATH AND SAY:

1. I am a medical doctor and the founder and principal of Dr. Bernstein Diet and Health Clinics. I am also the beneficial owner of DBDC Spadina Ltd. and the corporations listed on Schedule A to the Notice of Application, and, as such, have knowledge of the matters contained in this affidavit. Where matters are sworn to by way of information and belief, I have stated the source of that information and verily believe it to be true.
2. I first became acquainted with Norman Walton and Ronauld Walton in 2008 when I was approached to act (through one of my companies) as mortgagor for a commercial real estate property in Toronto owned by the Waltons and another investor.
3. I completed several loan transactions where the Waltons borrowed funds as mortgagors of commercial real estate properties in Toronto.
4. In 2010, Ms. Walton approached me to participate in a real estate purchase with her and Mr. Walton as an investor, rather than a lender. On September 24, 2010, we entered into an agreement to purchase together a property at 241 Spadina Avenue. Attached as Exhibit "A" to the affidavit of James Reitan sworn October 1, 2013 is a copy of that agreement.
5. I advanced a total of $\$ 1,120,500$ in equity to the Project through my holding company DBDC Investment Spadina Ltd. The Waltons advanced a total of $\$ 350,000$ in equity. Mortgages for $\$ 6,660,000$ and $\$ 1,090,045$ were placed on the Property, respectively. The budgeted capital costs of the Project were to be $\$ 8,541,000$.
6. As a result of the limited disclosure I have received it appears that the actual capital costs of the Project are to date $\$ 9,971,201$, yielding overruns of $\$ 1,430,201$. In addition, there is recorded in company accounts an intercompany amount said to be owing to The Rose \& Thistle Group-Ltd. ("Rose \& Thistle") of $\$ 1,790,944$.
7. As part of the agreement, I was to be consulted and my approval sought for:
(a) Any decisions concerning the selling or refinancing of the Property;
(b) Any decisions concerning the increase in the total amount of equity required to complete the Project; and
(c) Any cheque or transfer over $\$ 50,000$.
8. I was also to receive:
(a) Ongoing reports on at least a monthly basis detailing all items related to the Property;
(b) Copies of invoices for work completed the Project monthly;
(c) Bank statements monthly; and
(d) Listing of all cheques monthly.
9. I have not received the required reporting for 241 Spadina Avenue or any other Project. I have not been asked to approve any expenditures for 241 Spadina Avenue or any other Project, although I am aware that there have been invoices and payments made in excess of $\$ 50,000$. I have not received any return of capital or profits from any of my investments.
10. To date, I have invested approximately $\$ 110,000,000$ into 31 Projects. Based on the limited disclosure I have received to date, I understand that the Waltons have paid very little in the way of equity into the Projects and did not in fact contribute half of the deposit amounts to secure the Properties, as contractually required. Instead of contributing equity, they have further encumbered certain of the Properties without my knowledge or consent.
11. The Projects are all governed by agreements which have the same or similar provisions to those as set out in paragraphs 6 and 7 above.
12. As a result of the Waltons failing to contribute the equity required (the full extent of which I was not aware of until recently), over the past 6 months, certain of my equity investments in the Properties have been converted to shareholder loans, which bear interest.
13. Beginning in 2013, I became increasingly concerned about the management of the various Projects by the Waltons and Rose \& Thistle and the lack of information provided to me. I requested that Jim Reitan, Director of Accounting and Finance at Dr. Bernstein Diet and Health Clinics, conduct a review of the information available to him in respect of the Projects. His review raised many concerns, which I share.
14. On June 7, 2013, Mr. Reitan wrote to Norma Walton to set out certain questions and concerns. Attached as Exhibit "B" to Mr. Reitan's affidavit sworn October 1, 2013 is a copy of the letter and email Mr. Reitan sent to Norma Walton on June 7, 2013.
15. Ms. Walton responded on June 13, 2013. A copy of her response is attached Exhibit "C" to Mr. Reitan's affidavit sworn October 1, 2013. Her response did not, in my view, answer many of the issues raised by Mr. Reitan.
16. At my instruction, Mr. Reitan continued to follow-up with Ms. Walton, but was not provided with the information that we had requested. Mr. Reitan caused title searches to be performed on all-the Properties. At that time, I learned- of two additional \$3 million-mortgages placed on 1450 Don Mills Road and 1500 Don Mills Road, respectively. I was not informed of these mortgages by Ms. Walton, nor did Ms. Walton seek my approval, as required by our agreements.
17. On September 20, 2013, I retained Schonfeld Inc. Trustees and Receivers to conduct a review of the books and records of the various Owner Companies, as defined in the affidavit of James Reitan. I understand from Mr. Schonfeld and Mr. Reitan that they have been provided access to the books and records of only slightly more than half of the Owner Companies and that their review has raised further questions and requests for information which have not been responded to on a timely basis. I also understand that they have been informed that they will not have access to the books and records for all Owner Companies for several more weeks.
18. I request the appointment of Schonfeld Inc. as Inspector to investigate and determine:
(a) the whereabouts and use of the funds I have invested in these Owned Companies;
(b) the transactions that the Respondents appear to have entered into without notice to me;
(c) the changes made to the various Properties by the Respondents; and
(d) the many transfers of monies to Rose \& Thistle and what has happened to those monies,
all as more particularly set out in the affidavits of James Reitan and Harlan Schonfeld.
19. My correspondence and dealings with Ms. Walton have done nothing to reduce my concerns, more particularly her refusal to tell us the whereabouts of the $\$ 6$ million of the mortgage proceeds on 1450 Don Mills Road and 1500 Don Mills Road and her advice to Messrs. Reitan and Schonfeld that she would only tell us the whereabouts of the monies only in the context of a without prejudice mediation.
20. I swear this affidavit in support of an Application and Motion seeking to have Schonfeld Inc. appointed as inspector of the Projects and the records of Rose \& Thistle dealing with the Properties, Projects and Owner Companies, and other relief.

DBDC SPADINA LTD., et al Applicants

## Tab 5

Court File No.
ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE COMMERCIAL LIST

BETWEEN:
DBDC SPADINA LTD., and THOSE CORPORATIONS LISTED ON SCHEDULE A HERETO

Applicants
and

NORMA WALTON, RONAULD WALTON, THE ROSE \& THISTLE GROUP LTD. and EGLINTON CASTLE INC.

Respondents
and
THOSE CORPORATIONS LISTED ON SCHEDULE B HERETO, TO BE BOUND BY THE RESULT

## AFFIDAVIT OF HARLAN SCHONFELD

I, Harlan Schonfeld, of the City of Toronto, in the Province of Ontario, MAKE OATH AND SAY:

1. Iam Chartered Professional-Accountant (CPA), a Trustee in Bankruptcy, and a Chartered Insolvency and Restructuring Professional. I am the principal of Schonfeld Inc. Receivers + Trustees. Attached hereto as Exhibit "A" is a copy of my curriculum vitae.
2. On September 20, 2013, I was retained by Dr. Stanley Bernstein on behalf of DBDC Spadina Ltd. and the Corporations listed on Schedule A to the Notice of Application. Attached
hereto as Exhibit " $B$ " is a copy of my retainer letter dated September 23, 2013. As such, I have knowledge of the matters contained in this affidavit. Where matters are sworn to by way of information and belief, I have stated the source of that information and verily believe it to be true.
3. On September 20, 2013, I was tasked with gathering information related to Dr. Bernstein's investments with Norma Walton and Ronauld Walton in 31 projects (the "Projects") for 34 commercial real estate properties in Toronto (the "Properties"), as well as the companies incorporated for that purpose (the "Owner Companies"). Since September 20, 2013, along with James Reitan of Dr. Bernstein's Health and Diet Clinics and James Merryweather of my office, I have attended regularly at the offices of the Respondent The Rose \& Thistle Group Inc. ("Rose \& Thistle") and have requested access to records, documents and information.
4. Attached hereto as Exhibit "C" is a copy of a chart prepared by my office of the financial information available to date in respect of the various Projects. I believe that it is accurate. Information in respect of 15 Projects remains outstanding. The information provided to date on the balance of the 16 Projects is not complete.
5. By September 30, 2013, Ms. Walton promised me access to all of the leases for all of the properties, the mortgage documents for 1450 and 1500 Don Mills Road, access to 4 more property records, information and the roll out of all of the banking records for all of the properties and back up information and support for the Rose \& Thistle invoices.
6. Attached at Exhibit "D" is a copy of my email exchange with Ms. Walton at the end of day on September 30, 2013. At $5: 15 \mathrm{pm}$ on September 30, 2013, I was asked to leave Rose \& Thistle without receiving any of the promised information or supporting documents.
7. I have reviewed the affidavit of James Reitan sworn October 1, 2013. Based on my review of the information available to me from the process set out in paragraph 2 above, I agree with the paragraphs $15,16,18-20$ and 22 .
8. Prior to this engagement, I have had no prior relationship with the Applicants, Dr. Bernstein, DBDC Spading Ltd. and the Corporations listed on Schedule A or with the Respondents Norma Walton and Ronauld Walton, Rose \& Thistle and Eglinton Castle Inc. I similarly had no prior relationship with the Corporations listed in Schedule B.
9. On behalf of Schonfeld Inc., I hereby consent to be appointed as Inspector for the purposes of the relief sought in the Applicants' Notice of Motion.

SWORN BEFORE ME at the City of Toronto, in the Province of Ontario on this $1^{\text {st }}$ day of October, 2013.


Commissioner for Taking Affidavits (or as may be)
Shan n.foy.

## Tab A

This is Exhibit "A" referred to in the Affidavit of Harlan Schonfeld sworn before me this $1^{\text {st }}$ day of October, 2013


A Commissioner for Taking Affidavits

## S. Harlan Schonfeld, CA, CIRP

## Profile

Harlan is a Chartered Accountant and Trustee in Bankruptcy with more than 35 years of experience in delivering insolvency and advisory services and is active in many professional associations. Harlan has overseen many complex and unique assignments in Canada and abroad. Harlan's areas of specialization within insolvency, restructuring, and advisory services include; commercial bankruptcy, reorganizing proposals under the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, trustee services pursuant to Construction Lien Act appointments, Court and private receivership appointments, and the liquidation of companies under federal and provincial business corporation's statutes, among many others.

## Areas of Expertise

- Trustee in Bankruptcy and Reorganizing Proposals under the Bankruptcy Insolvency Act
- Private and Court-Appointed Receiverships
- Chief Restructuring Officer
- Monitoring
- Business and Operating Reviews
- Viability Assessment
- Liquidation of companies under federal and provincial business corporations statutes


## Professional Accomplishments

- Independent Manager - Matrimonial Proceedings: Acting as independentmanager to be responsible for the control and management of a significant portfolio of residential real estate with existing co-owners, controlling receipts and disbursements, dealing with property managers, and other investments.
- Court-Appointed Liquidator - Shareholder Dispute: Acting as Liquidator to take carriage of a partition and sale of real estate, deal with sale of other investment properties, distribution of proceeds among shareholders in a tax effective manner, deal with amalgamation of corporate entities, ongoing reporting and management of the assets.
- Independent Manager - Residential Developer - Shareholder Dispute: Acting as independent manager in-a shareholder dispute to a group of companies involved in residential construction and development in GTA, including overseeing all aspects of the operation to complete the construction and sale of over 200 homes in three subdivisions, managing customer service, complete obligations under various subdivision agreements, manage bank financing, relationship and letters of credit, including dealing with municipalities, engineers and contractors to successfully complete the projects. This assignment also included the valuation and division of investment assets among the shareholders.
- York Mills Centre, North York: Project management, under Court Order to complete construction to base building and tenant inducements (\$4+ million in construction costs). Negotiated operating agreements regarding public transit facilities located with 500,000 sq. ft. office/retail building. Successfully negotiated the opening of transit facilities previously unopened in the absence of significant agreements between the City of Toronto, TTC and former owners; allowed buses to operate and concluded agreements allowing for shared facilities, entrance and easement and land adjustments. Negotiated and settled significant claims from lease terminations and pursued litigation regarding damage claims from a repudiated lease.
- Served as; Agent, Receiver, Court-Appointed Receiver, Trustee in Bankruptcy, and Chief Restructuring Officer
- Restructured the management and recovery processes for companies in the following sectors; Banking and finance, Construction, Manufacturing, Consumer Products, Technology, and Retail
- Conducted limited and company-wide business reviews for lenders and investors in numerous industries, including; Manufacturing, Consumer Products, Engineering, Construction, Technology, and Entertainment
- Performed forensic accounting reviews and prepared detailed reports relating to potentially fraudulent transactions
- Monitored and advised under the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act
- Conducted a loan portfolio review and financial position review on 11 Indonesian banks and assisted in the restructuring process of Bank Indonesia by performing due diligence
- Acted as trustee in proposals under the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act
- Negotiated and successfully closed agreements for the sale of company assets under Court supervision
- Assisted in the orderly closure and restructuring of 22 finance companies in Thailand. This included; loan portfolio review, asset classification, and financial position reviews.
- Recommended and implemented a realization strategy for a Bank which included; ongoing reports to the Bank, security and preservation recommendations, monitoring the development status and issues of various assets
- Resolved significant claims from lease terminations and pursued litigation regarding damage claims from a repudiated lease
- Advised a Canadian chartered Bank regarding the valuation of land held for development. This included; acquiring information regarding the assets, analyzing the economics of each asset, and identifying potential realization strategies with respect to the Bank's security in consultation with Bank staff and former property owners
- Conducted security assessments and viability studies in the High Tech sector on behalf of Banks
- Acted as Receiver for a software development company, which included; the valuation of intellectual software and recoveries of Scientific Research and Development Tax Credits
- procedures and determining restructuring and recapitalization alternatives for the institutions
- Coordinated the availability and provision of Ontario's New Homes Warranty Program for all purchasers
- Negotiated between the City of Toronto, the TTC, and former owners for the successful opening of Public Transit facilities
- Performed monitoring duties on behalf of; secured creditors, government agencies, and other parties pursuant to specific agreements
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September 23, 2013

Dr. S. K. Bernstein, MD<br>368230 Ontario Ltd.<br>21 Kern Road<br>Toronto, ON M3B 1S9

Dear Dr. Bernstein:

## Re: 368230 ONTARIO LTD and Norma and Ron Walton and various joint venture

Thank you for the opportunity to offer our firm's services for the purpose of investigating and reporting to you the financial positions and affairs of various real estate joint ventures you have with Norma and Ron Walton.

## Our firm

Schonfeld Inc., Receivers + Trustees is an independent professional service firm formed over 14 years ago. The professional team has deep and wide experience in serving parties in private and court proceedings to achieve solution based outcomes in an efficient and cost effective manner. We have extensive experience in acting as monitor, receiver, interim receiver, and liquidator in numerous shareholder and family disputes, family law matrimonial proceedings and other high conflict engagements.

## Our people

Harlan Schonfeld is a chartered professional accountant and trustee in bankruptcy with over 35 years experience in court mandated and private engagements. His work experience covers the corporate and commercial landscape in Canada, with significant experience in real estate construction, development and management.

James Merryweather is a CGA. He has significant experience working in monitoring engagements for financial institutions and strong accounting and financial reporting skills. He has, over the past 11 years, worked on a variety of court and private engagements across various industries.

## Our understanding of the engagement

368230 Ontario Ltd has signed and entered into about 31 agreements that cover about 34 properties with Norma and Ron Walton. The total amount invested by you is approximately $\$ 110$ million. You have recently become concerned about the relationship, equity investments perhaps not be made, possible other $3^{\text {rd }}$ party investors, significant related party transactions, unapproved project expenses, lack of reporting, property sales without payment of mortgages, among other things.

The current engagement will be to review the books and records of the various joint venture projects and any Rose and Thistle Group Ltd's books and records related to the joint ventures and report our findings to you.

Our review will include, and not to be limited to,
Accounting documents including an accounting of the amounts invested by 368230 Ontario Ltd. and by Norma and Ron Walton;

Bank statements;
Cancelled cheques and details of cheques written or amounts withdrawn;
Copies of all invoices for work completed in respect of the properties, including those of Rose and Thistle Group Ltd. or any other company related to Norma and Ron Walton;

Lending and mortgage documents;
Rent rolls for each property detailing the rental revenues and other revenues earned;
And any other material or documents deemed relevant.
Our ability to carry out the terms of this engagement will depend on the level of cooperation and access to the records, the property, premises, books, records and financial documents of the joint venture, by Rose and Thistle Group L'td. Arrangements have been made for access to begin on Friday September 20, 2013.

High conflict engagements
Schonfeld Inc has significant experience working in high conflict engagements, both as a court appointed officer, and under private contract. Some examples of these engagements include:

## A Shareholder dispute, arbitration, wind down and dissolution:

A highly successful real estate development company became incapacitated by family disputes upon the transition of ownership to the second generation.

To preserve and protect the business the parties agreed to engage Schonfeld Inc. by private contract, to take control of the company's day-to-day operations. We efficiently wounddown business operations (including closing several hundred agreements of purchase and sale) in an effort to maximize the company's value for the benefit of the shareholders.

We were able to return significant funds to the family members, who eventually successfully mediated their dispute.

## Alleged Misappropriation of Funds

A Mareva injunction and an Anton Piller order were made following a belief that an employee has defrauded a major Canadian company of over $\$ 10$ million dollars through a phony billing scheme.

Schonfeld Inc. was appointed by the court as monitor over the suspect's assets with power to control receipts and disbursement, investigate and identify assets, investigate the financial position of the monitored parties and report to the court.

Schonfeld Inc. was able to identify assets, including real estate in United States, and Canada, investment portfolios, machinery and equipment, vehicles, a cottage and recreational vehicles. Within 4 months, the engagement was converted to a receivership proceeding with enhanced powers to liquidate assets, subject to further court approval.

## Marriage Breakdown

Schonfeld Inc. was called during the dissolution of a 25 year marriage. Substantial wealth was concentrated in the family business, $100 \%$ owned by one spouse. The other spouse managed the businesses, was a non shareholder and needed to be replaced.

Schonfeld Inc. was hired as manager of the family business by private contract. The engagement allowed the parties to mediate their separation and dissolve the marriage. Schonfeld Inc. played a key role in the mediation, which culminated in a settlement. The engagement continues today, long after the dispute has been resolved, as the sole shareholder has no interest in the day-to-day running of the business.

## Our costs

Our fees are based on the applicable hourly rates of the professional staff member working on the engagement, plus out of pocket disbursements (legal fees) and H.S.T.

The principal staff dedicated to this engagement will include S. Harlan Schonfeld CPA, CA-CIRP, and James Merryweather, CGA. The hourly rates applicable to these professionals are $\$ 550$ and $\$ 400$ per hour respectively. We will bill our services on a monthly basis.

Upon acceptance of this engagement we require a retainer in the amount of $\$ 15,000$.

## Our independence

Schonfeld Inc, its principal and its members are independent of the Walton's and Rose and Thistle Group Ltd. The acceptance of this engagement will not limit or preclude us from accepting any other engagement should this matter result in a court mandated proceeding.

If you require any further information please let me know. We are pleased to serve in this capacity.

Yours truly, SCHONFELD INC.
Receivers + Trustees
Per:
S. Harlan Schonfeld CPA, CA-CIRP
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Shara N. Roy

| From: | harlan@schonfeldinc.com |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Tuesday, October 01, 2013 7:42 AM |
| To: | Shara N. Roy |
| Subject: | Fw: Bank statements |

Sent wirelessly from my BlackBerry device on the Bell network.
Envoyé sans fil par mon terminal mobile BlackBerry sur le réseau de Bell.
From: Norma Walton [nwalton@roseandthistle.ca](mailto:nwalton@roseandthistle.ca)
Date: Mon, 30 Sep 2013 20:49:22 +0000
To: harlan@schonfeldinc.com[harlan@schonfeldinc.com](mailto:harlan@schonfeldinc.com)
Cc: Jim Reitan[Jim@drbdiet.com](mailto:Jim@drbdiet.com)
Subject: RE: Bank statements

It may be your day's end but is not yet ours. Kendra will unlock access to the four entities when she leaves; Trudy will leave the memory stick in the downstairs boardroom when she leaves; I will leave copies of the mortgage documents in the downstairs boardroom when I leave; and Sarita will continue scanning and sending you bank statements this week.

Regards,
Norma

From: harlan@schonfeldinc.com [mailto:harlan@schonfeldinc.com]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 4:46 PM
To: Norma Walton
Cc: Jim Reitan
Subject: Re: Bank statements
Norma:

Days end is upon us. I am downstairs.
Might I have today's promised materials?
Should I come to your office to get them?
Sent wirelessly from my BlackBerry-device-on-the-Bell network.
Envoyé sans fil par mon terminal mobile BlackBerry sur le réseau de Bell.
From: Norma Walton [nwalton@roseandthistle.ca](mailto:nwalton@roseandthistle.ca)
Date: Mon, 30 Sep 2013 18:01:41+0000
To: Harlan Schonfeld[harlan@schonfeldinc.com](mailto:harlan@schonfeldinc.com)
Ce: Jim Reitan[Jim@drbdiet.com](mailto:Jim@drbdiet.com)
Subject: RE: Bank statements
Dear Harlan,
Yes
Trudy is working on providing you with all leases as agreed.

Tom and I will chase down and send the mortgage documents for 1450 and 1500 before day's end.
Sarita is scanning all bank statements first then will roll to invoices.
Kendra and I are updating the four entities with a view to providing access.
Regards,
Norma
From: Harlan Schonfeld [mailto:harlan@schonfeldinc.com]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 1:57 PM
To: Norma Walton
Cc: Jim Reitan
Subject: Re: Bank statements
Norma:
And I expect to receive today mortgage documents for the 2 Don Mills properties ( 1450 and 1500) that relate to $\$ 6$ million in increased mortgages; and copies of all of the property leases.

You also said you would let us know (within 2 hours) about us getting access to the files for supporting documents and provide 4 more entities records.
S.Harlan Schonfeld, CPA, CA CIRP

SCHONFELD INC. Receivers + Trustees
438 University Avenue, 2Ist Floor
Toronto, ON M5G 2 K 8
Tel 416.862 .7785
Cell 416.254.1992
Fax 416.862 .2136
x

Experience acquired. Experience-applied.
This email may contain contidential information and no rights to privilege have been waived. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify us immediately. Thank you.

On Mon, Sep 30, 2013 at 12:56 PM, Norma Walton <nwalton@) roseandthistle.ca> wrote:
Dear Jim and Harlan,

You had requested bank statements on Friday. Sarita provided you with Global Mills bank statements on Friday afternoon and will provide the remainder of statements this week.

Regards,
Norma

## Tab 6

# ONTARIO <br> SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE COMMERCIAL LIST 

BETWEEN:

Applicants
and

NORMA WALTON, RONAULD WALTON, THE ROSE \& THISTLE GROUP LTD. and EGLINTON CASTLE INC.

Respondents
and
THOSE CORPORATIONS LISTED ON SCHEDULE C HERETO, TO BE BOUND BY THE RESULT

## AFFIDAVIT OF CHRISTOPHER HUNTER

I, Christopher Hunter, of the City of Toronto, in the Province of Ontario, MAKE OATH AND SAY:

1. I-am-a-Student-At-Law at Lenczner Slaght-Royce-Smith Griffin LLP and therefore have knowledge of the matters contained therein.
2. Attached hereto as Exhibit "A" is a copy of a Record of Discipline History against Norma Jean Walton dated December 21, 2007.
3. Attached hereto as Exhibit " $B$ " is a Notice of Application filed by the Law Society against Norma Jean Walton on March 7, 2011.
4. Attached hereto as Exhibit " C " is an interlocutory decision by the Law Society Hearing Panel denying an adjournment to Ms. Walton of the Law Society's Disciplinary Proceedings.
5. Attached hereto as Exhibit "D" is a copy of the Law Society Decision rendered on July 25, 2013.
6. Based on my review of the decision, the Law Society panel found inter alia:
(a) that there was not proper reporting by Walton to two individuals found to be her clients regarding the placing of mortgages;
(b) that there was not proper disclosure as to the identity of the borrower. Walton led the clients to believe the Borrower was a third party, when in fact the funds were borrowed by Walton and/or her companies;
(c) Walton failed to register the Mortgages in a timely fashion; discharged the Mortgages without consent; and rolled the funds into other Mortgages without consent;
(d) the Mortgages were registered in the name of Walton and her firm in trust without consent;
(e) the proper ledgers which should have been maintained with Mortgage funds that were being administered for third parties were not maintained;
(f) Walton failed to provide the appropriate forms with respect to disclosure of the investments;
(g) Walton failed to properly protect the interests of the clients;
(h) Walton failed to arrange for the clients to receive independent representation in a private Mortgage transaction;
(i) Walton improperly comingled personal and/or her corporate funds with clients' funds;
(j) Walton filed misleading member annual reports; and
(k) the panel found that while Walton may have been negligent, she did not deliberately mislead the Law Society;
7. I understand that penalties have not yet been imposed on Ms. Walton as a result of this disciplinary finding.
8. I swear this affidavit in support of an Application and Motion seeking to have Schonfeld Inc. appointed as inspector of the Projects and the records of Rose \& Thistle dealing with the Properties, Projects and Owner Companies, among other relief.

SWORN BEFORE ME at the City of Toronto, in the Province of Ontario on October 1, 2013.


Commissioner for Taking Affidavits (or as may be)
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> The Law Society Barreau du of Upper Canada Hat- Canada

# Lawyer and Paralegal l Directory 

## Discipline History Information


#### Abstract

New Search Back to Discipline Summary Page Norma Jean Walton, Lawyer, In Private Practice Conduct Proceeding: 21-Dec-2007 Norma Jean Walton was found to have engaged in professional misconduct OR conduct unbecoming a barrister and solicitor for failing to cooperate with a Law Society investigation by failing to produce requested in numerous communications. By Decision and Order dated December 21, 2007, the Hearing Panel ordered that the lawyer: (1) be reprimanded; (2) successfully complete, by April 30, 2008, the Financial Management, Professional Responsibility and Personal Management modules of the Private Practice Refresher Program; and (3) pay $\$ 3,750.00$ in costs to the Law Society.


## Let Right Prevail <br> More Info

- Home
- 1
- Legal Notice
- 1
- Sitemap
- Contact Us
- 1
- Media Room
© 2013 The Law Society of Upper Canada, Osgoode Hall, 130 Queen Street West, Toronto, Ontario M5H 2N6
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Law Society Hearing Panel File No. LCN $17 / 11$

LAW SOCIETY HEARING PANEL


## NOTICE OF APPLICATION

## TO THE RESPONDENT:

A CONDUCT PROCEEDING HAS BEEN COMMENCED by the applicant. The claim made by the applicant appears on the following page.

YOU ARE REQUIRED TO ATTEND at a proceeding management conference on Monday, April 18, 2011, at 9:00 a.m. at the offices of The Law Society of Upper Canada, Osgoode Hall, 130 Queen Street West, Toronto, Ontario. You may elect to attend by your representative,

IF YOU OR YOUR REPRESENTATIVE FAIL TO ATTEND AT THE PROCEEDING MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE, THE PANELIST CONDUCTING THE CONFERENCE MAY PROCEED IN YOUR ABSENCE

Date of issue: March \% 2011
TO: Norma Jean Walton
Walton Advocates
30 Hazelton Ave.
Toronto, ON M5R 2E2

## APPLICATION

1. The applicant makes application for:
(a) a determination that the respondent has contravened section 33 of the Law Society Act by engaging in professional misconduct, and
(b) its costs of this application.
2. The grounds for the application are: it is alleged that the respondent has engaged in professional misconduct.
3. The particulars of the application are:

## Clients D.N. and A.O.

(1) The Lawyer acted in a conflict of interest when she represented her clients D.N. and A.O. in relation to the following transactions:
a. a company wholly owned by the Lawyer and her spouse (the "Lawyer's Company") borrowed approximately $\$ 429,750$ from D.N. and A.O. without the Lawyer ensuring that D.N. and A.O.'s interests were fully protected by the nature of the case and by independent legal representation, contrary to Rule 2.06 (5) of the Rules of Professional Conduct (the "Rules"), and
b. the Lawyer represented both borrower and lender in private mortgage transactions totalling approximately $\$ 429,750$ in respect of loans by D.N. and A.O. to the Lawyer's Company, contrary to Rule 2.04 (11).
(2) The Lawyer failed to serve her two lender clients, D.N. and A.O., contrary to Rule 2.01 (2), by:
a. failing to report to D.N. and A.O. with respect to their mortgage transactions;
b. failing to advise A.O. as to the identity of the borrower;
c. failing to advise D.N. and A.O. as to the priority of their mortgages;
d. failing to register the mortgages securing loan advances by D.N. and A.O. in a timely manner, and
e. registering the mortgages in the name of the Lawyer's law firm in trust without obtaining instructions from D.N. and A.O.
(3) The Lawyer misled her client A.O. about the nature and particulars of A.O.'s investments in private mortgages, contrary to Rules 2.02 (1) and 6.01 (1).
(4) The Lawyer failed to complete an Investment Authority and Report on Investment (Forms 18A and 18B, respectively),
a. in connection with the funds borrowed by the Lawyer's Company from D.N. and A.O., contrary to the by-law in effect at the time, By-Law 18, s. 7 (1), and
b. in connection with the release of collateral or security held for D.N. and A.O.'s loans, contrary to By-Law 18, s. 7 (4) until May 1, 2007, and the ByLaw 9, s. 24 (4) thereafter.
(5) The Lawyer failed to maintain a mortgage asset ledger, mortgage liability ledger and monthly comparisons in connection with the mortgages held in trust by the Lawyer's law firm, contrary to By-Law 18, s. 3 until May 1, 2007, and By-Law 9, s. 20 thereafter.
(6) The Lawyer failed to obtain the written consent of her clients, D.N. and A.O., for the substitution of security held for their loans, contrary to By-Law 18, s. 7 (7) until May 1, 2007, and By-Law 9, s. 24 (7) thereafter.
(7) The Lawyer misled the Law Society about the nature and particulars of her client A.O.'s investments in private mortgages, contrary to Rule 6.01 (1).
(8) The Lawyer failed to conduct herself in a way that maintains the integrity of the profession by filing inaccurate or misleading Member Annual Reports, contrary to Rule 6.01 (1).

## Condominium Purchasers

(9) The Lawyer misappropriated approximately $\$ 383,598$ held in trust on behalf of purchasers of condominium units by disbursing those funds without authority and, in particular, contrary to the Agreements of Purchase and Sale, the provisions of the Condominium Act, 1998 and the by-law in effect at the time, By-Law 19, s. 4 (1).
(10) The Lawyer co-mingled personal/corporate funds with client funds, contrary to the by-law in effect at the time, By-Law 19, s. 3 (2).

Jan Parnega-Welch<br>Discipline Counsel<br>The Law Society of Upper Canada<br>Osgoode Hall<br>130 Queen Street West<br>Toronto, Ontario<br>M5H 2N6

Tel.: (416) 947-3469
Fax: (416) 947-3927
E-mail: jparnega@1suc.on.ca
Norma Jean Walton
Respondent
and
The Law Society of Upper Canada
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# LAW SOCIETY HEARING PANEL 

Citation: Law Society of Upper Canada v. Norma Jean Walton, 2012 ONLSHP 0017
Date: January 24, 2012
Docket: 2011-00022
File No.: LCN17/11

## BETWEEN:

## The Law Society of Upper Canada, Applicant

v.

Norma Jean Walton, Respondent

Before: Linda R. Rothstein (chair)
Heard: January 23, 2012, in Toronto, Ontario
Counsel: Jan Parnega-Welch, for the applicant
Rabinder Sidhu, for the respondent
commercial real estate and real estate development. Ms. Walton's law practice is now restricted to providing legal advice to these companies. Ms. Walton testified that these companies employ 20 people directly on pay-roll and another 30 to 40 on a "weekly basis". She told the panel that she and her husband are very active in the running of their companies and that they "do not run themselves".
[5] The Lawyer also described in detail the impact of her in-laws' illnesses on the family schedule. She explained that she drops her young children off at school first thing in the morning and then goes to work. This conforms with the schedule prior to the hospitalization of her father-in-law. Her husband collects the children from school at 3:15 p.m. and takes them home. However, unlike the situation that pertained prior to her father-in law's hospitalization when she would stay at work until 6 or $6: 30$ p.m., she now leaves the office between $4: 30$ and 5 p.m. in order to give her husband an opportunity to attend the hospital or his mother's home. In other words, the Lawyer testiffed that this has "truncated her work day by approximately three hours". It is clear that this calculation is in error and that her work day has been truncated by approximately an hour and a half. Ms. Walton testified that she continues to be able to meet the minimum requirements of her law practice and of the companies that she and her husband run. However, this truncated schedule and the additional stresses have unduly impacted her preparation for the hearing.
[6] Counsel for Ms. Walton argued strenuously for an adjournment until July 2012. Although the prognosis for Ms. Walton's father-in-law is still unclear, he submitted that the additional five months will permit Ms. Walton to prepare for the hearing to the extent that is required. He argued that to force her to a hearing in February would cause her great prejudice and there was no countervailing prejudice to the Law Society. In contrast, counsel for the Law Society argued that the hearing ought to proceed in February. She explained that the Law Society's main witness is 85 years of age, has previously suffered from cancer, and has filed an affidavit which has been in the hands of Ms. Walton and her counsel since the summer of 2011. On two previous occasions, counsel for Ms. Walton had agreed to cross-examine her and the cross-examinations were cancelled at the last minute. Counsel for the Law Society argued that it will cause an undue strain on an important witness to adjourn her examination for a third time.
[7] The Ontario Court of Appeal decisions in Igbinosun, and Dominion Bank, the Divisional Court decision Howett and the College of Physicians and Surgeons all make clear that there is no absolute right to an adjournment before an administrative tribunal, including a disciplinary body. Rather, whether or not the adjournment should be granted should be considered in light of the specific facts of the case, having regard to the right of the Applicant to a fair hearing weighed against the obvious desirability of a speedy and expeditious hearing into charges of professional misconduct. When balancing these two factors, the right of an applicant to a fair hearing must be paramount.
[8] However, fairness to a licensee does not mean that a panel must accede to her view of the time necessary for her to properly prepare with her counsel. In this case, there can be no doubt that the Lawyer has had many months to prepare for the Law Society's evidence at the hearing scheduled for February. The affidavit of the key witness has been in her
hands for six months or more. Nor is it common for the key Law Society witness to have sworn an affidavit in advance of testifying at a hearing. Likewise, the report of the Law Society's expert witness has been in the hands of the Lawyer and her counsel since September. A draft of the Agreed Statement of Facts was sent to the Lawyer in May of last year. Moreover, the Lawyer concedes that she and her counsel have been hard at work preparing for the hearing for some time with the result that Mr . Cohen has recently comprehensively responded to the Law Society's proposed Agreed Statement of Facts.
[9] Nor is this a case where it is the Lawyer's own health condition that undermines her ability to adequately prepare for a hearing. It is apparent from the Lawyer's evidence that the stresses that affect her family have taken a toll. Nevertheless, she is putting in what many would consider to be full days at the office attending to her responsibilities as an owner of a business. It is inevitable that preparation for a Law Society hearing would interfere with one's regular schedule and would require one to delegate the responsibilities of one's business to a greater degree than might be ideal.
[10] I am not persuaded that the fact that Ms. Walton's days have been "truncated" has caused significant prejudice such as to make an adjournment of the Law Society's evidence necessary in order to prevent unfairness. The Lawyer still has three weeks to assist Mr. Cohen to prepare his cross-examinations. This is a reasonable time.
[11] That said, I agree with counsel for the Law Society that the Lawyer has provided a basis upon which to consider, on compassionate grounds, that she be relieved of the responsibility of testifying. Her counsel resisted this accommodation; he argued that there is an inherent unfairness in hearing the Law Society witnesses followed by a lengthy break before the Lawyer and her witnesses are called.
[12] I disagree. Indeed, this is frequently the way long hearings evolve. Panels take careful notes, review transcripts as required and understand the dangers of drawing premature conclusions.
[13] For all of these reasons, an adjournment of the hearing scheduled for February 13 to 17, 2012 is denied. Should the Law Society's evidence be completed before the end of that week, an adjournment will be granted for the remainder of the week.
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Citation: Law Society of Upper Canada v. Norma Jean Walton, 2013 ONLSHP 0110

## BETWEEN:

# The Law Society of Upper Canada, Applicant 

v.

## Norma Jean Walton, Respondent

Before: Gerald A. Swaye, Q.C., C.S. (chair) Jacqueline A. Horvat
Jan Richadson
Heard: $\quad$ February 13, 14, 15; August 14, 15 and 16, 2012 in Toronto, Ontario
Counsel: Jan Parnega-Welch and Joshua Elcombe, for the applicant Howard Cohen and Lesia Jennifer Lawrence, for the respondent

## Summary:

WALTON - Findings of Misconduct - Lawyer acted in a conflict of interest when she represented her clients D.N. and A.O. in relation to the following transactions: a company wholly owned by the Lawyer and her spouse borrowed from D.N. and A.O. without the Lawyer ensuring that D.N. and A.O.'s interests were fully protected by the nature of the case and by independent legal representation - Lawyer represented both borrower and lender in private mortgage transactions in respect of loans by D.N. and A.O. to the Lawyer's Company - Lawyer failed to serve her two lender clients, failing to register the mortgages securing loan advances by D.N. and A.O. in a timely manner; and registering the mortgages in the name of the Lawyer's law firm in trust without obtaining instructions from D.N. and A.O - Lawyer misled her client A.O. about the nature and particulars of A.O.'s investments in private mortgages - Lawyer failed to complete an Investment Authority Report on Investment in connection with the funds borrowed by the Lawyer's Company from D.N. and A.O. - Lawyer failed to maintain a mortgage asset ledger, mortgage liability ledger and monthly comparisons in connection with the mortgages held in trust by the Lawyer's law firm, Lawyer failed to obtain the written consent of her clients, D.N. and A.O., for the substitution of security held for their loans - Lawyer co-mingled personal/corporate funds with client funds - Expert evidence: Lawyer "fell below the standard of care of a reasonably competent solicitor" - Even in cases where no one loses money, or no measurable harm is done, a finding of professional conduct may be made

## REASONS FOR DECISION ON FINDING

## THE ALLEGATIONS

[1] Jacqueline A. Horvat (for the panel):- On March 7, 2011 the Law Society of Upper Canada ("Law Society") brought an application for a finding of professional misconduct against Norma Jean Walton (the "Lawyer") under s. 33 of the Law Society Act on the following particulars:

1) The Lawyer acted in a conflict of interest when she represented her clients D.N. and A.O. in relation to the following transactions:
(a) a company wholly owned by the Lawyer and her spouse (the "Lawyer's Company") borrowed approximately $\$ 429,750$ from D.N. and A.O. without the Lawyer ensuring that D.N. and A.O.'s interests were fully protected by the nature of the case and by independent legal representation, contrary to Rule $2.06(5)$ of the Rules of Professional Conduct (the "Rules"); and
(b) the Lawyer represented both borrower and lender in private mortgage transactions totaling approximately $\$ 429,750$ in respect of loans by D.N. and A.O. to the Lawyer's Company, contrary to Rule 2.04(11).
2) The Lawyer failed to serve her two lender clients, D.N. and A.O., contrary to Rule 2.01(2), by:
(a) failing to report to D.N. and A.O. with respect to their mortgage transactions;
(b) failing to advise A.O. as to the identity of the borrower;
(c) failing to advise D.N. and A.O. as to the priority of their mortgages;
(d) failing to register the mortgages securing loan advances by D.N. and A.O. in a timely manner; and
(e) registering the mortgages in the name of the Lawyer's law firm in trust without obtaining instructions from D.N. and A.O.
3) The Lawyer misled her client A.O. about the nature and particulars of A.O.'s investments in private mortgages, contrary to Rules 2.02(1) and 6.01(1).
4) The Lawyer failed to complete an Investment Authority Report on Investment (Forms 18A and 18B, respectively),
(a) in connection with the funds borrowed by the Lawyer's Company from D.N. and A.O., contrary to the by-law in effect at the time, By-Law 18, s. 7(1); and
(b) in connection with the release of collateral or security held for D.N. and A.O.'s loans, contrary to By-Law 18, s. 7(4) until May 1, 2007, and ByLaw 9, s. 24(4) thereafter.
5) The Lawyer failed to maintain a mortgage asset ledger, mortgage liability ledger and monthly comparisons in connection with the mortgages held in trust by the Lawyer's law firm, contrary to By-Law 18, s. 3 until May 1, 2007, and By-Law 9, s. 20 thereafter.
6) The Lawyer failed to obtain the written consent of her clients, D.N. and A.O., for the substitution of security held for their loans, contrary to By-Law 18, s. 7(7) until May 1, 2007, and By-Law 9, s. 24(7) thereafter.
7) The Lawyer misled the Law Society about the nature and particulars of her client A.O.'s investments in private mortgages, contrary to Rule 6.01(1).
8) The Lawyer failed to conduct herself in a way that maintains the integrity of the profession by filing inaccurate or misleading Member Annual Reports, contrary to Rule 6.01(1).
9) The Lawyer misappropriated approximately $\$ 383,598$ held in trust on behalf of purchasers of condominium units by disbursing those funds without authority and,
in particular, contrary to the Agreements of Purchase and Sale, the provisions of the Condominium Act, 1998 and the by-law in effect at the time, By-Law 19, s. 4(1).
10) The Lawyer co-mingled personal/corporate funds with client funds, contrary to the by-law in effect at the time, By-Law 19, s. 3(2).
[2] The Lawyer admitted service of the Notice of Application and the hearing in this matter proceeded on February 13, 14, 15 and August 14, 15, 16, 2012. The Law Society and the Lawyer agreed that the hearing should be held in public pursuant to s. 9 of the Statutory Powers Procedure Act and Rule 18.01 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure made pursuant to s. 61.2 of the Law Society Act.
[3] We find that the Lawyer engaged in the professional misconduct alleged in Particulars 1, $2,3,4,5,6$ and 10 above for the reasons that follow.

## FACTS NOT IN DISPUTE

[4] The Law Society and the Lawyer filed an Agreed Statement of Facts ("ASF"). The ASF was admitted as Exhibit 1. The Lawyer admitted the authenticity of the documents in the accompanying Document Book, admitted as Exhibit 2. The undisputed facts follow.

## (a) Relevant Persons

[5] The Lawyer was born in 1970. She received her law degree and an Executive MBA from the University of Western Ontario and was called to the Bar in 1995. The Lawyer is a partner at Walton Advocates located at 30 Hazelton Avenue in Toronto, Ontario (the "Firm") where she practises $50 \%$ real estate and $50 \%$ corporate/commercial. The Lawyer is responsible for the bookkeeping and the accounting at the Firm. The only other partner of the Firm is the Lawyer's husband. The Firm advertises as an in-house law firm and trade mark agent that provides litigation, corporate and real estate services to The Rose and Thistle Group ("Rose and Thistle").
[6] Since approximately 2001, the Lawyer has been involved in the real estate development business, including the development of properties located at 185 Davenport Road in Toronto (the "Davenport Property") and 1246 Yonge Street in Toronto (the "Yonge Property'). The Lawyer arranges the finaneing for the-developments.
[7] Rose and Thistle was incorporated on June 16, 2003 and has its registered address as 30 Hazelton Avenue. The Lawyer and her husband are the only shareholders, directors and officers of Rose and Thistle. Rose and Thistle is a private land and investment company that owns and operates a stable of commercial real estate properties in the Greater Toronto Area.
[8] Hazelton Property Management Ltd. ("Hazelton") was incorporated on September 16, 2002 and has as its registered address 30 Hazelton Avenue. The Lawyer uses Hazelton to manage and develop properties.
[9] D.N. was born on October 27, 1917 and is not related to the Lawyer by blood, marriage or adoption. The Lawyer began acting for D.N. in 1998 when she prepared a will and a power of attorney for D.N. Subsequently, the Lawyer prepared an additional four or five revised wills for D.N. The Lawyer is the sole estate trustee for D.N. and holds a continuing power of attorney for property and a power of attorney for personal care for D.N.
[10] A.O. was born in 1927 and is a friend of D.N. A.O. was introduced to the Lawyer in or about January 2003 by D.N. A.O. is not related to the Lawyer by blood, marriage or adoption. Prior to meeting the Lawyer, A.O. owned three properties that were mortgaged and the Lawyer was not aware of the extent of A.O.'s previous investment experience.
(b) Particular 1: Alleged Conflict of Interest
[11] On July 5, 2002 the Lawyer and her husband purchased all of the shares of 364808 Ontario Limited ("Davenport"), a company that owned the Davenport Property. At the time, the Davenport Property was subject to a $\$ 1$ million first mortgage in favour of Foremost Financial Corp. (the "Foremost Mortgage"). The Foremost Mortgage was assumed by the Lawyer and her husband when they purchased Davenport.
[12] In October 2002 the Lawyer acted for D.N. on the sale of D.N.'s home. On October 26, 2002 the Lawyer deposited the purchaser's $\$ 12,000$ deposit into the Firm's trust account. On December 12, 2002 the sale closed and the Lawyer received the net proceeds of sale of $\$ 221,242.66$ into the Firm's trust account. The Lawyer transferred $\$ 1,836.88$ to the Firm's general account for fees on the sale. D.N. loaned $\$ 150,000$ to Davenport ('First D.N. Loan"). From the net proceeds, the Lawyer transferred $\$ 150,000$ to the credit of Davenport and the balance, being $\$ 81,405.78$, was paid to D.N. The First D.N. Loan was secured by a mortgage, discussed further below. The Lawyer did not recommend, and D.N. did not obtain, independent legal advice or independent legal representation with respect to the First D.N. Loan.
[13] On January 6, 2003 the Lawyer registered a second collateral mortgage for $\$ 4.5$ million against the Davenport Property in favour of Laurentian Bank of Canada ('Laurentian Mortgage"). The Laurentian Mortgage was collateral security for a mortgage registered against the Yonge Property. The Laurentian Mortgage was discharged against the Davenport Property on December 17, 2003.
[14] A.O. learned from D.N. that D.N. had made an investment with the Lawyer with a favourable interest rate. A.O. then contacted the Lawyer about making a similar investment and on January 24, 2003, A.O. gave the Lawyer a cheque in the amount of $\$ 129,750$, made out to the Firm in trust ("First A.O. Loan"). The Lawyer deposited the First A.O. Loan into the Firm's trust account. The First A.O. Loan was secured by a mortgage, discussed further below. The Lawyer did not recommend, and A.O. did not obtain, independent legal advice or independent legal representation with respect to the First A.O. Loan. The Lawyer disbursed the First A.O. Loan from the Firm's trust account as follows:

| DATE | DISBURSED TO | AMOUNT |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| January 31,2002 | Hazelton | $\$ 40,000$ |
| January 31,2003 | The Firm | $\$ 18,725$ |
| February 3,2003 | Hazelton | $\$ 50,000$ |
| February 11,2003 | Mark M. Orkin, in trust | $\$ 21,025$ |

[15] On April 25, 2003 D.N. loaned an additional $\$ 80,000$ to Davenport ("Second D.N. Loan"). The funds were deposited into the Firm's trust account and secured by a mortgage discussed below. The Lawyer did not recommend, and D.N. did not obtain, independent legal advice or independent legal representation with respect to the Second D.N. Loan. On April 25, 2003, the Lawyer paid the Second D.N. Loan to Hazelton.
[16] On April 25, 2003 A.O. loaned an additional $\$ 70,000$ ("Second A.O. Loan"). The funds were deposited into the Firm's trust account and secured by a mortgage discussed below. The Lawyer did not recommend, and A.O. did not obtain, independent legal advice or independent legal representation with respect to the Second A.O. Loan. The Lawyer disbursed the Second A.O. Loan from the Firm's trust account as follows:

| DATE | DISBURSED TO | AMOUNT |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| May 13, 2003 | Hazelton | $\$ 30,000$ |
| May 20, 2003 | The Firm | $\$ 40,000$ |

[17] The Lawyer acted for Davenport in relation to the loans made by D.N. and A.O. The Lawyer acted for D.N. and A.O. in relation to their loans to Davenport in that she prepared, registered and discharged all mortgage documents securing the loans.
(c) Particulars 2 \& 3: Alleged Failure to Serve D.N. and A.O. and Alleged Misleading of A.O. about the Nature and Particulars of Her Investments
[18] On December 30, 2002 the Lawyer sent D.N. a reporting letter regarding the sale of D.N.'s home. The letter stated, in part:

As discussed, we have arranged a mortgage on a condominium in Yorkville in the amount of $\$ 150,000$ paying $6 \%$ interest only. This will provide income of $\$ 750$ per month or $\$ 9,000$ per year, commencing February 28,2003 , to assist you in paying your rent without depleting your capital. [...] I have transferred the $\$ 150,000$ to [Davenport], the owner of the property, with interest of $1.5 \%$ from now until then. The mortgage will begin paying on January 31, 2003.

The schedule of payments into your account will be as follows:
January 31, 2003: $\quad \$ 281.25$ (approximately)
[...]
January 31, 2004: $\$ 750$
The amount of $\$ 150,000$ will then be due and payable back to you, unless you wish to extend the mortgage term for a further year. Each year, you will have the option of extendingn [sic] for a further year (assuming the purchaser wants to continue to extend as well).

The address is Suite 100, 185 Davenport Road, Toronto, Ontario. It is a 1,550 square feet main floor suite that will be registered as a condominium. A fellow named [J.G.] has purchased the condominium for $\$ 373,000$ and he is taking possession on January 31, 2003. [...]
[19] On January 16, 2003 the Lawyer sent A.O. a reporting letter regarding "Mortgage of 185 Davenport, Suite 100 ." The letter stated, in part:

As discussed, a purchaser named [J.G.] is purchasing Suite 100 at 185 Davenport Road with the purchase to close January 31,2003 . He is paying $\$ 373,000$ for the condominium, and requires a mortgage of $75 \%$ of the value of the condominium at a rate of $6 \%$ interest only for 12 months. The total mortgage is thus for $\$ 279,750$. [D.N.] will be investing $\$ 150,000$ of that amount leaving $\$ 129,750$ available for you to invest.

Your $\$ 129,750$ mortgage will provide income of $\$ 648.75$ per month or $\$ 7,785$ per year, commencing February 28, 2003. The benefit of an interest-only mortgage is it provides interest income without depleting your capital. As you requested, I will arrange a direct deposit into your account starting February 28, 2003. [...] We will need a cheque prior to January $24^{\text {th }}$ for $\$ 129,750$ payable to [the Firm] in trust.

The schedule of payments into your account will be as follows:
February 28, 2003:
$\$ 648.75$
[...]
January 31, 2004: $\$ 648.75$

The amount of $\$ 129,750$ will then be due and payable back to you, unless you wish to extend the mortgage term for a further year. Each year, you will have the option of extending for a further year (assuming the purchaser wants to continue to extend as well).

## [...]

[20] On February 13, 2003 the Lawyer sent a second reporting letter to A.O. stating, in part:

As promised, enclosed is a copy of the mortgage registered against Suite 100 at 185 Davenport Road. You will note the amount of $\$ 129,750$ beside your name, being the amount of your principal.

As discussed, we will deposit $\$ 648.75$ into your bank account at the end of every month commencing February 28, 2003 and ending January 31, 2004, at which time the $\$ 129,750$ you loaned will be due and payable in full. We in turn will be collecting this amount from [J.G.], the purchaser of Suite 100 .

If at the end of the first 12 months you wish to renew for another 12 months and [J.G.] also wishes to renew, the mortgage will be renewed for a further 12 months. If not, I will attempt to find another source of mortgage interest income for you.
[21] The enclosed mortgage document identified Davenport as the borrower and the lender as the Firm, trustee for D.N. as to $\$ 150,000$ and for A.O. as to $\$ 129,750$. The lands subject to the mortgage were identified as the Davenport Property as a whole. The mortgage document was registered on February 7, 2003 in the amount of $\$ 279,750$ ("First Davenport Mortgage"). Neither the Lawyer nor her husband personally guaranteed the First Davenport Mortgage, or any subsequent mortgage securing D.N.'s or A.O.'s loans. The loans were ultimately paid in full.
[22] On May 5, 2003 the Lawyer sent a third reporting letter to A.O. stating, in part:
As discussed Suites 200 and 250, being the entire second floor of 185 Davenport Road, have been sold to [J.H.] for $\$ 600,000$. We will be registering a mortgage against both suites at 185 Davenport Road in the amount of $\$ 450,000-75 \%$ of the purchase price - of which you have contributed $\$ 70,000$. It will bear interest of $6 \%$ for the next 12 months.

We will deposit $\$ 350.00$ into your bank account at the end of every month (in addition to the $\$ 648.75$ already being deposited from the $\$ 129,750$ mortgage) commencing May 31, 2003 and ending April 30, 2004, at which time the $\$ 70,000$ you loaned will be due and payable in full. We in turn will be collecting this amount from [J.H.], the purchaser of Suites 200 and 250.

If at the end of the first 12 months you wish to renew for another 12 months and [J.H.] also wishes to renew, the mortgage will be renewed for a further 12 months. If not, I will attempt to find another source of mortgage interest income for you.
[...] We will forward a copy of the charge once registered.
[23] On March 5, 2004 the Lawyer sent a fourth reporting letter stating, in part:
Enclosed is a copy of the mortgage registered against Suites 200 and 250 at 185 Davenport Road. You will note we are the Trustee for you and [D.N.] as to the amounts provided. You will note the amount of $\$ 70,000$ beside your name, being the amount of your principal.

We will continue to deposit $\$ 350.00$ into your bank account at the end of every month, having commenced those deposits on May 31, 2003 continuing to April 30,2004 , at which time the $\$ 70,000$ you loaned will be due and payable in full. We in turn will be collecting this amount from [J.H.], the purchaser of Suites 200 and 250 (the entire second floor).

If at the end of the first 12 months you wish to renew for another 12 months and [J.H.] also wishes to renew, the mortgage will be renewed for a further 12 months. If not, I will attempt to find another source of mortgage interest income for you.
[24] On March 8, 2004 the Lawyer registered a mortgage in the amount of \$429,500 against the Davenport Property as a whole ("Second Davenport Mortgage"). The borrower is identified as Davenport and the lender as the Firm, trustee for D.N. as to $\$ 230,000$ and for A.O. as to $\$ 199,500$ [sic]. The Second Davenport Mortgage ought to have been in the amount of $\$ 429,750$ and had an interest rate of $6 \%$. The Lawyer intended the Second Davenport Mortgage to replace the First Davenport Mortgage and secure all of D.N.'s and A.O.'s investments.
[25] On January 18, 2005 a Condominium Declaration for the Davenport Property was registered as Toronto Standard Condominium Plan No. 1652. A number of the units at the Davenport Property were sold prior to this registration. The final closing of the sold units took place following the registration. On the closings, the Lawyer was required to register partial discharges of the Second Davenport Mortgage. All of the units were sold with the exception of Suite 300, which was retained by Davenport.
[26] On April 19, 2005 the Lawyer sent a fifth reporting letter to A.O. setting out the mortgage renewal particulars for A.O.'s combined loans in the amount of $\$ 199,750$. The letter only contained reference to Suites 200 and 250. The letter stated, in part:

We will continue to collect the monies owing from the purchaser on your behalf, and deposit into your bank account at the end of each month. Your mortgage will be due and payable in full on April 30, 2006. If at that time you wish to renew for another 12 months, the mortgage will be renewed for a further 12 months.
[27] By November 25, 2005 the Second Davenport Mortgage had been discharged against all five suites, being $100,150,200,250$ and 300 . The Lawyer did not provide written notice to D.N. or to A.O. regarding these discharges and there are no written instructions from D.N. or A.O. authorizing the discharges.
[28] On November 29, 2005 the Lawyer registered a mortgage in the amount of $\$ 429,500$ against the Davenport Property, Suite 300, owned by Davenport. The borrower is identified as Davenport and the lender as the Firm, trustee for D.N. in the amount of $\$ 230,000$ and for A.O. in the amount of $\$ 199,500$ [sic] (the "Third Davenport Mortgage"). The Third Davenport Mortgage had an interest rate of $6 \%$ and ought to have been in the amount of $\$ 429,750$. At the time of registration, the Third Davenport Mortgage was in second place behind a new first mortgage for $\$ 650,000$ in favour of The

## Equitable Trust Company.

[29] On March 2, 2006 the Lawyer sent a sixth reporting letter to A.O. enclosing an "income tax receipt for 2005 interest income from your mortgage registered against 185 Davenport." The letter referred only to units 200 and 250 and the attached income tax receipt stated that the "mortgage principal amount owing as of December 31, 2005" was \$199,750.
[30] In September 2006 the Lawyer repaid A.O.'s loans and advised A.O. that 'the mortgage that was registered against 185 Davenport Road" was discharged on September 21, 2006. The Lawyer did not provide A.O. with copies of any trust statements showing disbursement of A.O.'s loans.
[31] On October 4, 2006 the Lawyer discharged the Third Davenport Mortgage and registered a new mortgage to secure D.N.'s continuing loans against Suite 300, in favour of the Firm, as trustee for D.N., and the Lawyer's parents (the "Fourth Davenport Mortgage"). There are no written instructions from D.N. authorizing the discharge of the Third Davenport Mortgage.
[32] On December 18, 2008 suite 300 was sold. On closing, the Fourth Davenport Mortgage was discharged. There are no written instructions from D.N. authorizing the discharge of the Fourth Davenport Mortgage.
[33] On January 5, 2009 the Lawyer registered a new mortgage against 247 Ranee Drive in Toronto, Ontario (the "Ranee Property") in the name of D.N. (the "Ranee Mortgage"). The Ranee Property was owned by 1304362 Ontario Limited, a company owned by the Lawyer and her husband. The Ranee Mortgage was in second place behind a first mortgage in the amount of $\$ 700,000$ in favour of $B \& M$ Handelman Investments Limited and others.
[34] The Ranee Property was sold with a closing date of June 9, 2009. On June 3, 2009 the Lawyer discharged the Ranee Mortgage. There are no written instructions from D.N. authorizing the discharge of the Ranee Mortgage. Following the sale of the Ranee Property, D.N.'s loans were not secured by a registered mortgage on any property.
[35] On February 4, 2010 the Lawyer repaid D.N.'s loans, paying $\$ 168,230.97$ in principal and $\$ 2,165$ in interest.
[36] With the exception of the December 30, 2002 letter sent by the Lawyer to D.N., the Lawyer did not provide any written reports to D.N. regarding her total loan investment of $\$ 230,000$. The Lawyer did not report to D.N. in writing regarding the:
(a) discharge of the First Davenport Mortgage on March 8, 2004;
(b) registration of the Second Davenport Mortgage on March 8, 2004;
(c) discharges of the Second Davenport Mortgage between January 18, 2005 and November 25, 2005;
(d) registration of the Third Davenport Mortgage on November 29, 2005;
(e) discharge of the Third Davenport Mortgage on October 4, 2006;
(f) registration of the Fourth Davenport Mortgage on October 4, 2006;
(g) discharge of the Fourth Davenport Mortgage on December 18, 2008;
(h) registration on the Ranee Mortgage on January 5, 2009; and
(i) discharge of the Ranee Mortgage on June 3, 2009.
[37] Also with respect to D.N., the Lawyer did not:
(a) provide D.N. with copies of any trust statements showing disbursements of D.N.'s loans (and there is no evidence that D.N. requested copies of trust statements showing disbursements of her loans);
(b) ask D.N. to provide written authorization to discharge her mortgage security; or
(c) provide D.N. with copies of any mortgages registered, discharged or substituted on D.N.'s behalf as security for her loans.
[38] The Lawyer did obtain written authorizations from her parents, also clients, to discharge a mortgage they held against suite 100 of the Davenport Property, signed in advance of the final closing of the sale of Suite 100 to J.G.
(d) Particular 2(d): Alleged Failure to Register Mortgages in a Timely Manner
[39] The First D.N. Loan was transferred to Davenport by December 30, 2002. The funds from the First A.O. Loan were received by the Firm on January 24, 2003. The Lawyer registered the First Davenport Mortgage securing these loans on February 7, 2003-39 days after the First D.N. Loan and 14 days after the First A.O. Loan.
[40] The Second D.N. Loan and the Second A.O. Loan were advanced on April 25, 2003. The Lawyer registered the Second Davenport Mortgage securing the total combined loans of $\$ 429,500$ (which ought to have been $\$ 429,750$ ) on March 8, $2004-319$ days after receiving the loans from D.N. and A.O.
[41] The Lawyer registered the final discharge of the Second Davenport Mortgage on November 25, 2005 but did not register the Third Davenport Mortgage until November 29,2005 , four days later.
[42] The Lawyer discharged the Fourth Davenport Mortgage on December 18, 2008 and registered the Ranee Mortgage on January 5, 2009, leaving a gap of 18 days.
[43] On June 3, 2009 the Lawyer discharged the Ranee Mortgage and did not register any replacement mortgage security securing D.N.'s loans.
(e) Particular 4: Alleged Failure to Complete Forms 18A and 18B Regarding Loans and Release of Collateral or Substitution of Security
[44] The Lawyer did not prepare an Investment Authority (Form 18A). Neither D.N. nor A.O. signed a Form 18A in connection with their first respective advances of funds to, or on behalf of, Davenport.
[45] The Lawyer did not deliver a complete Report on the Investment (Form 18B) to either D.N. or A.O. with respect to any of their loans, nor did she provide them with a reporting letter containing all of the required information, including the name and address of the borrower, the legal description of the property and the rank of the particular mortgage.
[46] The Lawyer did not complete Forms 18A and 18B regarding the discharges of the First Davenport Mortgage, the Second Davenport Mortgage, the Third Davenport Mortgage, the Fourth Davenport Mortgage or the Ranee Mortgage.
(f) Particular 5: Alleged Failure to Maintain a Mortgage Asset Ledger, Mortgage Liability Ledger and Monthly Comparisons
[47] The Lawyer did not maintain a mortgage asset ledger, a mortgage liability ledger, or monthly reconciliations of the principal balances outstanding on the mortgages and the balances held on behalf of D.N. and A.O. in relation to any of the mortgages.
(g) Particular 8: Alleged Filing of Inaccurate or Misleading Member's Annual Reports
(i) Reporting Borrowing from Clients
[48] Lawyers are required to report in their Member's Annual Report ("MAR") to the Law Society whether they are indebted, directly or indirectly, to a person who, at the time of borrowing, was or had been a client.
[49] The First D.N. Loan was made to Davenport in December 2002 and the last mortgage, being the Ranee Mortgage, was discharged on February 4, 2010. The Lawyer's MARs from 2002 to 2006 do not report any indebtedness to D.N.
[50] The First A.O. Loan was made on January 24, 2003 and A.O. was repaid on September 21, 2006. The Lawyer's MARs from 2003 to 2006 do not report any indebtedness to A.O.
[51] On her 2007 MAR the Lawyer answered "Yes" in response to whether she was indebted, directly or indirectly, to a client. The Lawyer provided the following particulars: "Our company [Davenport] borrowed money from my parents [J.R. and D.M.R.], who are clients of our firm, and my adopted grandmother, [D.N]." The particulars do not include the amount of the loan, the security provided or particulars of independent legal representation for the lender, as required by the MAR. The Lawyer did not consult the Income Tax Act (Canada) for the definition of "related person" before completing her 2007 MAR. D.N. and the Lawyer are not related persons.
[52] The Lawyer's MAR for 2008 does not report her indebtedness to D.N.
[53] On her 2009 MAR the Lawyer answered "Yes" in response to whether she was indebted, directly or indirectly, to a client. While the Lawyer provided the following particulars, she failed to include the name of the borrower, the amount of the loan, the security provided and particulars of independent legal representation for the lender, as required by the MAR:

From 2003 through to February 2010, [my husband] and I borrowed monies from [D.N], a good friend of mine and also a client. We also were indebted to [A.O.] for the period from 2003 through to 2006 when she was paid back in full, although [A.O.] was never a legal client of ours. Finally, we borrowed monies from my parents during that same time period - 2003 to 2010 - and remain indebted to them and they are clients of ours as well.

The above-described loans were sometimes processed through corporations that [R. W.] and I owned to the three parties already mentioned above, namely [D.N.], [A.O.] and [J.R and D.M.R.].
(ii) Reporting Mortgage Transactions
[54] Lawyers are required to report on their MAR (i) whether they hold, directly or indirectly, mortgages or other charges on real property in trust for clients or other persons, and (ii) whether they acted for, or received money from, lenders whose loans were secured by a charge or charges on real property.
[55] The Lawyer received money from D.N. into the Firm's trust account in December 2002 and on April 25, 2003. The Firm is listed as the lender in trust for D.N. on the First Davenport Mortgage, the Second Davenport Mortgage, the Third Davenport Mortgage and the Fourth Davenport Mortgage, spanning 2003 to 2008.
[56] The Lawyer received money from A.O. into the Firm's trust account on January 24, 2003 and on April 25, 2003. The Firm is listed as the lender in trust for A.O. on the First Davenport Mortgage, the Second Davenport Mortgage and the Third Davenport Mortgage, spanning 2003 to 2006.
[57] The Lawyer answered "No" on her 2002 and 2003 MARs in response to whether she acted for or received money from a lender who was lending money secured by a charge on real property.

## (h) Particular 9: Alleged Misappropriation of Trust Funds

[58] In 2002 and 2003 the Lawyer and her husband developed the Davenport Property and the Yonge Property for sale as residential condominiums.
[59] The Condominium Act, 1998 (the "Act") applies to the sale of residential condominium units. Under the Act, a "declarant" of a condominium is the company that owns the land
and registers the declaration and description. Section 81 of the Act requires that all deposit moneys paid by a prospective purchaser, including funds paid on interim occupancy, be held in trust by the declarant's solicitor or by a prescribed trustee until the completion of the transaction, unless the declarant delivers "prescribed security" to the purchaser to protect the deposits.

## (i) The Davenport Property

[60] On November 25, 2002 J.G. entered into an agreement of purchase and sale ("APS") with Davenport to purchase Suite 100 at 185 Davenport for $\$ 373,000$. The APS was executed by the Lawyer on behalf of Davenport. Under the APS, J.G. paid an immediate deposit of $\$ 25,000$ to Davenport's real estate agent with the balance of the purchase price due on completion of the transaction. The APS also provided that an additional $25 \%$ of the purchase price, less the deposit paid to the agent, was due on the interim occupancy date "to be held in trust" by the Firm pending completion or other termination of the APS. J.G. was represented by a lawyer on both the interim occupancy and final closing.
[61] The interim occupancy closing for J.G. took place on January 30, 2003 and the Possession Statement of Adjustments directs J.G. to pay $\$ 68,397.24$ to the Firm in trust, representing the supplementary deposit or interim occupancy funds, pursuant to the APS. This amount was paid by J.G. and deposited to the Firm's trust account on February 3, 2003.
[62] By April 4, 2003 the Lawyer disbursed all of J.G.'s interim occupancy funds to the Firm's general account by eight trust cheques, each signed by the Lawyer. The Lawyer relied on a document entitled Bond, Guarantee and Indemnity, dated December 6, 2002, and a document entitled Bonding Agreement, dated January 30, 2003 (collectively the "Bonding Agreements"), as her authority for using J.G.'s trust funds in this manner. The Lawyer did not provide a copy of the Bonding Agreements to J.G. or his solicitor.
[63] The Bond, Guarantee and Indemnity states:
364808 Ontario Limited (" 364808 ") is receiving monies from Walton Advocates in trust to finance construction of the five condominium suites at 185 Davenport Road. In consideration of the advance of these funds, and recognizing that something may happen prior to the closing of the sale of these five suites that requires repayment of the monies to Walton Advocates in trust or ultimately to the purchasers, both 364808 and Ron and Norma Walton personally, them being the only directors of 364808 , hereby bond, guarantee and indemnify Walton Advocates in trust and ultimately the purchasers for the monies being advanced to 364808. If under any circumstances the monies advanced need to be re-paid to Walton Advocates in trust, 364808 and Norma and Ron Walton will repay such funds forthwith upon the request being made by Walton Advocates in trust. Otherwise they will be applied against the ultimate purchase of units once condominium registration is obtained.
[64] The Bonding Agreement states:

WHEREAS 364808 is constructing condominium units for re-sale at 185 Davenport Road, Toronto, Ontario;

AND WHEREAS there will be purchasers who provide deposit monies to Walton Advocates in trust towards the purchase of one of those condominium units;

AND WHEREAS 364808 wishes to use those purchaser deposits to pay for the completion of construction;

AND WHEREAS Norma and Ron Walton are Directors and Shareholders of 364808;

THEREFORE 364808 and Norma and Ron Walton in their personal capacity hereby agree as follows:

1. 364808 will use the funds to pay to complete the construction of the units being purchased.
2. Forthwith upon demand, 364808 will return to Walton Advocates in trust the full amount of the deposits that are being used for construction.
3. If 364808 does not forthwith return the monies, Norma and Ron Walton personally will forthwith return the monies and will in turn collect the monies from 364808.
[65] On March 4, 2003 J.H. signed an APS to purchase Suites 200 and 250 at the Davenport Property for the initial price of $\$ 600,000$. The Lawyer and her husband accepted J.H.'s APS on behalf of the vendor, Davenport, on March 8, 2003. The APS required that J.H. pay an immediate deposit of $\$ 25,000$ to the vendor's real estate agent to be held in trust pending completion or other termination of the APS, with the balance of the purchase price due on completion of the transaction. The APS also provided that an additional $\$ 125,000$ was due on the interim occupancy date "to be held in trust" by the Firm pending completion or other termination of the APS. The initial interim occupancy date was in July 2003 but was later changed to August 27, 2003. J.H. was represented by a lawyer on the interim occupancy closing.
[66] On June 27, 2003 the Lawyer requested an additional deposit of $\$ 35,000$ be paid to the Firm, in trust, to bring the total deposit up to $10 \%$ of the purchase price. On July 3, 2003 J.H. provided a bank draft for $\$ 35,000$ payable to the Firm, in trust. The funds were deposited to the Firm's trust account on July 4, 2003. J.H. also provided an additional $\$ 20,000$ to the Firm for extra construction work. By July 18, 2003 the Lawyer disbursed J.H.'s additional deposit of $\$ 35,000$ from the Firm's trust account to Hazelton.
[67] The interim occupancy closing took place on August 28, 2003 and the Possession Statement of Adjustments directs that $\$ 89,012.64$ (this reflects the unadjusted original
amount due on the interim closing, being $\$ 125,000$, with a credit of $\$ 35,000$ ), representing the additional sum required pursuant to the APS, be paid to the Firm, in trust. J.H. provided a certified cheque dated August 29, 2003 in the amount of $\$ 89,012.64$ payable to the Firm, in trust. The cheque was deposited to the Firm's trust account on September 2, 2003.
[68] By November 1, 2003 the Lawyer disbursed all of J.H.'s additional deposit and interim occupancy funds, totaling $\$ 124,012.64$, to Hazelton, Rose and Thistle, the vendor's real estate agent and the Firm's general account. The Lawyer signed all the trust cheques disbursing the funds. The Lawyer relied on the Bonding Agreements as her authority for using J.H.'s trust funds in this manner.
(ii) The Yonge Property
[69] 1549670 Ontario Inc. (" 154 ") is a company owned by the Lawyer and her husband and Located at 30 Hazelton Ave., Toronto. 154 owns the Yonge Property, a mixed use project containing both residential and commercial units. 154 sold five residential units in the Yonge Property, namely Suites 204, 205, 206, 207 and 304 in five separate transactions. Hazelton acted as agent for the vendor, 154, and the Lawyer acted for both Hazelton and 154 on each transaction. The five APSs for the Yonge Property all had the following provisions:
a) the APS was made between the purchaser and Hazelton;
b) there were staged deposits payable by the purchaser to Hazelton, in trust; and
c) the following clause was the heading "General":
4. The Purchaser acknowledges that amounts payable to the Vendor's solicitors pursuant to this Agreement, if any, may be paid by the Vendor's solicitors to the Vendor or as the Vendor may direct, upon delivery of prescribed security to the Purchaser for repayment in accordance with the provisions of the Act or upon the Purchaser's default hereunder and the Purchaser hereby irrevocable [sic] authorizes and directs the Vendor's solicitors to release such funds, if any, to the Vendor or as it may direct in such event. The foregoing may be pleaded as an estoppel or bar to any subsequent action by the Purchaser against the Vendor or the Vendor's solicitor with respect to such deposit funds.
[70] On the interim occupancy closings of the five units, the Firm received a total of $\$ 191,188.23$, in trust, from the purchasers. These funds were immediately disbursed from the Firm's trust account by the Lawyer to Hazelton in trust. The Lawyer relied on the Bonding Agreement for the Yonge Property as her authority for using the trust funds in this manner.

## (j) Particular 10: Alleged Co-Mingled Personal/Corporate Funds with Client Funds

[71] During 2003 to 2006 the Firm regularly received and deposited into its trust accounts funds belonging to Davenport, Rose and Thistle and 154, all corporations owned by the Lawyer and her husband. The Lawyer acknowledges that corporate and personal funds were put through the Firm's trust accounts and co-mingled with client funds.
[72] In addition to the facts agreed upon by the parties in the ASF, the parties also agreed that fact witnesses would be called at the hearing to give evidence that does not contradict the facts agreed upon in the ASF. The Law Society called the following witnesses: Jan Walker, an intake resolution officer with the Law Society; Vicki MacArthur of Teranet; Auldeen Oldham, otherwise known as A.O. (D.N. has not waived solicitor-client privilege but A.O. has waived her privilege); and Catherine Helen Campbell, assistant manager, legal counsel to Investigations at the Law Society. An expert report by Reuben Rosenblatt was admitted on consent. The Lawyer gave oral evidence at the hearing on her own behalf. The Lawyer did not call any additional witnesses.

## EVIDENCE OF THE LAW SOCIETY

## (a) Jan Walker

[73] A.O. filed a complaint against the Lawyer with the Law Society on June 13, 2006. Ms. Walker is an intake resolution officer at the Law Society. She has been employed with the Law Society since 1997. Ms. Walker was assigned A.O.'s complaint and first contacted the Lawyer in early August 2006. The Lawyer explained to Ms. Walker that the reason for the delay in repayment of A.O.'s loan was that "[J.H.] was trying to arrange other financing." Ms. Walker spoke to the Lawyer again on August 15, 2006 and the Lawyer advised her that A.O. "did not appear to understand that the mortgage was not with [the Lawyer]." On August 30, 2006 Ms. Walker spoke to A.O. and A.O. asked Ms. Walker to hold off taking any further action with the Lawyer because the Lawyer told A.O. that "if she went back to the Law Society to cause a problem then there would be no payment." Ms. Walker kept contemporaneous notes of her conversations with both the Lawyer and A.O.
[74] Ms. Walker confirmed that the Lawyer did not advise her of any health issues or of the birth of her twins during their telephone conversations. Ms. Walker stated that if the Lawyer had, then Ms. Walker would have made a notation in her notes. There were no such notations.
(b) Vicki MacArthur
[75] The affidavit of Ms. MacArthur sworn on February 3, 2012 was submitted on consent. Ms. MacArthur is the director of product development at Teranet. Attached to the Lawyer's March 5, 2004 reporting letter to D.N. was a document purporting to be a mortgage registered against the Davenport Property (the "Purported Mortgage"). Ms. MacArthur's affidavit explains that when a document is being prepared, prior to submission to the Land Registry Office, Teranet automatically generates the notation "This document has not been submitted and may be incomplete" and the text "In preparation on [date] at [time]" on the mortgage document. Ms. MacArthur goes on to
explain that once the document has been successfully submitted to the Land Registry Office, text such as "The applicant(s) hereby applies to the Land Registrar" and the text "Receipted as [instrument number] on [date] at [time]." Ms. MacArthur concluded her affidavit by stating "I am not aware of any circumstances in which the [Purported Mortgage] would be generated by Teraview, without the report requirements identified above regarding documents in preparation, submitted or certified." There was no crossexamination of Ms. MacArthur.

## (c) Auldeen Oldham

[76] On February 7, 2008 A.O. swore an affidavit. A.O. also attended the hearing to give her evidence orally, adopting her affidavit. A.O. was cross-examined.
[77] The Lawyer told A.O. that J.G. needed to borrow money for the purchase of a unit at the Davenport Property and that the Lawyer would arrange a mortgage. A.O. stated: "I thought the mortgage was for [J.G.] and that it would be a first mortgage. I probably assumed the mortgage would be a first mortgage. The Lawyer did not specifically discuss that issue with me." Further, A.O. thought "the mortgage would be held in the name of [D.N.] and me," that J.G. "was paying the interest on our loan and that the Lawyer was depositing the payments into our accounts as a matter of convenience" and she "expected the mortgage to be registered immediately." A.O. had the same beliefs about the Second A.O. Loan that she believed to be a mortgage to J.H. She went on to state:

I never would have loaned money to a number company owned by the Lawyer and her husband. I would have investigated the whole situation if I had known a number company was borrowing the money. ...
[78] With respect to the Second A.O. Loan, made on April 25, 2003, A.O. "expected the new mortgage to be registered right away by the Lawyer." Regarding the Second Davenport Mortgage, A.O. confirmed that the Lawyer never asked her if she and D.N. wanted their loans rolled into one mortgage.
[79] A.O.'s loan was due and payable on April 30, 2006. On April 4, 2006 she informed the Lawyer that she did not wish to renew the mortgage and asked that her $\$ 199,750$ principal be remitted to her bank account on April 30, 2006. When the funds were not returned to A.O. by June 10, 2006, she submitted a complaint to the Law Society. On June 12, 2006 A.O. advised the Lawyer that she wanted her money and was going to seek assistance from the Law Society. A.O. kept notes of her conversations with the Lawyer. A.O. stated that the Lawyer became upset with her and told her: "We have your money not the Law Society. All the Law Society will do is call us and we will explain what's going on." The Lawyer agreed to pay A.O. $11 \%$ interest on her loan from June $1^{\text {st }}$ to the date she received repayment. Through the summer of 2006 the Lawyer continued to tell A.O. that she would receive her money by a certain date but each time she failed to make payment. On August 15, 2006 the Lawyer telephoned A.O. and stated: "If you call the Law Society again I will not pay you." It was not until September 21, 2006 that A.O. finally received full repayment of her loans.
[80] In her evidence, A.O. was clear that she relied on the Lawyer to protect her interests and she did not enquire about the details of the mortgages because "[the Lawyer] was looking after it; she was the lawyer." A.O. confirmed that she never authorized or consented to the Lawyer registering discharges of any of the mortgages and that the Lawyer had never suggested to A.O. that she ought to consult another lawyer regarding the loans.

## (d) Catherine Campbell

[81] Ms. Campbell, legal counsel to Investigations at the Law Society, interviewed the Lawyer on February 19, 2010. The Lawyer admitted in her interview that "in hindsight" she appreciated that D.N. was a client at the time of the loans but maintained that she did not appreciate that D.N. was her client at the time of the loans. Similarly, with respect to Rule 2.06(5), the Lawyer stated that in hindsight she realized that the loan transactions were "neither sensible nor in accordance with the Law Society's rules" and that she "would do it differently in the future." The Lawyer also confirmed that she did not provide Form 18A to D.N. or A.O. at any time. During the interview, the Lawyer took the position that the reporting letters described in detail above were simply chatty letters and not formal reporting letters. With respect to the Purported Mortgage, the Lawyer could not offer any reasonable explanation for it during her interview and undertook to find out if it was ever registered.
[82] In November 2006 Ms . Campbell wrote to the Lawyer seeking a written response to a number of questions. The Lawyer replied on January 31, 2007, writing that J.G. and J.H. required mortgages to finance their purchases of condominium units and that the Lawyer arranged for D.N. and A.O. to provide the money for these mortgages. The Lawyer stated that J.G. and J.H. paid the interest on the mortgages. The Lawyer wrote:
[J.G.] took possession of Suite $100 \ldots$ and he paid interest on a mortgage of $\$ 279,750$, representing $75 \%$ of the purchase price $\ldots$ We arranged with [D.N.] and [A.O.] to provide the funds for that mortgage which was registered against [the Davenport Property] for $\$ 279,750$. .... We agreed to collect the monies from [J.G.] each month and automatically deposit them into [D.N.'s] and [A.O.'s] and accounts, which we did. This trusteeship arrangement was for banking convenience only, and was to the benefit of [A.O.] and [D.N.] and they were both delighted with the arrangement.

1. ... I considered it a non-arms length transaction and therefore did not provide either [A.O.] or [D.N.] with Forms 18a and 18b. I did provide them with most of the information contained on those forms verbally. In future, I will provide forms 18 a and 18 b in any private transactions to avoid any misunderstandings.
2. I did not prepare a Client Ledger or Mortgage Asset Ledger ... In future, I will prepare them even if the loan is between family or friends;
3. [A.O.] was paid interest only on the first day of each month for the prior month, and [J.G.] and [J.H.] paid the interest income and we then transferred it to [A.O.];
[84] Ms. Campbell testified that there is no evidence in any of the Lawyer's files that show that any money was ever loaned to J.G. or J.H. by either D.N. or A.O. The interim occupancy fees being paid by J.H. and J.G. were used to pay the interest to D.N. and A.O. on the monies loaned. During the interview the Lawyer explained to Ms. Campbell that she felt that she was "administering" the mortgages for A.O. and D.N. and this was her reasoning for registering them in the name of the Firm in trust for A.O. and D.N. At no time did the Lawyer obtain a written consent, authorization or direction from A.O. or D.N.
[85] During her interview with Ms. Campbell the Lawyer said that she relied on the Bonding Agreements as her authorization for using the purchaser's deposit funds and releasing them from the trust account because she believed that the Bonding Agreements protected the deposit funds. The Lawyer prepared the Bonding Agreements and told Ms. Campbell that she did not consult with any other lawyers. The Lawyer did speak to three builders about the Bonding Agreements and she relied on their advice that she was permitted to use the deposits as long as they were bonded. Despite the wording of the Bonding Agreements, the funds were never paid to Davenport but were rather paid to the Firm because the Firm had paid the vendors. The funds were deposited into the Firm's trust account and then transferred to the general account.
[86] In her interview, the Lawyer stated: "Now with the benefit of time and far more knowledge about how you go about doing these sorts of developments, I realize that the fact that I was both the developer and the lawyer was a real problem because I did not differentiate between [the Firm] in trust and the developer because we were one and the same in my mind." But the Lawyer maintained her position that at the time of the creation of the Bonding Agreements she "had no question in [her] mind" and she "was a hundred percent confident ... that everything we were doing was proper." The Lawyer admitted that, in hindsight, it was "very stupid" not to look at the relevant legislation and regulations concerning "prescribed security."
[87] The-Lawyer confirmed in her interview with Ms. Campbell that no notice was given to the purchasers or their lawyers regarding the dispersing of the deposit funds from the trust account and the Lawyer also confirmed that there were no assets backing up the Bonding Agreements. During the interview, the Lawyer also stated that, in hindsight, she agreed that the Bonding Agreements did not entitle her to use the trust funds. In correspondence to the lawyers for two purchasers, the Lawyer assured them that "the deposit will be held in trust at TD Canada Trust attracting interest, albeit a nominal amount, until the condominium is registered and title can be transferred." During the interview, Ms. Campbell put to the Lawyer that it appeared that the Lawyer was trying to mislead the purchasers and their lawyers. The Lawyer responded: "That was never my intention. I was always very confident that what we were doing with the bonding
agreement was in accordance with generally accepted practices in the construction industry ...".
[88] Ms. Campbell testified that she viewed a number of deficiencies in the Lawyer's reporting letters to D.N. and A.O. including the borrower of the funds not being clearly identified, no reference to the priority of the mortgage, and no reference to any prior encumbrances. In reviewing the Lawyer's files, there was no evidence that any money was ever lent by D.N. or A.O. to J.G. or J.H. and there was no evidence of any written consents or authorizations from either D.N. or A.O. Further, there was no evidence in the Lawyer's file about reporting to A.O. on the registration of the Third Davenport Mortgage or any of the discharges.
[89] There was no cross-examination of Ms. Campbell.

## (e) Report of Reuben Rosenblatt

[90] The report of Mr. Rosenblatt was admitted on consent. Mr. Rosenblatt's opinion was that the Lawyer "fell below the standard of care of a reasonably competent solicitor" both in the manner that she dealt with D.N.'s and A.O.'s mortgage transactions and in disbursing the trust funds of the purchasers of proposed condominium units. He also concluded that a reasonably competent solicitor would have recognized that D.N. was her client at the time of the loans, that the Rules required that D.N. have independent legal representation, and that Forms 18A and 18B were required to be completed. In addition, a reasonably competent solicitor would have explained the risks of the loan to D.N. The same conclusions apply to A.O.
[91] Mr. Rosenblatt was also of the opinion that the Lawyer fell below the standard of care of a reasonably competent solicitor practicing in Ontario in the following ways:
(a) by failing to recognize that A.O. and D.N. were her clients;
(b) by failing to advise A.O. and D.N. to obtain independent legal representation;
(c) by failing to disclose who the borrowers were and who was financially obligated to repay the loans;
(d) by failing to explain the risks of the loan and mortgage investments and failing to disclose material facts;
(e) by signing discharges of mortgages without written authorizations or directions from D.N. or A.O.; and
(f) by failing to register mortgages in a timely manner.
[92] Further, Mr. Rosenblatt expressed the opinion that the Firm was in breach of the terms of the trust in favour of the purchasers of condominium units by releasing the trust funds without authorizations or directions, and that the Lawyer fell below the standard of care
of a reasonably competent solicitor by releasing those trust funds.
[93] The report also explained the concept of a phantom mortgage as follows: when a building is being developed into a condominium, a vendor may require the purchasers to take possession of their unit as soon as they are fit for occupancy, but before closing; this date is called the interim occupancy date or closing; title does not transfer on this date and the purchaser is not required to pay the purchase price; but the vendor does charge an occupancy fee while the purchaser is living in the unit prior to the final closing date and transfer of title. To calculate a reasonable occupancy fee, an APS sets out a number of factors such as taxes, monthly common expenses and interest that the purchaser would hypothetically pay if they had a mortgage for the balance of the purchase price that would eventually be due on closing. This hypothetical mortgage interest component of the interim occupancy fee is called the phantom mortgage.

## EVIDENCE OF THE LAWYER

[94] The Lawyer gave evidence on her own behalf. She was born in 1970 in London, Ontario and received her LL.B. in 1993. The Lawyer articled with the family law firm Epstein Cole LLP and was called to the Bar in February 1995 along with her husband. From 1995 to 2000 the Lawyer's practice was focused on family law, with some ancillary wills/estate and real estate work. In 2002 the Lawyer obtained an Executive MBA. The Lawyer also self-published a book called "Seven Steps to Successful Separation." In $2002 / 2003$ approximately $20-30 \%$ of the Lawyer's practice related to real estate. The Lawyer's current practice is $50 \%$ real estate and $50 \%$ corporate/commercial.
[95] The Lawyer first entered into the real estate development business in 2001 when she purchased a property on Hazelton Avenue in Toronto with her husband. They used part of the property as the office for the Firm, and they severed and redeveloped the remainder of the property resulting in a $\$ 1.2$ million increase in its value.
(a) D.N. and A.O.
[96] The Lawyer described in detail how she met D.N., initially did some wills/estate work for her, and then developed what the Lawyer described as a close relationship with D.N. that continued to the date of the hearing. With respect to D.N.'s loans, the Lawyer said that the only reason that she felt comfortable with D.N. investing with her was because J.G. had just agreed to purchase Suite 300 at a price that validated the investment. The Lawyer said that she would never have agreed to D.N. investing unless J.G. made the purchase and that she saw D.N.'s investment as a win-win situation because the Lawyer would also be benefitting with a better mortgage rate. At the time of her investment, D.N. was in her mid-eighties.
[97] During her evidence, the Lawyer stated that she did not believe that independent legal advice was necessary for D.N. because the Lawyer believed that her and D.N.'s interests were the same and she viewed her relationship with D.N. as one of grandmothergranddaughter and not one of lawyer-client or lender-borrower. While the Lawyer considered herself to be D.N.'s lawyer on the sale of her home, she did not view her role
as one of a lawyer in D.N.'s investment "because it was between me and her, as opposed to me as the lawyer representing her with a third-party lender." She also stated that she was unaware of the Rules, the By-Laws and Forms 18A and 18B at the time of D.N.'s investment. Under cross-examination the Lawyer did not disagree that she was D.N.'s lawyer, but took the position that with respect to D.N.'s loans, she viewed them as an investment opportunity and not as a solicitor-client relationship.
[98] The Lawyer described being introduced to A.O. by D.N. and A.O.'s desire to invest and receive the same return that D.N. was receiving. A.O. and the Lawyer did not develop a close relationship like the Lawyer testified she did with D.N., but the Lawyer said that she treated A.O. the same way that she treated D.N. and did not view A.O. as a client. The Lawyer hired A.O.'s son to work at the Firm and he was privy to all the conversations concerning Davenport. At the time of her investments, A.O. was in her mid-seventies.
[99] The Lawyer stated that it was "crystal clear" that A.O. understood that she was loaning the funds to the Lawyer and the Lawyer's husband and not to J.G. or J.H. because the Lawyer advised her verbally. With respect to the First A.O. Loan, the Lawyer told the panel that all of the funds had been used to renovate the Davenport Property. Concerning the various reporting letters sent to A.O., the Lawyer said the letters were intended to be "chatty" personal letters and not formal reporting letters. The Lawyer admitted that she was paying less interest than an institutional lender would have charged for a second mortgage, which is what D.N.'s and A.O.'s loans were secured by. Following the condominium registration of the Davenport Property in January 2005, the Lawyer said that she telephoned both D.N. and A.O. to advise them that their mortgages would be discharged against the individual suites, with the exception of Suite 300, and that their mortgage would remain as against Suite 300 only.
[100] In her evidence, the Lawyer described what she called a "perfect storm" in early 2006: The Lawyer began winding down her practice in preparation for a maternity leave; in March A.O. called the Lawyer and demanded her investment be returned; this caught the Lawyer by surprise; the Lawyer gave birth to twins on April 22, 2006; after only a month, the Lawyer returned to the office and brought her twins to the office with her; the Lawyer described the lack of sleep and stress about paying A.O. back as hampering her law practice; from March 2006 to October 2006 (when the money was returned to A.O.) was the only time in the Lawyer's professional career that she could not meet her obligations. The Lawyer stated that she and her husband simply did not have the funds available to pay back A.O. at the time. It took the Lawyer from April to September of 2006 to pay back A.O. and she did so in the following installments:
(a) on June 9, 2006 the first $\$ 50,000$ repayment came from the Lawyer's legal receipts; and
(b) on September 21, 2006 the remaining $\$ 149,750$ was repaid to A.O. (the Lawyer borrowed $\$ 100,000$ from her parent and the remainder came from additional funds owed to the Lawyer by her clients).
[101] Throughout her evidence the Lawyer was very respectful to A.O.'s position and appeared to be genuinely embarrassed and upset by the fact that she was unable to repay A.O. immediately upon A.O.'s demand. During this period in 2006 the Lawyer decided to wind down her family law practice and continue to only do legal work for the companies that she owned.
[102] Concerning the threat that A.O. says the Lawyer made to her about contacting the Law Society and filing a complaint, the Lawyer explained that A.O. told the Lawyer that if the Lawyer did not pay her back, then the Law Society would. The Lawyer denied ever threatening A.O. but did admit to being sharp with A.O. on the phone because she was getting frustrated with her. She explained that emotions were running high on both sides during the telephone conversation but the Lawyer apologized to A.O. and promised that she would get A.O.'s money back to her. The Lawyer also stated that during the various telephone exchanges she had with A.O., A.O. told her that she had another investment opportunity that would pay her $11 \%$ and as a result, the Lawyer agreed to increase the interest rate to $11 \%$ on A.O.'s loans.
[103] Under cross-examination the Lawyer reiterated her position that she did not consider A.O. to be a client. The Lawyer blamed the Law Society for poisoning A.O.'s mind and stated that A.O.'s understanding of her investment changed after A.O.'s contact with the Law Society. The Lawyer could not recall if she ever told A.O. that her mortgage was second in priority and she confirmed that there were never any discussions with D.N. or A.O. regarding loan to value ratios. The Lawyer also stated that she did not inform A.O. about the Laurentian Mortgage because she forgot that it was registered against the Davenport Property. With respect to independent legal advice for D.N. and A.O., the Lawyer stated that if it had ever occurred to her that they needed it, then she would have encouraged them to obtain it.
[104] With respect to the Laurentian Mortgage, the Lawyer said that she forgot that she agreed that Laurentian could register a collateral mortgage against the Davenport Property, which essentially gave D.N. and A.O. third priority. D.N.'s and A.O.'s loans were registered behind a $\$ 1$ million mortgage to Foremost and a $\$ 4.5$ million collateral mortgage to Laurentian, totaling $\$ 5.5$ million. The Laurentian Mortgage was severable from the principal mortgage registered against the Yonge Property. In the event of a default, Laurentian could enforce its security on the Davenport Property and the Yonge Property simultaneously. The Lawyer explained that she did not immediately register the various Davenport Mortgages because she viewed the investments of D.N. and A.O. as incredibly strong and secure and she did not perceive any immediate risks to their loans. Further, the Lawyer stated that she did not perceive the collateral mortgage as a significant risk to D.N.'s and A.O.'s loans.
[105] In cross-examination the Lawyer denied that any of the letters sent to D.N. or A.O., described above, were reporting letters. She explained that she registered the mortgages in trust on behalf of D.N. and A.O. because the Lawyer felt that they wanted her to handle everything and D.N. and A.O. did not want any hassle. The Lawyer agreed that not registering the Second Davenport Mortgage for 319 days was an obscene gap and stated that it was not registered for that long through inadvertence. With respect to the

Purported Mortgage, it was sent to A.O because A.O. had asked for a copy of the mortgage document securing her second loan a few weeks prior. The Lawyer testified that the document was a mystery and that her law clerk completes all of her Teranet work. The Lawyer did not call her law clerk as a witness.
[106] With respect to her failure to report the various mortgages held in trust by the Firm for D.N. and A.O. on her MAR, the Lawyer stated under cross-examination that it never occurred to her that D.N. and A.O. were clients until Ms. Campbell explained it to the Lawyer during their interview.
(c) J.H.
[107] In her evidence the Lawyer described in detail the purchase by J.H. and the resulting legal proceeding and complaint against the Lawyer by J.H. The Lawyer testified that J.H. did not drive but wanted a parking space at the Davenport Property so that he could rent it out. The APS entered into by J.H. bargained for a parking space. As a result of a zoning issue, there were not enough parking spaces available at the Davenport Property and the Lawyer offered J.H. a reduction in his purchase price if he agreed to complete the purchase without a parking space. The Lawyer says that following the offer J.H. was silent for a couple of months and then the Lawyer received a letter from J.H.'s lawyer advising that J.H. did not want to complete the purchase. Negotiations between J.H.'s lawyer and the Lawyer followed and the Lawyer testified that an agreement was reached whereby J.H.'s deposit money could be used by the Lawyer to upgrade and renovate the suites J.H. intended to purchase to make them more marketable. The renovations were completed and the two units were sold to two new purchasers. The Lawyer was then required to complete an accounting and she stated that it was her belief that she owed J.H. approximately $\$ 40,000$.
[108] Following the accounting J.H. fired his lawyer and hired a new lawyer who made a number of demands on behalf of J.H., including that the Lawyer continue to hold the deposit in trust, and filed an application against the Lawyer and a complaint with the Law Society. The Lawyer stated that ultimately a settlement was reached with J.H. where the Lawyer was required to pay J.H. approximately $\$ 125,000$. She said that this was because J.H. had a contingency fee agreement with his lawyer and he required this amount to break even. Unsigned minutes of settlement were produced at the hearing; however, the Lawyer could not locate a copy of the signed minutes of settlement. The Lawyer was represented by counsel during these proceedings and negotiations and she stated that her lawyer and J.H.'s first lawyer had an agreement that the Lawyer could use J.H.'s deposit (trust funds) to complete the improvements and renovations to the suites at the Davenport Property. None of J.H., J.H.'s first or second lawyer, nor the Lawyer's lawyer were called as witnesses.
[109] During cross-examination various letters from J.H.'s first lawyer demanding repayment of J.H.'s deposit money were put to the Lawyer. The Lawyer stated that these demands were only made to show mitigation of damages and so that J.H. could secure a potential court action.
[110] In her evidence the Lawyer explained that she and her husband gave personal guarantees in the J.H. dispute and the Laurentian Mortgage but did not offer personal guarantees to either A.O. or D.N.

## (d) The Lawyer as Condominium Developer

[111] The Lawyer admitted that in hindsight, her knowledge of condominiums was very limited in 2002 and neither she nor her husband sought outside counsel on the conversion to condominiums process. At the time, the Lawyer and her husband only consulted with architects and surveyors and the Lawyer believed that she knew what she was doing.
[112] Additionally, the Lawyer admitted that at the time that she drafted the Bonding Agreements she was seven years out and she did not understand what they were, or what "prescribed security" meant under s. 81 of the Act. It never occurred to her that the Bonding Agreements did not satisfy the requirements. The Lawyer's only familiarity with the Act at the time was with respect to the disclosure requirements for purchasers. Under cross-examination the Lawyer admitted to not reading the entire Act and that she only referred to the Act when specific issues arose as the development process moved forward. The Lawyer also admitted that none of the purchasers or their lawyers knew about the Bonding Agreements or her intention to use their deposits. The Lawyer did not give a copy of the Bonding Agreements to any of the purchasers or their lawyers. The Lawyer believed that the Bonding Agreements were her authority to release the deposit funds from trust and to use those funds for renovations.
[113] The Lawyer also emphasized during her evidence that she had no concept that she was doing anything wrong and that at all times, all the funds were fully covered. Further, the Lawyer stated that the only reason she co-mingled the funds was because she was the lawyer for all of the companies.
[114] Under cross-examination the Lawyer described herself as overly confident about her abilities in the condominium development process and that she now realizes that she has more and more to learn about the law. The Lawyer stated that she did not seek third party legal advice regarding the conversion to condominiums of the Davenport Property or the Yonge Property because she was her own client on the condominium developments and she felt that she could be more relaxed with legal formalities.
[115] The Lawyer did not call any other witnesses. The Lawyer did seek to rely upon a statement of D.N. given on February 5, 2010. The Law Society did not object to the statement being admitted as proof that it was given; however it took the position, correctly, that the statement cannot be admitted as proof of the truth of its contents.

## CREDIBILITY AND ADVERSE INFERENCES

[116] The Law Society submits in its written submissions that the various explanations provided by the Lawyer for the events described above "lack an air of plausibility or are unreasonable when placed in the context of other evidence" and as a result the Lawyer was not a credible witness and no weight should be given to her evidence. The Law

Society relies on the Court of Appeal's decision in Law Society of Upper Canada v. Neinstein, ${ }^{1}$ and the Hearing Panel's decision in Law Society of Upper Canada v. Wong. ${ }^{2}$ The Lawyer in response relies on the Supreme Court of Canada's decision in R.v. $W .(D .)^{3}$ on the issue of credibility.
[117] We respectfully decline the Law Society's invitation to find that no weight should be given to the Lawyer's evidence.
[118] In addition to asking this panel to find that the Lawyer was not a credible witness, the Law Society asks this panel to draw an adverse inference from the Lawyer's failure to call various witnesses that the Lawyer said could corroborate her position, including her law clerk, various builders and architects who she conferred with during the development of the Davenport Property and the Yonge Property, her lawyer in the proceedings brought by J.H. and J.H. himself. The Law Society relies on the Court of Appeal's decision in Bernardi (c.o.b. Bruno's Pizzeria \& Main Street Billiards) v. Guardian Royal Exchange Assurance Co. ${ }^{4}$ With respect to D.N., the Law Society asks this panel to reject the Lawyer's claims concerning D.N. because they are not supported, but rather contradicted, by other evidence.
[119] In response the Lawyer takes the position that the evidence of these witnesses would have been "superfluous and unnecessary" and that the Law Society equally chose not to call these witnesses. We agree with the Lawyer's position to the extent that the Law Society had an equal opportunity to call these witnesses but chose not to. Adverse inferences are to be drawn sparingly. We do not find it appropriate to draw an adverse inference in the circumstances of this case and rely upon the decision of Justice Lax in Andersen v. St. Jude Medical, Inc. ${ }^{5}$ In short, we do not see any evidentiary gaps on material issues that demanded a response from the Lawyer and, as a result, we decline to draw any adverse inference.

## ANALYSIS

[120] There was some disagreement between the Law Society and the Lawyer on the appropriate standard of proof. We agree with the Law Society's submission that the appropriate standard is proof on a balance of probabilities and that all of the relevant evidence must be scrutinized "with care to determine whether it is more likely than not that an alleged event occurred."
[121] The Lawyer has taken the position that no professional misconduct has occurred, that her conduct was as a result of a series of honest mistakes, and that she did things because of her own faith and belief in her own abilities. While some of her actions, including the

[^8]${ }^{2} 2009$ ONLSHP 60
${ }^{3}$ [1991] 1 S.C.R. 742
${ }^{4}$ [1979] O.J. No. 553 (C.A.) at paras. 28-32.
${ }^{5} 2012$ ONSC 3660 (S.C.J.) at paras. 31-37.
${ }^{6}$ F.H. v. McDougall, [2008] 3 S.C.R. 41 at paras. 45 and 49.

Lawyer's reliance on the Bonding Agreements, could be described as technical violations of the Rules, the Lawyer takes the position that her actions did not bring discredit to the profession and that everyone who invested with her made money. The Lawyer submitted that it is difficult to characterize her actions as misconduct under circumstances where A.O. and D.N. were satisfied with her representation, where neither received a poor bargain and where the Lawyer continues to obligingly manage D.N.'s financial affairs. We are of the view that even in cases where no one loses money, or no measurable harm is done, a finding of professional conduct may be made.

## Particular 1: Conflict of Interest

[122] Rule 2.06(5) states:
In any transaction, other than a transaction within the provisions of subrule (4), in which money is borrowed from a client by a lawyer's spouse or by a corporation, syndicate, or partnership in which either the lawyer or the lawyer's spouse has, or both of them together have, directly or indirectly, a substantial interest, the lawyer shall ensure that the client's interests are fully protected by the nature of the case and by independent legal representation. [Emphasis added]
[123] While the Lawyer now agrees in hindsight that both D.N. and A.O. were her clients during the loan transactions, she has taken the position the she did not realize that D.N. and A.O. were her clients while her corporation was borrowing money from them and, as a result, she is not guilty of professional misconduct. The Lawyer says that she merely saw her role as one of facilitator for the investments, as opposed to acting as a lawyer. The Law Society, on the other hand, takes the position that the Lawyer knew at all material times that both D.N. and A.O. were her clients because: (i) she sent reporting letters to D.N. and A.O.; (ii) she had a longstanding solicitor-client relationship with D.N.; (iii) the Lawyer was providing legal services; (iv) the Lawyer knew that neither D.N. nor A.O. were legally sophisticated; and (v) the Lawyer admitted her awareness during her initial interview with Ms. Campbell.
[124] We agree with the submissions of the Law Society and find that, on the balance of probabilities, the Lawyer knew at the time of the loans from each of D.N. and A.O. that D.N. and A.O. were her clients. In her evidence the Lawyer stated that she did not consider D.N. and A.O. to be her clients on the loan transactions because the transactions were mutually beneficial to her and to D.N./A.O. We agree with the following submission of the Law Society: "If a lawyer finds herself in a business transaction with a client that would benefit the lawyer, it is submitted that the rules regarding conflict of interest operate to put the lawyer on guard, not at ease." Given the Lawyer's intelligence and sophistication, which was evident in her oral evidence, we find it difficult to believe that it never occurred to her that D.N. and A.O. were her clients. Further, the Lawyer's position was not supported by any of the evidence and flew in the face of the plain reading of the various reporting letters, the mortgage documents and A.O.'s evidence that she believed that the Lawyer was acting in her interests and acting as her lawyer.
[125] There is no dispute on the facts that the Lawyer did not advise either D.N. or A.O. to
obtain independent legal advice or representation, and that neither D.N. nor A.O. sought such advice. Given that Rule $2.06(5)$ requires that the client's interests be protected by the nature of the case "and" by independent legal representation, the fact that neither D.N. or A.O. were represented by independent legal counsel is enough to find a breach of Rule $2.06(5)$. We find, however, that in addition to the lack of independent legal representation, D.N.'s and A.O.'s interests were not fully protected. The most compelling reasons, in our view, are: (i) the third priority placement of the Davenport Mortgage; (ii) the 319 day gap in the registration of the Second Davenport Mortgage; and (iii) the fact that the Lawyer controlled the mortgages by naming herself as chargee. We are of the view that, A.O.'s and D.N.'s interests were not "fully protected" as Rule $2.06(5)$ requires. As a result, we find that the Lawyer is in breach of Rule 2.06(5).
[126] Rule 2.04(11) states:
Subject to subrule (12), a lawyer or two or more lawyers practising in partnership or association shall not act for or otherwise represent both lender and borrower in a mortgage or loan transaction.
[127] None of the exceptions listed in subrule (12) apply in this case and the Lawyer does not rely on any. Given our finding under Particular 1 above concerning the Lawyer's knowledge that D.N. and A.O. were her clients and the agreed fact that the Lawyer acted for 364 and D.N./A.O. on the mortgages, we also find that the Lawyer has contravened Rule 2.04(11).

## Particular 2: Failure to Serve

[128] The Law Society argues that the Lawyer has failed to serve D.N. and A.O., contrary to Rule 2.01 (2), in various ways including by failing to report to D.N. and A.O. regarding their mortgage transactions, failing to advise A.O. of the identity of the borrower, failing to advise both D.N. and A.O. as to the priority of their mortgages, failing to register the mortgages in a timely manner, and registering the mortgages in the name of the Firm in trust rather than in D.N.'s and A.O.'s names. We are of the view that the agreed to facts establish each of these failings on the part of the Lawyer. The question for this panel now is did the Lawyer act to the standard of a competent lawyer?
[129] Rule 2.01(2) states: "A lawyer shall perform any legal services undertaken on a client's behalf to the standard of a competent lawyer." Rule 2.01(1) defines a "competent lawyer" as:
2.01 (1) In this rule
"competent lawyer" means a lawyer who has and applies relevant skills, attributes, and values in a manner appropriate to each matter undertaken on behalf of a client including
(a) knowing general legal principles and procedures and the substantive law and procedure for the areas of law in which the lawyer practises,

## [Amended - June 2007]

(b) investigating facts, identifying issues, ascertaining client objectives, considering possible options, and developing and advising the client on appropriate courses of action,
(c) implementing, as each matter requires, the chosen course of action through the application of appropriate skills, including,
i. legal research,
ii. analysis,
iii. application of the law to the relevant facts,
iv. writing and drafting,
v. negotiation,
vi. alternative dispute resolution,
vii. advocacy, and
viii. problem-solving ability,
(d) communicating at all stages of a matter in a timely and effective manner that is appropriate to the age and abilities of the client,
(e) performing all functions conscientiously, diligently, and in a timely and costeffective manner,
(f) applying intellectual capacity, judgment, and deliberation to all functions,
(g) complying in letter and in spirit with the Rules of Professional Conduct,
(h) recognizing limitations in one's ability to handle a matter or some aspect of it, and taking steps accordingly to ensure the client is appropriately served,
(i) managing one's practice effectively,
(j) pursuing appropriate professional development to maintain and enhance legal knowledge and skills, and
(k) adapting to changing professional requirements, standards, techniques, and practices.
[130] The commentary to Rule 2.01(2) states:
This rule does not require a standard of perfection. An error or omission, even though it might be actionable for damages in negligence or contract, will not necessarily constitute a failure to maintain the standard of professional competence described by the rule.
[...]
The Act provides that a lawyer fails to meet standards of professional competence if there are deficiencies in (a) the lawyer's knowledge, skill, or judgment, (b) the lawyer's attention to the interests of clients, (c) the records, systems, or procedures of the lawyer's professional business, or (d) other aspects of the lawyer's professional business, and the deficiencies give rise to a reasonable apprehension that the quality of service to clients may be adversely affected. [Emphasis added]
[131] Neither the Law Society nor the Lawyer provided any authorities to the panel concerning the interpretation of this Rule. On the facts of this case, based on the evidence presented and a plain reading of the Rule, we are satisfied that the Law Society has proven on the balance of probabilities that the Lawyer did not perform legal services to the standard of the competent lawyer, most notably by not communicating at all stages to D.N. and A.O. on the full particulars of their mortgage transactions.

## Particular 3: Misleading A.O.

[132] The Law Society argues that the Lawyer breached Rules 2.02(1) and 6.01(1) by misleading A.O. about the nature and particulars of her loans. Rule 2.02(1) requires a lawyer to be honest and candid when advising clients and Rule 6.01(1) states: "A lawyer shall conduct himself or herself in such a way as to maintain the integrity of the profession." It submits that the Lawyer misrepresented the nature of the mortgages to A.O. and concealed a number of risk factors about the loans such as who the true borrower was, the priority of the mortgage security, and that the project had not yet received condominium status.
[133] The Lawyer submits that there was a "distinct correlation between D.N.'s and A.O.'s investments and J.G.'s and J.H.'s purchases" and that "there was a very distinct and discernible indirect relationship among [D.N./A.O. and J.G./J.H.]." The Lawyer further argues that a "superficial reading" of the letters may lead one to mistakenly infer that J.G./J.H. were the borrowers and that the Lawyer provided full details to D.N. and A.O. "of their investments through other media (i.e. through property tours and frequent verbal communications, as well as through A.O.'s son ..."). She also attempts to defend her letters by arguing that she never explicitly stated in her letters that J.G./J.H. would be responsible for payment of interest on the loans and repayment of the principal
investments. With respect, a plain reading of the letters is all that should be required of a client and we reject the Lawyer's submissions. We also reject the Lawyer's self-serving evidence that she did not further particularize the letters because she verbally told D.N. and A.O. the full particulars. We prefer the evidence of A.O. on this point and find that the Lawyer did not at any point communicate the full particulars of the investments to A.O.
[134] The Lawyer argued that the reliability of the evidence of A.O. is diminished because she could not recall fundamental details of her conversations with the Lawyer, particularly regarding priority of the mortgages. We find that the reliability of the evidence of A.O. was not diminished in any respect. A.O. did not recall being told about the priority of the mortgages. The Lawyer confirmed that she did not provide fundamental details of the investments and mortgages to A.O. in her reporting letters, but claimed that that was because she advised A.O. of those details verbally. The Lawyer had no evidence to support her claim. We prefer the evidence of A.O. on this point.
[135] It is apparent on the face of the reporting letters to A.O., as described in detail above, that the Lawyer misled A.O. with respect to various aspects of her loan, including the fact that the Lawyer was the actual borrower and not J.H./J.G. The Lawyer did not provide any explanation or reason for the inaccuracies in her reporting letters or for the Purported Mortgage sent to A.O., other than to say that full particulars were provided to A.O. verbally.
[136] In her written submissions the Lawyer argues that A.O. "shares significant responsibility" for not being concerned "about conducting a documentary review" and for failing "to seek clarification ... regarding any issue or confusion." We reject this submission. Whether or not A.O. should have sought clarification, completed her own legal research, or hired another lawyer to review all of the Lawyer's correspondence is not a question for us and it does not change the fact that the Lawyer's reporting letters to A.O. were misleading in many respects.
[137] Most troubling to this panel is the Purported Mortgage sent to A.O. on March 5, 2004. Only three days following the Purported Mortgage being sent to A.O., the Lawyer registered the Second Davenport Mortgage consolidating the four loans made by D.N. and A.O. The Second Davenport Mortgage was never disclosed to A.O. The Lawyer's only explanation for the Purported Mortgage is that she has no explanation for it as she relies exclusively on her law clerk to use the Teraview soffware. The Lawyer chose not to call her law clerk as a witness.
[138] We find that on the balance of probabilities, the Lawyer was not honest and candid when reporting to A.O. and as a result, she did not conduct herself in a manner so as to maintain the integrity of the profession. The Lawyer has contravened Rules 2.02(1) and 6.01(1).

## Particular 4: Failure to Complete Forms 18A and 18B

[139] At the material times, s. 7(1) of By-Law 18 required the Lawyer to maintain a number of
documents relating to the loans including an investment authority completed by D.N. and A.O. for each mortgage, and a report on the investment for each mortgage completed by the Lawyer. Section 7(4) of By-Law 18 required the Lawyer to obtain a new investment authority and complete a new report on investment each time that she discharged one of D.N.'s or A.O.'s mortgages. The Forms 18A (investment authority) and 18B (report on the investment) are prescribed by the By-Laws. On May 1, 2007 By-Law 18 was revoked and replaced with By-Law 9.
[140] As we found above, the Lawyer knew that D.N. and A.O. were her clients at the time of their loans. The Lawyer admitted in the ASF, during her interview with Ms. Campbell and in her evidence at the hearing that she did not have D.N. or A.O. complete a Form 18A at any time, and the Lawyer did not complete any reports on investment for their loans. In her evidence the Lawyer took the position, however, that she did not know about the requirements of the By-Laws and that her failure to complete the forms was a function of her overall approach to D.N. and A.O. as non-arms length investors.
[141] We agree with the Law Society's submission that ignorance of the By-Laws is no defence. The evidence establishes that the Lawyer failed to complete the required forms even after she wrote to Ms. Campbell in January 2007 stating that "[i]n future, given this experience, I will always prepare and provide Forms 18 a and b ...". More than a year later she discharged the Fourth Davenport Mortgage (December 18, 2008) and two years following the letter she registered the Ranee Mortgage and discharged it without completing the required forms.
[142] On the balance of probabilities, we therefore find that the Lawyer failed to complete Forms 18A and 18B and contravened By-Law 18.

## Particular 5: Failure to Maintain Mortgage Asset Ledger, Mortgage Liability Ledger and Monthly Comparisons

[143] Section 3 of By-Law 18 required the Lawyer to maintain extensive financial records, including a mortgage asset ledger, a mortgage liability ledger, a record of monthly reconciliations of the outstanding principal balances held in trust and the outstanding balances as they appeared on the financial documents. Section 3 provides precise requirements for the documents.
[144] The Lawyer admitted in the ASF that she did not maintain a mortgage asset ledger, mortgage liability ledger, or monthly reconciliations for any of D.N.'s or A.O.'s mortgages. This non-compliance continued following her assurance to Ms. Campbell in January 2007 that she would prepare the documents and comply with the requirements of By-Law 18 going forward.
[145] We therefore find, on the balance of probabilities, that the Lawyer breached s. 3 of ByLaw 18.

## Particular 6: Failure to Obtain Written Consent

[146] Section 7(7) of By-Law 18 required the Lawyer to obtain the written consent of D.N. and A.O. for the substitution of the security held for their loans, before the substitution is made. The Lawyer admitted that she did not receive any written instructions, consents or authorizations from D.N. or A.O. regarding the discharges of their mortgages or the substitution of the mortgage security. A.O. was clear in her evidence that at no time had she provided any written instructions or consents to the Lawyer, and the Lawyer did not dispute this.
[147] The Lawyer substituted D.N.'s and A.O.'s mortgage security at least four times without written consent: (i) the discharge of the First Davenport Mortgage and the registration of the Second Davenport Mortgage; (ii) the discharge of the Second Davenport Mortgage and the registration of the Third Davenport Mortgage; (iii) the discharge of the Third Davenport Mortgage and the registration of the Fourth Davenport Mortgage; and (iv) the discharge of the Fourth Davenport Mortgage and the registration of the Ranee Mortgage. As a result, we find that, on the balance of probabilities, the Lawyer contravened s. 7(7) of By-Law 18 .

## Particular 7: Misleading the Law Society

[148] Rule 6.01(1) states: "A lawyer shall conduct himself or herself in such a way as to maintain the integrity of the profession." The Commentary to the Rule states:

Integrity is the fundamental quality of any person who seeks to practise as a lawyer. If a client has any doubt about his or her lawyer's trustworthiness, the essential element in the true lawyer-client relationship will be missing. If integrity is lacking, the lawyer's usefulness to the client and reputation within the profession will be destroyed regardless of how competent the lawyer may be.

Public confidence in the administration of justice and in the legal profession may be eroded by a lawyer's irresponsible conduct. Accordingly, a lawyer's conduct should reflect credit on the legal profession, inspire the confidence, respect and trust of clients and the community, and avoid even the appearance of impropriety.
[149] The Law Society submits that the Lawyer misrepresented to Ms. Walker the borrower in A.O.'s loan and misrepresented to Ms. Campbell that A.O. and the Lawyer were nonarm's length parties. With respect to Ms. Walker, the Lawyer misled her by suggesting that A.O.'s mortgage was with J.H. and that J.H. was having difficulty repaying the loan. The Lawyer did not disclose to Ms. Walker that she was the true borrower. The Law Society also submits that the Lawyer's letter to Ms. Walker stating that she and her husband will personally pay A.O. and replace her as mortgagee is also misleading because it suggests that the Lawyer was not the borrower. With respect to her communications with Ms. Campbell, the Law Society argues that the Lawyer's January 31, 2007 letter, responding to Ms. Campbell's request for a full and frank response, conveyed two misleading impressions: it obscured the identity of the real borrower and exaggerated her friendship with A.O. before the loans were advanced.
[150] In response, the Lawyer submits she did not intend to mislead the Law Society in her
communications with Ms. Walker and Ms. Campbell and that she was truthful and forthcoming with the Law Society at all times.
[151] Neither the Law Society nor the Lawyer submitted any authorities or provided any guidance on the interpretation of Rule 6.01(1).
[152] While we agree with the Law Society's position that the Lawyer was less than full and frank in her communications with Ms. Walker and Ms. Campbell, we are not satisfied that the Law Society has satisfied its burden of proving that the Lawyer conducted herself in such a manner as to breach Rule 6.01(1).

## Particular 8: Filing Inaccurate or Misleading MARs

[153] The Law Society submits that the Lawyer failed to conduct herself in a way that maintains the integrity of the profession, contrary to Rule 6.01(1) (reproduced above), by filing inaccurate or misleading MARs. The Law Society argues that MARs play an important part in the regulation of the profession and when a lawyer provides misleading information in the MAR, this "damages the Law Society's ability to protect the public and undermines the reputation of lawyers as a well-regulated profession."
[154] The MAR at the relevant times required a lawyer to answer the following two questions:
(a) "were you indebted, either directly or indirectly, to a client or person who at the time of borrowing was or had been your client or a client of a firm of which you were then a member?" and
(b) "did you directly or indirectly through a related person or corporation, hold mortgages or other charges on real property in trust for clients or other persons?"
[155] The Lawyer remained indebted to A.O. from January 2003 to September 2006 and to D.N. from December 2002 to February 2010 and registered the mortgages with the Firm as "in trust" for D.N. and A.O. The Lawyer admitted in the ASF that she failed to report her indebtedness to D.N. and A.O. and her role and the Firm's role in the mortgages on her MARs from 2002 to 2006. The evidence establishes that the Lawyer also failed to report her indebtedness to D.N. in her MAR for 2008. While the Lawyer responded in the affirmative to whether she was indebted directly or indirectly to a client in her 2007 MAR, the Lawyer admitted that she failed to provide full particulars of D.N.'s loan. Even if D.N. and A.O. were not the Lawyer's clients at the relevant times, the failure of the Lawyer to respond in the affirmative to the question of whether she held property or mortgages in trust for "other persons" was an inaccurate answer.
[156] The Law Society has not relied on any authorities for their position and we are not satisfied, in all of the circumstances and facts of this case, that the failure of the Lawyer to provide accurate answers in her MARs is a breach of Rule $6.01(1)$. While we find that the Lawyer provided inaccurate answers in her MARs for the years 2002 to 2006 and 2008, we are not satisfied that the Law Society has satisfied its burden of showing on a
balance of probabilities that the Lawyer acted in contravention of Rule 6.01(1).

## Particular 9: Misappropriation

[157] The Law Society submits that the Lawyer misappropriated approximately $\$ 383,598$ held in trust by the Firm on behalf of purchasers of condominium units by disbursing those funds without authority and in contravention of the APS, the provisions of the Act and s. 4(1) of By-Law 19. The definition of "professional misconduct" in Rule 1.02 provides that it includes "misappropriating or otherwise dealing dishonestly with a client's or a third party's money or property." The fact that the purchasers were not the Lawyer's clients does not relieve her from dealing with their deposits in accordance with the Rules. Section 4(1) of By-Law 19 states:

A member may withdraw from a trust account only the following money:

1. Money properly required for payment to a client or to a person on behalf of a client.
2. Money required to reimburse the member for money properly expended on behalf of a client or for expenses properly incurred on behalf of a client.
3. Money properly required for or toward payment of fees for services performed by the member for which a billing has been delivered.
4. Money that is directly transferred into another trust account and held on behalf of a client.
5. Money that under this By-Law should not have been paid into a trust account but was through inadvertence paid into a trust account.
[158] The Law Society relies on Sullivan ${ }^{7}$ for the following definition of misappropriation: "any unauthorized use ... of clients' funds entrusted to [a lawyer], including not only stealing, but also unauthorized temporary use for the lawyer's own purposes, whether or not he derives any personal gain or benefit therefrom." The Law Society must establish on a balance of probabilities that the Lawyer knew at the time that the disbursing of the funds was unauthorized. In Law Society of Upper Canada v. Reiten ${ }^{8}$ the Appeal Panel defined misappropriation as follows:
[47] 'Misappropriation" refers to a deliberate (i.e., knowing) taking with a dishonest intention, usually theft, or fraud or some other serious wrong. Such allegations are among the most serious that can be brought. The usual consequences - disbarment, or permission to resign, subject to unusual

[^9]circumstances such as a small amount, the absence of loss, medical or psychological evidence - are commensurate with that specific intent. They do not form a rule, but rather reflect the experience of the Bench year after year, case after case. [Emphasis added]
[48] A person who is reckless or willfully blind in the operation of a trust account has committed an act or omission of professional misconduct that requires no such specific intent. Each state of mind, the equivalent of knowledge, is sufficient to justify a finding of professional misconduct, but the appropriate penalty will reflect all the circumstances. There will be cases where disbarment or permission to resign is appropriate, and others where suspensions, fines or remedial measures will properly protect the public. The Hearing Panel will consider the previous history of the licensee, the harm caused, and any considerations of ungovernability.
[49] There can also be a merely negligent operation of a trust account, based on a failure to take proper care. Negligence, unless rebutted by evidence of due diligence, is also an appropriate state of mind to characterize professional misconduct.
[159] The Law Society submits that Reiten was overruled by the Appeal Panel's subsequent decision in Kazman. ${ }^{9}$ We do not interpret the decision in Kazman as overruling Reiten and the Reiten definition of "misappropriation" has been adopted and applied by the Hearing Panel subsequent to the Kazman decision. ${ }^{10}$ Kazman was in the context of allegations of a mortgage fraud and when analyzing the Supreme Court of Canada's decision in $R . v$. Sansregret, ${ }^{11}$ the appeal panel in Kazman stated (at para. 60):

While the Court does later say that culpability for recklessness may [our emphasis] be less than culpability for willful blindness in the criminal context, nowhere does the Court say that the difference exists in the administrative law context (the issue was not before them). The Court does say that culpability is "justified" under either recklessness or willful blindness and describes the two means by which the culpability is established (consciousness of risk or deliberate failure to inquire). Therefore, while recklessness may result in less culpability, it may also result in identical culpability.
[160] The Lawyer argues that the decision in Reiten shows comparable circumstances to the present case, particularly, the manner in which Ms. Reiten was overwhelmed by her inexperience. The Lawyer relies on the hearing panel's decision in Law Society of Upper Canada v. Farant ${ }^{12}$ and argues that the Law Society must adduce clear and cogent evidence of intent to take the funds and that the standard of proof is higher than on the

[^10]balance of probabilities. In Reiten, the appeal panel stated that "cogent" evidence was required along with proof that is "clear and convincing." In reply, the Law Society vehemently opposes the Lawyer's interpretation of Reiten.
[161] With great respect to the position of the Law Society, the definition of misappropriation in Sullivan has not been adopted by the Appeal Panel. We feel bound to follow, and prefer, the definition of misappropriation as outlined by the Appeal Panel in Reiten.
[162] The undisputed facts before us are as follows: the Lawyer and her husband received approximately $\$ 383,598$ in deposit funds on the sale of units in the Davenport Property and the Yonge Property; the Lawyer was obligated under the APS, s. 81 of the Act and its regulations to hold the funds in trust until the renovations were complete and title transferred to the purchasers; rather than keeping the funds in trust, the Lawyer transferred the deposits into the Firm's general account and spent the funds on renovating the suites.
[163] In her written submissions, the Lawyer stated that the "purchasers were not, at any time, clients of the [Lawyer]" and relies on the Bonding Agreements as the reason that she believed at the time that she was permitted to withdraw and use the deposits from the trust account. Additionally, the Lawyer says that she was confident in her abilities as a lawyer and developer and "genuinely believed" that she was able to be in legal compliance without requiring the assistance of a real estate lawyer despite her inexperience. Despite this, the Lawyer has taken the position that while now she realizes that the Bonding Agreements are not in compliance with the Act, at the time she was not aware of the provisions of the Act relevant to prescribed security. The Lawyer also says that at the time that she drafted and put in place the Bonding Agreements (in 2002 and 2003), she and her husband had substantial equity and that, in her view, this provided sufficient security for the repayment of the purchasers' deposits.
[164] While the Lawyer now admits that the Bonding Agreements do not constitute prescribed security under the Act, the Lawyer has maintained the position throughout that at the time she believed that she was entitled to use the funds because of the Bonding Agreements. She submits that while she may have been overly confident in her abilities, this does not disclose the mindset of a lawyer "involved in furtive and clandestine activities that are criminal in nature." We agree. And we equally agree with the Lawyer's submissions that her actions with respect to the deposit funds are as a result of her "inexperience, tremendous self-confidence and zeal." The standard before us is not a criminal one. We must be satisfied on the balance of probabilities that the Lawyer deliberately took the deposits from the trust account with a dishonest intention. ${ }^{13}$
[165] We are unable to find, on the balance of probabilities, that it is more likely than not that the Lawyer knew at the time that she was unauthorized to disburse the funds. Further, we are unable to find on the balance of probabilities that the Lawyer was reckless (as the Law Society explains in its submissions, the Lawyer would have to appreciate the risk

[^11]associated with improper use of trust funds yet proceed in any event) or wilfully blind (as the Law Society explains in its submissions, the Lawyer had numerous opportunities to ask qualified advisors for their advice, or to research the matter herself, but preferred not to inform herself). On recklessness, the Lawyer did appreciate the risk but she took steps that she believed authorized her to use the funds (the Bonding Agreements), and only proceeded to use the funds after she put those agreements in place in 2002 and 2003. We therefore find that recklessness cannot apply. On wilful blindness, the Lawyer did ask for advice and while she perhaps completed her legal research negligently, we cannot ignore that she took the step of putting the Bonding Agreements in place and believe that they authorized her to use the funds. We are of the view that the Lawyer's actions with the Bonding Agreements are more akin to negligence than to recklessness or wilful blindness.
[166] In the result, we find that the Law Society has not discharged its burden of proving on the balance of probabilities that the Lawyer misappropriated approximately $\$ 383,598$ held in trust by the Firm on behalf of purchasers of condominium units.

## Particular 10: Co-Mingling Personal/Corporate Funds with Client Funds

[167] Section 3(2) of By-Law 19 prohibits lawyers from using their firm trust account to conduct their own affairs. The Lawyer has admitted in the ASF that she used the Firm's trust account to hold her personal funds and that her personal funds were co-mingled with client funds. The Lawyer also admitted that she used the Firm's trust accounts to hold funds belonging to the various companies owned by the Lawyer and her husband.
[168] We therefore find on a balance of probabilities that the Lawyer contravened s. 3(2) of ByLaw 19.

## FINDINGS OF PROFESSIONAL MISCONDUCT

[169] In summary, the Lawyer engaged in professional misconduct as set out in Particulars 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 10 of the Notice of Application. Given this finding of professional misconduct, arrangements should be made through the Tribunals Office to set a date for the penalty hearing.
[170] We thank both counsel for the Law Society and for the Lawyer for their thoughtful and thorough written submissions.
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