

**ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
Commercial List**

B E T W E E N:

**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 IN SCHEDULE “B” HERETO, TO BE
BOUND BY THE RESULT**

MOTION RECORD OF THE MANAGER, SCHONFELD INC.
(Motion re: Discharge of Manager’s obligations in respect of 1485 Dupont, returnable
October 9, 2014)

GOODMANS LLP
Barristers & Solicitors
Bay Adelaide Centre
333 Bay Street, Suite 3400
Toronto, Ontario
M5H 2S7

Brian Empey LSUC#: 30640G
Mark S. Dunn LSUC#: 55510L
Tel: (416) 979-2211
Fax: (416) 979-1234

Lawyers for The Manager

TO: SERVICE LIST

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
(Commercial List)

B E T W E E N:

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 IN SCHEDULE B, TO BE
BOUND BY THE RESULT

SERVICE LIST
(Updated September 30, 2014)

Goodmans LLP
Barristers & Solicitors
Bay Adelaide Centre
333 Bay Street, Suite 3400
Toronto, Canada M5H 2S7

Brian Empey – bempey@goodmans.ca
Mark Dunn – mdunn@goodmans.ca
Jacqueline LaBine – jlabin@goodmans.ca

Tel: 416.979.2211
Fax: 416.979.1234

Counsel to the Inspector/Manager

Lenczner Slaght Griffin LLP

Barristers & Solicitors
130 Adelaide St W
Suite 2600
Toronto, ON
Canada M5H 3P5

Peter Griffin – pgriffin@litigate.com
Shara N. Roy – sroy@litigate.com
Paul-Erik Veel – pveel@litigate.com

Tel: 416.865.9500
Fax: 416.865.9010

Counsel to the Applicants

Norma Walton

PO Box 22070
East York Post Office
Toronto, Ontario
M4H 1N9

Norma Walton - waltonlitigation@gmail.com

Tel: (416) 444-3950
Fax: (416) 489-9973

Respondent

Cohen, Sabsay LLP

357 Bay Street, Suite 901
Toronto, ON
M5H 2T7

Howard Cohen - cohen@cohensabsay.com

Tel: 888-626-1102
Fax: 416-364-0083

Counsel to the Respondents other than Norma
Walton

Robins, Appleby & Taub LLP

Barristers & Solicitors

2600 – 120 Adelaide Street W

Toronto, Ontario M5H 1T1

Irving Marks imarks@robapp.com

Dominique Michaud dmichaud@robapp.com

Tel: 416.360.3795

Fax: 416.868.0306

Counsel to Trez Capital Limited Partnership

Minden Gross LLP

Barristers & Solicitors

145 King Street W., Suite 2200

Toronto, Ontario M5H 4G2

Timothy R. Dunn

Tel: 416.369.4335

Fax: 416.864.9223

E-mail: tdunn@mindengross.com

Counsel to 295 The West Mall Portfolio Ltd.

Zimmerman Associates

3338 Dufferin Street

Toronto, Ontario M6A 3A4

Lawrence Zimmerman

Tel: 416.489.9222

Fax: 416.489.6222

E-mail: larry@zimlaw.ca

Counsel to the Handelman Group and the
Tannenbaum Group

Lawrence F. Wallach

4580 Dufferin Street, Suite 302
Toronto, Ontario M3H 5Y2

Lawrence F. Wallach

Tel: 416.661.5600

Fax: 416.663.4424

E-mail: wallach@wallach.ca

Litigation counsel to E. Manson Investments
Limited, B & M Handelman Investments
Limited, 136557 Ontario Limited and Martha
Sorger

Stikeman Elliot LLP

5200 Commerce Court West
199 Bay Street
Toronto, Ontario M5L 1B9

Maria Konyukhova

Tel: 416.869.5230

Fax: 416.947.0866

E-mail: mkonyukhova@stikeman.com

Counsel to IMC Limited Partnership

Fogler, Rubinoff LLP

77 King Street West
Suite 3000, PO Box 9
TD Centre North Tower
Toronto, ON M5K 1G8

Vern W. DaRe – vdare@foglers.com

Tel: 416.864.9700

Fax: 416.941.8852

Counsel to Riocan Management Inc., RioCan
Mortgage Corp., RioCan Real Estate Investment
Trust and Trinity Urban Properties Inc.

Aird & Berlis LLP

Brookfield Place
181 Bay Street
Suite 1800, Box 754
Toronto, ON M5J 2T9

Steven L. Graff – sgraff@airdberlis.com
Ian Aversa – iaversa@airdberlis.com

Tel: 416.865.7726
Fax: 416.863.1515

Counsel for 165 Bathurst Financial Inc.

Torkin Manes LLP

151 Yonge Street
Suite 1500
Toronto, Ontario M2C 2W7

Jeffrey Simpson

Tel: 416. 777.5413
Fax: 1.888.587.9143
E-mail: jsimpson@torkinmanes.com

Counsel to Harbour Mortgage Corp.

Osler, Hoskin & Harcourt LLP

Box 50, 1 First Canadian Place
Toronto, Ontario M5X 1B8

Marc Wasserman

Tel: 416. 862.4908
Fax: 416.862.6666
E-mail: mwasserman@osler.com

Counsel to Sam Reisman and Rose Reisman

Sam Reisman and Rose Reisman

156 Duncan Mill Road
Unit 12
Toronto, Ontario M3B3N2

Martie Simon

Tel: 416. 916.4333
E-mail: msimon@rosecorp.com

Bram Zinman
Barristers & Solicitors
4711 Yonge Street, Suite 509
Toronto, ON M2N 6K8

Bram Zinman

Tel: 416.221.5919
Fax : 416.226.0910
E-mail: bzinman@bellnet.ca

Counsel for Gemtec Wall & Ceiling Systems
Ltd., a subcontractor of Fox Contracting

Jack Copelovici
Barristers & Solicitors
1220 Sheppard Avenue East
Suite 204
Toronto, Ontario M2K 2S5

Jack Copelovici

Tel: 416. 494.0910
Fax: 416.494.5480
E-mail: jack@copel-law.com

Counsel for Fox Contracting Ltd.

Glaholt LLP
141 Adelaide Street West
Suite 800
Toronto, Ontario M5H 3L5

Andrea Lee

Tel: 416.368.8280
Fax: 416.368.3467
E-mail: andrealee@glaholt.com

Counsel for Gentry Environmental Systems Ltd.

Brauti Thorning Zibarras LLP

151 Yonge Street
Suite 1800
Toronto, ON M5C 2W7

David Meirovici – dmeirovici@btzlaw.ca
Mark R. McMackin – mmcmackin@btzlaw.ca

Tel: 416.362.4567
Fax: 416.362.8510

Counsel for Norel Electric Ltd.

Chaitons LLP

5000 Yonge Street, 10th Floor
Toronto, Ontario M2N 7E9

George Benchetrit

Tel: 416.218.1141
Fax: 416.218.1841
E-mail: George@chaitons.com

Counsel for Return on Innovation Capital Inc.

Bianchi Presta LLP

Barristers and Solicitors
9100 Jane Street, 3rd Floor Building A
Vaughn, Ontario L4K 0A4

Renzo Belluz

Tel: 905.738.1076
Fax: 905.738.0528
E-mail: rbelluz@bianchipresta.com

Counsel for the Estate of Celestina Venuto and
Silvano & Celestina Investments Ltd.

Kramer Simaan Dhillon LLP

Litigation Counsel
120 Adelaide St West, Suite 2100
Toronto, Ontario M5H 1T1

Nathaniel Erskine-Smith – nerskine-smith@kramersimaan.com

Tel: 416.601.6819
Fax: 416.601.0702

Counsel to Atrium Mortgage Investment Corporation

Dale & Lessmann LLP

181 University Avenue
Suite 2100
Toronto, Ontario M5H 3M7

David E. Mende

Tel: 416.369.7838
Fax: 416.863.1009
E-mail: dmende@dalelessmann.com

Counsel for First National Financial LP whose first mortgage is registered in the name of Computershare Trust Company of Canada

Dentons Canada LLP

Barristers & Solicitors
77 King Street West
Suite 400
Toronto-Dominion Centre
Toronto, Ontario M5K 0A1

Amer Pasalic

Tel: 416.863.4368
Fax: 416.863.4592
E-mail: amer.pasalic@dentons.com

Counsel for Page & Steele/IBI Group Architects

Oldfield, Greaves, D'Agostino

P.O. Box 16580
172 King Street South
Waterloo, Ontario N2J 4X8

Edward L. D'Agostino

Tel: 519.576.7200

Fax: 519.576.0131

E-mail: edagostino@watlaw.com

Counsel for Macnaughton Hermsen Britton
Clarkson Planning Limited

Torkin Manes LLP

151 Yonge Street
Suite 1500
Toronto, Ontario M2C 2W7

S. Fay Sulley

Tel: 416. 777.5419

Fax: 1.888.587.9143

E-mail: fsulley@torkinmanes.com

Counsel to Almanox Limited

Kramer Simaan Dhillon LLP

Litigation Counsel
120 Adelaide St West, Suite 2100
Toronto, Ontario M5H 1T1

Michael Simaan msimaan@kramersimaan.com

Tel: 416.601.0965

Fax: 416.601.0702

Counsel to Windsor Private Capital Inc.

Rosenbaum & Frank LLP

The Exchange Tower
130 King St. W., Suite 1800
Toronto, ON
M5X 1E3

Vanessa A. Ibe
vibe@rosenbaum.com

Tel: 416.364.1919
Fax: 416.850.9699

Counsel to Proteck Roofing & Sheet Metal Inc.

Pallett Valo LLP

Lawyers & Trade-Mark Agents
77 City Centre Drive, West Tower, Suite 300
Mississauga, ON
L5B 1M5

Alex Ilchenko –ailchenko@pallettvalo.com

Tel: 905-273-3300
Fax: 905-273-6920

Counsel to Toronto Children's Care Inc.,
operating as Ronald McDonald House Toronto,
mortgagee of Gerrard House Inc.

Sack Goldblatt Mitchell LLP

20 Dundas Street West, Suite 1100
Toronto, Ontario
M5G 2G8

Daniel Iny – diny@sgmlaw.com

Tel: 416.979.4247
Fax: 416.591.7333

Counsel to CEP Local 591G Benevolent Society
Incorporated, mortgagee of 324 Prince Edward
Drive

Dickinson Wright LLP

199 Bay Street, Suite 2200

P.O. Box 447, Commerce Court Postal Station

Toronto, Ontario

M5L 1G4

Mark Shapiro – mshapiro@dickinsonwright.com

Michael J. Brzezinski -

MBrzezinski@dickinsonwright.com

Tel – 416-646-4603

Fax – 416-865-1398

Counsel to Florence Leaseholds Ltd., Beatrice
Leaseholds Ltd. and ADA Leaseholds Ltd.,
mortgagees of 1485 Dupont St.

Loopstra Nixon LLP

135 Queen's Plate Drive, Suite 600
Toronto, Ontario, M9W 6V7

Peter W. G. Carey – pcarey@loonix.com

Tel – 416.748.4774
Fax – 416.746.8319

Counsel to Wendy Gaucher

Boghosian + Allen LLP

Litigation Counsel
65 Queen Street West, Suite 1000
Toronto, Ontario M5H 2M5

Rolf M. Piehler – rmp@boglaw.ca

Tel – 416.367.5558
Fax – 416-368-1010

Lawyers for Variety Club of Ontario – Tent 28,
mortgagee of 14 Trent Avenue and 2 Kelvin
Avenue.

Cassels Brock & Blackwell LLP

2100 Scotia Plaza,
40 King Street West
Toronto, Ontario
M5H 3C2

Lorne Silver – lsilver@casselsbrock.com
John Birch – jbirch@casselsbrock.com

Tel - 416 869 5300
Fax - 416 360 8877

Counsel to Cushman & Wakefield Ltd., real
estate broker with respect to the sale of 65 Front
St. East.

Steinberg Morton Hope & Israel LLP

Barristers & Solicitors
5255 Yonge Street
Suite 1100
Toronto, Ontario
M2N 6P4

David A. Brooker - dbrooker@smhilaw.com
Tel: (416) 225-2777
Fax: (416) 225-7112

Counsel for Collins Barrow Toronto Limited,
court appointed receiver for Global Mills Inc.
and Wynford Professional Centre Ltd.

SimpsonWigle Law LLP

501-390 Brant Street
Burlington, ON
L7R 4J4

Rosemary A. Fisher –
fisherr@simpsonwigle.com

Tel – 905.639.1052
Fax – 905.333.3960

Counsel to Christine DeJong, Michael DeJong,
Christine DeJong Medicine Professional
Corporation, C2M2S Holding Corp. and DeJong
Homes Inc.

Cassels Brock & Blackwell LLP

2100 Scotia Plaza
40 King Street West
Toronto, Ontario
M5H 3C2

David S. Ward
dward@casselsbrock.com

Tel: (416) 869-5960
Fax: (416) 640-3154

Counsel for the State Bank of India

I N D E X

TAB NO.

- A. Notice of Cross-Motion
- B. Twelfth Report of the Manager, Schonfeld Inc.
 - 1. Endorsement of Justice Newbould dated November 5, 2013
 - 2. Order of Justice Newbould dated November 5, 2013

A

|Court File No.: CV-13-1 0280-00CL

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
 (Commercial List)

B E T W E E N:

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 IN SCHEDULE “B” HERETO, TO BE
 BOUND BY THE RESULT

NOTICE OF CROSS-MOTION

(Cross-Motion re: Discharge of Manager’s obligations in respect of 1485 Dupont,
 returnable October 9, 2014)

Schonfeld Inc., in its capacity as manager (the “**Manager**”) of certain companies listed in Schedule “B” to the Order of Justice Newbould dated November 5, 2013 (the “**Companies**”) together with the real estate properties owned by the Companies (the “**Properties**”), as amended by Order of Justice Newbould dated January 6, 2014, will make a cross-motion to a judge presiding on the Commercial List on October 9, 2014 at 10:00 a.m., or as soon after that time as the motion can be heard, at 330 University Avenue, Toronto.

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

- 2 -

THE MOTION IS FOR:

1. Florence Leasholds Limited, Beatrice Leasholds Limited and ADA Leasholds Limited (collectively, the “**Dupont Mortgagees**”), the holders of a first mortgage on 1485 Dupont Street (“**1485 Dupont**”), served a motion to lift the stay against Dupont Developments Ltd. (“**Dupont Developments**”), the Company that owns 1485 Dupont to permit power of sale proceedings by the Dupont Mortgagees. If the Dupont Mortgagees’ motion is granted, the Manager respectfully requests an Order:

- (a) abridging the time for service of the Notice of Motion and the materials filed in support of the Motion and dispensing with further service thereof;
- (b) discharging any responsibilities that the Manager may have had with respect to the management, control, preservation or protection of the property known municipally as 1485 Dupont Avenue in Toronto, Ontario;
- (c) granting all ancillary and necessary relief and such further and other relief as the Court may deem just.

THE GROUNDS FOR THE MOTION ARE:

A. Funding issues

2. Several Properties do not generate revenue or do not generate enough revenue to fund the obligations of the relevant owner Company. The Manager advised the parties early in these proceedings that it would not comingle funds between the various Companies and, accordingly, the Companies that did not generate revenue required an outside funding source. The Manager and the Applicants agreed that the Applicants would provide funding of approximately \$1.3 million between December 20, 2013 and January 31, 2014. That funding was provided.

3. The Applicants had no obligation to advance further amounts unless they agreed to provide further funding in writing or were ordered to provide funding by the Court. Since January 31, 2014, the Manager has submitted monthly funding requests to the Applicants. The Applicants have assessed these funding requests and determined what obligations they were prepared to fund.

- 3 -

4. By e-mail dated February 5, 2014, the Applicants' counsel advised that the Applicants were not prepared to fund any further obligations owed by Dupont Developments in respect of 1485 Dupont. Accordingly, Dupont Developments has been unable to meet its obligations to the Dupont Mortgagees.

B. The Dupont Mortgagees' Motion

5. 1485 Dupont has significant potential environmental remediation issues and several construction liens registered against it. These liens are summarized below:

Lien Claimant	Amount
Gentry Environmental Systems Ltd.	\$269,967
CAM Moulding & Plastering Ltd.	\$73,800
Titan Plumbing Ltd.	\$89,899.39
Norel Electric Ltd.	\$248,631
Abaco Glass Inc.	\$139,000

6. In addition, the City of Toronto (the "City") issued a work order for 1485 Dupont in 2013 concerning the deteriorating condition of the exterior. Basic repairs were made in December 2013 to remove loose materials that posed an immediate danger to the public. The exterior deteriorated further over the winter and the City attended at 1485 Dupont in May 2014 with the Manager. The City insists that repairs be made to the exterior. These repairs include stucco work, brick replacement and repair of a broken lentil, all of which pose safety concerns. The Manager is seeking quotes for this work, which is expected to cost in excess of \$50,000. The Manager does not presently have the funding required to undertake the repair work.

7. The Manager does not oppose the relief sought by the Dupont Mortgagees and the Dupont Mortgagees have advised that they would prefer for the Manager to stay in place while they conduct power of sale proceedings. However, neither the Dupont Mortgagees nor the Applicants are prepared to fund such a mandate. Accordingly, the Manager has brought a motion to be relieved of any obligation for the management, control, preservation or protection of 1485 Dupont.

- 4 -

8. The Manager intends to continue as manager/receiver of Dupont Developments to ensure that it is able to effectively exercise whatever rights it may have in respect of the Dupont Mortgagees' ongoing power of sale proceedings.

C. Efforts to sell 1485 Dupont

9. The Manager previously entered into an Agreement of Purchase and Sale ("APS") in respect of 1485 Dupont. However, that APS was terminated by the purchaser during the due diligence phase.

10. The Manager has negotiated with other purchaser groups and has identified a potential purchaser. The transaction proposed by this purchaser would, if completed, be sufficient to pay out all amounts secured against 1485 Dupont. The terms proposed by the potential purchaser are set out in the e-mail attached as Confidential Appendix "A".

11. The Dupont Mortgagees have engaged in preliminary discussions relating to the assumption of the Dupont Mortgage by the potential purchaser. However, the Dupont Mortgagees have refused to execute a confidentiality agreement and, accordingly, have not been provided with detailed information relating to the potential purchase.

12. The potential purchaser has insisted on a 60 day due diligence period and a further 30 days before closing. Accordingly, the proposed transaction cannot be completed if the Dupont Mortgagees' motion is granted.

13. Such further and other grounds as counsel may advise and this Honourable Court permit.

THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE WILL BE USED AT THE HEARING OF THE MOTION:

1. The Twelfth Report of the Manager dated June 6, 2014; and

2. Such further and other material as counsel may advise and this Honourable Court may permit.

Date: October 1, 2014

- 5 -

GOODMANS LLP

333 Bay Street, Suite 3400
Toronto, Canada M5H 2S7

Brian Empey LSUC#: 30640G
Mark Dunn LSUC#: 55510L

Tel: (416) 979-2211
Fax: (416) 979-1234

Lawyers for the Manager

SCHEDULE “A” COMPANIES

1. Dr. Bernstein Diet Clinics Ltd.
2. 2272551 Ontario Limited
3. DBDC Investments Atlantic Ltd.
4. DBDC Investments 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 Ltd.
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 Lands 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.

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 Ltd.
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. Royal Gate Nominee Inc.
29. Royal Gate (Land) Nominee Inc.
30. Dewhurst Development Ltd.
31. Eddystone Place Inc.

- 32. Richmond Row Holdings Ltd.
- 33. El-Ad (1500 Don Mills) Limited
- 34. 165 Bathurst Inc.

DBDC SPADINA LTD. ET AL

and

NORMA WALTON ET AL

Court File No: CV-13-10280-00CL

Applicants

Respondents

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
 (Commercial List)

Proceeding commenced at TORONTO

NOTICE OF CROSS-MOTION
 (Cross-Motion re: Discharge of Manager's obligations in
 respect of 1485 Dupont, returnable October 9, 2014)

GOODMANS LLP
 Barristers & Solicitors
 333 Bay Street, Suite 3400
 Toronto, Canada M5H 2S7

Brian Empey LSUC#: 30640G
 Mark Dunn LSUC#: 55510L
 Tel: 416.979.2211
 Fax: 416.979.1 234

Lawyers for the Manager

B

Court File No.: CV-13-10280-00CL

**ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
(Commercial List)**

B E T W E E N:

**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 IN SCHEDULE "B" HERETO, TO BE
BOUND BY THE RESULT**

TWELFTH REPORT OF THE MANAGER, SCHONFELD INC.

Contents

Contents

I.	Introduction.....	2
A.	Purpose of this Report.....	2
B.	Terms of reference	2
C.	Background	3
II.	1485 Dupont.....	3
A.	Funding issues.....	3
B.	The Dupont Mortgagees' Motion	4
C.	Efforts to sell 1485 Dupont.....	5
III.	Conclusion and Recommendations	5

I. Introduction

1. This is the Twelfth Report of Schonfeld Inc. (the “**Manager**”) in its capacity as Manager of certain companies listed at Schedule “B” to the Order of Justice Newbould dated November 5, 2013 (the “**Companies**”),¹ together with the real estate properties owned by the Companies (the “**Properties**”).

A. Purpose of this Report

2. Florence Leasholds Limited, Beatrice Leasholds Limited and ADA Leasholds Limited (collectively, the “**Dupont Mortgagees**”), the holders of a first mortgage on 1485 Dupont Street (“**1485 Dupont**”), served a motion to lift the stay against Dupont Developments Ltd. (“**Dupont Developments**”), the Company that owns 1485 Dupont to permit power of sale proceedings by the Dupont Mortgagees. One purpose of this report is to provide information relevant to the Dupont Mortgagees’ motion.

3. The Manager has brought a cross-motion for an Order discharging it from any obligation for the management, control preservation or protection of 1485 Dupont. For greater certainty, the Manager has not sought any discharge or other relief in respect of its mandate as Manager of the Companies that own the Discharge Properties.

4. This Report provides a summary of the circumstances that, in the Manager’s view, require that it be relieved of responsibility for the Discharge Properties and a recommendation that this Honourable Court grant the relief described in the Manager’s Notice of Motion.

B. Terms of reference

5. Based on its review and interaction with the parties to date, nothing has come to the Manager’s attention that would cause it to question the reasonableness of the information presented herein. However, the Manager has not audited, or otherwise attempted to independently verify, the accuracy or completeness of any financial information of the Companies. The Manager therefore expresses no opinion or other form of assurance in respect of any of the Companies’ financial information that may be in this Report.

¹ Schedule “B” was amended by Order dated January 16, 2014.

C. Background

6. The Companies are a group of real estate development corporations incorporated as part of a series of joint ventures between Dr. Stanley Bernstein and companies that he controls (the “**Bernstein Group**”) and Norma and Ronauld Walton and entities that they control (the “**Walton Group**”). Most of the Companies were incorporated to purchase and develop a particular Property.

7. In the summer and fall of 2013, the relationship between the Walton Group and the Bernstein Group broke down amid allegations that the Walton Group had, among other things, placed mortgages on jointly-held properties without the Bernstein Group’s consent and failed to provide reporting required by the agreements that govern the joint venture. The dispute between the Walton Group and Bernstein Group is described in more detail in the Endorsement of Justice Newbould dated November 5, 2013, which is attached as Appendix “1”.

8. Pursuant to the Order of Justice Newbould dated November 5, 2014(the “**November 5 Order**”), which is attached as Appendix “2”, the Manager was appointed to provide independent management of the Companies and the Properties for the benefit of all stakeholders.

II. 1485 Dupont

A. Funding issues

9. Several Properties do not generate revenue or do not generate enough revenue to fund the obligations of the relevant owner Company. The Manager advised the parties early in these proceedings that it would not commingle funds between the various Companies and, accordingly, the Companies that did not generate revenue required an outside funding source. The Manager and the Applicants agreed that the Applicants would provide funding of approximately \$1.3 million between December 20, 2013 and January 31, 2014. That funding was provided.

10. The Applicants had no obligation to advance further amounts unless they agreed to provide further funding in writing or were ordered to provide funding by the Court. Since January 31, 2014, the Manager has submitted monthly funding requests to the Applicants. The Applicants have assessed these funding requests and determined what obligations they were prepared to fund.

11. By e-mail dated February 5, 2014, the Applicants' counsel advised that the Applicants were not prepared to fund any further obligations owed by Dupont Developments in respect of 1485 Dupont. Accordingly, Dupont Developments has been unable to meet its obligations to the Dupont Mortgagees.

B. The Dupont Mortgagees' Motion

12. 1485 Dupont has significant potential environmental remediation issues and several construction liens registered against it. These liens are summarized below:

Lien Claimant	Amount
Gentry Environmental Systems Ltd.	\$269,967
CAM Moulding & Plastering Ltd.	\$73,800
Titan Plumbing Ltd.	\$89,899.39
Norel Electric Ltd.	\$248,631
Abaco Glass Inc.	\$139,000

13. In addition, the City of Toronto (the "City") issued a work Order for 1485 Dupont in 2013 concerning the deteriorating condition of the exterior. Basic repairs were made in December 2013 to remove loose materials that posed an immediate danger to the public. The exterior deteriorated further over the winter and the City attended at 1485 Dupont in May 2014 with the Manager. The City insists that repairs be made to the exterior. These repairs include stucco work, brick replacement and repair of a broken lintel, all of which pose a safety concern. The Manager is seeking quotes for this work, which is expected to cost in excess of \$50,000. The Manager does not presently have the funding required to undertake the repair work.

14. The Manager does not oppose the relief sought by the Dupont Mortgagees and the Dupont Mortgagees have advised that they would prefer for the Manager to stay in place while they conduct power of sale proceedings. However, neither the Dupont Mortgagees nor the Applicants are prepared to fund such a mandate. Accordingly, the Manager has brought a motion to be relieved of any obligation for the management, control, preservation or protection of 1485 Dupont.

15. The Manager intends to continue as manager/receiver of Dupont Developments to ensure that it is able to effectively exercise whatever rights it may have in respect of the Dupont Mortgagees' ongoing power of sale proceedings.

C. Efforts to sell 1485 Dupont

16. The Manager previously entered into an Agreement of Purchase and Sale ("APS") with respect to 1485 Dupont. However, that APS was terminated by the purchaser during the due diligence phase.

17. The Manager has negotiated with other purchaser groups and has identified a potential purchaser. The transaction proposed by this purchaser would, if completed, be sufficient to pay out all amounts secured against 1485 Dupont. The terms proposed by the potential purchaser are set out in the e-mail attached as Confidential Appendix "A".

18. The Dupont Mortgagees have engaged in preliminary discussions relating to the assumption of the Dupont Mortgage by the potential purchaser. However, the Dupont Mortgagees have refused to execute a confidentiality agreement and, accordingly, have not been provided with detailed information relating to the potential purchase.

19. The potential purchaser has insisted on a 60 day due diligence period and a further 30 days before closing. Accordingly, the proposed transaction cannot be completed if the Dupont Mortgagees' motion is granted.

III. Conclusion and Recommendations

20. For the reasons set out above, the Manager respectfully recommends that, if the relief sought by the Dupont Mortgagees is granted, then the relief sought by the Manager should also be granted and possession of, and responsibility for, 1485 Dupont should be transferred to the Dupont Mortgagees.

All of which is respectfully submitted this 6th day of June, 2014.

SCHONFELD INC.

**In its capacity as Manager pursuant to
the Order of Newbould, J. dated
November 5, 2013**

Per: _____

Harlan Schonfeld CPA•CIRP

SCHEDULE "A" COMPANIES

1. Dr. Bernstein Diet Clinics Ltd.
2. 2272551 Ontario Limited
3. DBDC Investments Atlantic Ltd.
4. DBDC Investments 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 Ltd.
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 Lands 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.

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 Ltd.
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. Royal Gate Nominee Inc.
29. Royal Gate (Land) Nominee Inc.
30. Dewhurst Development Ltd.
31. Eddystone Place Inc.
32. Richmond Row Holdings Ltd.

33. El-Ad (1500 Don Mills) Limited
34. 165 Bathurst Inc.

6338232

1

CITATION: DBCD Spadina Ltd et al v. Norma Walton et al, 2013 ONSC 6833
COURT FILE NO.: CV-13-10280-00CL
DATE: 20131105

**SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE – ONTARIO
 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

BEFORE: Newbould J.

COUNSEL: *Peter H. Griffin and Shara N. Roy*, for the Applicants

John A. Campion, Emmeline Morse and Guillermo Schible, for the Respondents

Fred Myers and Mark S. Dunn, for the Inspector

HEARD: November 1, 2013

ENDORSEMENT

[1] On October 4, 2013, Schonfeld Inc. was appointed as inspector of all of the companies in schedule B. On October 24, 2013 a motion by the applicants to have Schonfeld Inc. appointed as a manager of those corporations and related corporation was adjourned to November 1, 2013 and

interim relief was granted, including giving the applicants access to and joint control over all bank accounts.

[2] The applicants now move for the appointment of the Inspector as receiver/manager over the schedule B corporations and certain other properties that are mortgaged to Dr. Bernstein under mortgages which have expired. It is resisted by the respondents who maintain that the appointment would be an interim appointment pending a trial of the issues that should be ordered and that the applicants have sufficient protection from the order of October 24, 2013 that the respondents will not attack.

[3] For the reasons that follow, Schonfeld Inc. is appointed as receiver/manager of the 31 schedule B corporations.

Background

[4] Dr. Bernstein is the founder of very successful diet and health clinics. Norma Walton is a lawyer and co-founder with her husband Ronauld Walton of Rose & Thistle. She is a principal of Walton Advocates, an in-house law firm providing legal services to the Rose & Thistle group of companies. Ronauld Walton is also a lawyer and co-founder of Rose & Thistle and a principal of Walton Advocates

[5] Beginning in 2008, Dr. Bernstein acted as the lender/mortgagee of several commercial real estate properties owned by the Waltons either through Rose & Thistle or through other corporations of which they are the beneficial owners.

[6] Following several financings, Dr. Bernstein and the Waltons agreed to invest jointly in 31 various commercial real estate projects. Each is a 50% shareholder of each corporation set up to hold each property.

[7] The known facts and concerns of the applicants giving rise to the appointment of the Inspector are set out in my endorsement of October 7, 2013 and were contained in affidavits of James Reitan, director of accounting and finance at Dr. Bernstein Diet and Health Clinics. Since

then, there has been further affidavit material from both sides and the Inspector has delivered two interim reports and a supplement to the first. The most recent affidavit from the applicants' side is an affidavit of Mr. Reitan sworn October 24, 2013. The most recent from the respondents' side is an affidavit of Norma Walton sworn October 31, 2013 on the day before this motion was heard. There has been no cross-examination on any affidavits. The first interim report of the Inspector is dated October 21, 2013, the supplement to it is dated October 24, 2013 and the second interim report is dated October 31, 2013. I have not permitted any cross-examination of the Inspector but the respondents have been free to make reasonable requests for information from the Inspector and they have availed themselves of that opportunity.

[8] To date, Dr. Bernstein through his corporations has advanced approximately \$105 million into the 31 projects (net of mortgages previously repaid), structured as equity of \$2.57 million, debt of \$78.5 million and mortgages of \$23.34 million`.

[9] According to the ledgers provided to the Inspector, the Waltons have contributed approximately \$6 million. \$352,900 is recorded as equity, which I assume is cash, \$1.78 million is recorded as debt and \$3.9 million is recorded in the intercompany accounts said to be owing to Rose & Thistle and is net of (i) amounts invoiced by Rose & Thistle but not yet paid; (ii) amounts paid by Rose & Thistle on behalf of the companies such as down-payments; and (iii) less amounts paid by DBDC directly to Rose & Thistle on behalf of the companies and (iv) other accounting adjustments.

Concerns of the applicants

(i) \$6 million mortgage

[10] This was a matter raised at the outset and was one of the basis for my finding of oppression leading to the appointment of the Inspector. Mr. Reitan learned as a result of a title search on all properties obtained by him that mortgages of \$3 million each were placed on 1450 Don Mills Road and 1500 Don Mills Road on July 31, 2013 and August 1, 2013. Dr. Bernstein had no knowledge of them and did not approve them as required by the agreements for those properties. At a meeting on September 27, 2013, Ms. Walton informed Mr. Reitan and Mr.

Schonfeld that the Waltons were in control of the \$6 million of mortgage proceeds (rather than the money being in the control of the owner companies), but refused to provide evidence of the existence of the \$6 million. Ms. Walton stated that she would only provide further information regarding the two mortgages in a without prejudice mediation process. That statement alone indicates that Ms. Walton knew there was something untoward about these mortgages.

[11] In his first interim report, Mr. Schonfeld reported that the proceeds of the Don Mills mortgages were deposited into the Rose & Thistle account. Rose & Thistle transferred \$3,330,000 to 28 of the 31 companies. The balance of the proceeds of the Don Mills mortgages totalling \$2,161,172, were used for other purposes including the following:

1. \$98,900 was paid to the Receiver General in respect of payroll tax;
2. \$460,000 was deposited into Ms. Walton's personal account;
3. \$353,000 was apparently used to repay a loan owed by Rose & Thistle in relation to Richmond Row Holdings Ltd.; and,
4. \$154,600 was transferred electronically to an entity named Plexor Plastics Corp. and \$181,950 transferred electronically to Rose and Thistle Properties Ltd. Ms. Walton advised the Inspector that she owns these entities with her husband.

[12] In her affidavit of October 31, 2013, Ms. Walton admits that \$2.1 million was "diverted" and used outside the 31 projects. She admits it should not have been done without Dr. Bernstein's consent. She offers excuses that do not justify what she did. What happened here, not to put too fine a point on it, was theft. It is little wonder that when first confronted with this situation, Ms. Walton said she would only talk about it in a without prejudice mediation.

[13] In her affidavit of October 4, 2013, Ms. Walton said she had made arrangements to discharge the \$3 million mortgage on 1500 Don Mills Rd on October 21, 2013 and to wire money obtained from the mortgage on 1450 Don Mills Road into the Global Mills account (one of the 31 companies) by the same date. Why the money would not be put into the 1450 Don

Mills account was not explained. In any event, no repayment of any of the diverted funds has occurred.

(ii) Tisdale Mews

[14] Tisdale Mews is a rezoning for 35 townhomes near Victoria Park Avenue and Eglinton Avenue East. Mr. Reitan states in his affidavit that Dr. Bernstein made his equity contribution to Tisdale Mews December 2011 in the amount of \$1,480,000. The bank statements for December 2011 for Tisdale Mews have not been made available. The forwarded balance on the bank statements available for Tisdale Mews from January 2012 is \$96,989.91, indicating that most if not all of Dr. Bernstein's money went elsewhere. Ms. Walton states in her affidavit that the project "was purchased by Dr. Bernstein on January 11, 2012" and he invested \$1.7 million in equity. How it was that Dr. Bernstein purchased the property is not explained and seems contrary to the affidavit of Mr. Reitan. The bank account statements for the property show no deposits of any consequence in January 2012 or later.

[15] In any event, Mr. Reitan was able to review bank records and other documents. Invoices and cheques written from Tisdale Mews' bank account show that a total of \$268,104.57 from Tisdale Mews has been used for work done at 44 Park Lane Circle, the personal residence of the Waltons in the Bridle Path area of Toronto.

[16] Ms. Walton in her affidavit acknowledges that the money was used to pay renovation costs on her residence. She says, however, that Rose & Thistle funded 100% of the \$268,104.57 purchases before any cheques were sent out of the Tisdale Mews account. How this was funded was not disclosed, although she did say that overall, Rose & Thistle has a positive net transfer to the Tisdale Mews account of \$2,208,964 "as per Exhibit G to the Inspector's first interim report". Exhibit G to that report has nothing to do with Tisdale Mews. Exhibit D to that report, being the property profile report of the Inspector for the 31 properties, contains no information for Tisdale Mews because information had not yet been provided to the Inspector. The Inspector's updated profile prepared after information was obtained from Rose & Thistle shows \$1,274,487 owing from Tisdale Mews to Rose & Thistle, but whether this is legitimate cannot be

determined until back-up documents sought by the Inspector are provided. It is no indication that cash was put into Tisdale Mews by Rose & Thistle.

[17] The statement of Ms. Walton that Rose & Thistle funded 100% of the \$268,104.57 purchases on her residence before any cheques were sent out of the Tisdale Mews account makes little sense. There would be no reason for Rose & Thistle to transfer funds into the Tisdale Mews account to pay personal expenses of Ms. Walton for her residence. Again, it has all the appearances of another case of theft.

(iii) Steps to impede a proper inspection

[18] It is quite evident that from the moment the order was made appointing the Inspector, Ms. Walton took various steps to hinder the Inspector. That order was made on October 4, a Friday, and permitted the Inspector to go to the offices of Rose & Thistle during normal business hours and on that evening and throughout the week-end. Mr. Reitan swears in his affidavit that when he arrived at the Rose & Thistle offices at 3:33 p.m. on the direction of the Inspector, which was shortly after the order was made, he saw Ms. Walton locking the door to the premises and she waved to him as she walked away from the doors. He was informed by Angela Romanova that Ms. Walton had told all employees to leave the premises once the order was granted at approximately 3 pm. He observed one employee who left with a server and one or more computers. After a discussion with the employee and Steven Williams, VP of operations at Rose & Thistle, these were taken back into the building. I received an e-mail from Mr. Griffin early in the evening alerting me to the problem and I was asked to be available if necessary. Mr. Reitan states that after several hours, and following Mr. Walton's arrival, Mr. Schonfeld, Mr. Merryweather and he were allowed into the premises.

[19] Ms. Walton in her affidavit states that a laptop "that was about to be removed" from the Rose & Thistle offices was 13 years old and they were disposing of it. One of her occasional workers asked if he could have it and they agreed. She states that the timing was unfortunate. She states that there are eight server towers permanently affixed to the premises. What she does not answer is Mr. Reitan's statement that she locked the doors and told her employees to leave, that whatever was taken from the premises was returned after discussions with the employee and

Mr. Williams, the VP of operations, and that it took several hours before the Inspector and Mr. Reitan were permitted on the premises. The order appointing the Inspector required Ms. Walton to fully co-operate with the Inspector.

[20] The order also permitted the Inspector to appoint persons as considered necessary, including Mr. Reitan. Ms. Walton however took the position that Mr. Reitan should not be on the premises, which was contrary to the order, and that the Inspector should not discuss with the applicants or their lawyers any information he obtained before making his first report to the court. Mr. Reitan was the accounting person for Dr. Bernstein most familiar with the investments and not having him available to the Inspector, either on the Rose & Thistle premises or not, would not be helpful to the Inspector. On October 9, 2013 I made a further order, which should not have been necessary, permitting Mr. Reitan to be on the premises when Mr. Schonfeld or his staff were present. I also ordered that Mr. Schonfeld was entitled, but not required, to discuss his investigation with the parties or their representatives.

[21] Ms. Walton informed the Inspector that the books and record of the companies were last brought current in 2011. Since August or September, 2013, after Mr. Reitan became involved in seeking information, Rose & Thistle employees have been inputting expense information into ledgers relating to the period January 2012 and August 2013. They have also issued a number of invoices for services rendered or expenses incurred by Rose & Thistle during the period January 2012 to August 2013. On October 17, 2013, Mr. Schonfeld convened a meeting with the parties and their counsel to orally present his findings. Prior to that meeting, Ms. Walton would only provide the Inspector with access to general ledgers for individual companies once she and Rose & Thistle had completed their exercise of updating the ledgers and issuing invoices from Rose & Thistle to each company. At the meeting, Ms. Walton agreed to provide the Inspector with access to ledgers for the remaining companies in their current state. These were eventually provided.

[22] Ms. Walton instituted a procedure under which no information could be provided by Rose & Thistle employees to the Inspector only after Ms. Walton had vetted it, which was causing considerable difficulties for the Inspector. On October 18, counsel for the Inspector wrote to counsel to the respondents and asked that the respondents provide immediate unfettered access to the books and records and end the insistence that all information be provided through

Ms. Walton. During the week of October 21, Ms. Walton said she could not meet because she was involved in preparing responding material in the litigation and that her staff was unavailable. By October 24, 2013 no substantive response to the Inspector's request was made, and on that date I made an order requiring Ms. Walton not to interfere with Rose & Thistle employees providing information to the Inspector. This should not have been necessary in light of the terms of the original order of October 4, 2013 appointing the Inspector.

(iv) Improper use of bank accounts

[23] The agreements for each project require that each project has a separate bank account. The Inspector reports, however, that there has been extensive co-mingling of bank accounts and that funds were routinely transferred between the company accounts and the Rose & Thistle account. From the date of each agreement to September 30, 2013, approximately \$77 million was transferred from the companies' accounts to Rose & Thistle and Rose & Thistle transferred approximately \$53 million to the various company accounts meaning that Rose & Thistle had retained approximately \$24 million transferred to it from the various companies.

[24] Ms. Walton confirmed to the Inspector that equity contributions to, and income received by, the companies were centralized and co-mingled in the Rose & Thistle account, which she described as a "clearing house". This practice continued in September 2013 and the Inspector reported it was difficult to trace how transfers from the companies were used because the funds were also co-mingled with funds transferred to the Rose & Thistle account by other Walton companies not making up the 31 companies in which Dr. Bernstein has his 50% interest. It is clear that the Waltons did not treat each company separately as was required in the agreements for each company.

[25] To alleviate the problem of the co-mingling of funds and the payments out to Rose & Thistle, the order of October 25 provided for the payment of deposits to be made to the bank accounts of the 31 companies and that no payment out could be made without the written consent of the applicants or someone they may nominate.

(v) Receivables of Rose & Thistle from the 31 companies

[26] The agreements for the 31 properties state that Dr. Bernstein and the Waltons are to provide 50% of the equity required. They do not provide that the Walton's equity is to be provided in services. They state that each of Dr. Bernstein and the Waltons will put in amounts of money. In her lengthy affidavit of October 31, 2013, Ms. Walton went to the trouble of describing each of the 31 projects, including stating how much equity Dr. Bernstein had put into each property. Tellingly, however, she made no statement at all of how much equity she or her husband had put into any of the properties, and gave no explanation for not doing so. This may be an indication that Ms. Walton is not able to say what equity has been put into each property, hardly surprising as the books and records were two years out of date at the time the Inspector was appointed.

[27] In his first interim report, Mr. Schonfeld reported that based on invoices and general ledger entries provided to October 18, 2013, Rose & Thistle appeared to have charged the companies approximately \$27 million for various fees and HST on the fees. On October 17, the date of his meeting with the parties, he had circulated a version of his chart regarding this which identified \$2.68 million that had been transferred to Rose & Thistle that could not be reconciled to any invoice issued by Rose & Thistle. On the following day on October 18, Rose & Thistle provided additional invoices to the companies for \$5.6 million so that the total amount invoiced exceeded the amounts transferred by Rose & Thistle to the companies by \$2.9 million. In his supplement to his first report, Mr. Schonfeld reported that the respondents had produced further invoices from Rose & Thistle dated between January 2012 and September 2013 to the companies for a total of \$34.6 million, being \$10.6 million more than it had received from the companies. Mr. Schonfeld identified approximately \$3.9 million recorded on the ledgers of Rose & Thistle as owing from the companies to Rose & Thistle. This amount is part of the \$6 million recorded in the books as being the contribution by the Waltons to the companies.

(vi) Documentation to support Rose & Thistle invoices

[28] The Inspector has sought unsuccessfully so far to obtain documentation underlying Rose & Thistle's invoices of some \$34.6 million to the companies, including construction budgets for

the various projects. This is of considerable importance in understanding the claim for equity put into the properties by the Waltons, because by far the largest amount of equity now claimed to have been put in by the Waltons are the fees for services said to have been provided by the Waltons to the various companies.

[29] The information that has been obtained regarding the invoices issued to some of the companies by Rose & Thistle is troubling and gives little confidence in what Ms. Walton and Rose & Thistle have done.

[30] Riverdale Mansion Inc. is one of the 31 projects. It is the owner of a historic mansion on Pape Avenue. Riverdale transferred \$1,759,800 to Rose & Thistle and received from Rose & Thistle \$785,250. Thus Rose & Thistle retained \$974,550 transferred to it by Riverdale.

[31] Rose & Thistle provided the Inspector with invoices addressed to Riverdale for construction management fees totaling \$1,183,981 plus HST and maintenance fees of \$60,000, including \$275,000 for "deposits for materials", \$103,863 for "project management services", \$295,000 for "site plan deposits and application" and \$67,890 for "steel bar ordered and installed". At the October 17 meeting, the Inspector asked for documentation, including third party invoices, to support the amounts invoiced to Riverdale. Ms. Walton said that Rose & Thistle did not have third party invoices for many of the invoiced expenses because Rose & Thistle performed much of the work itself (it has a construction company) and that some of the expenses had not yet been incurred. In response, the Inspector requested documents such as material invoices and payroll records to validate the cost of work done by Rose & Thistle and invoiced to Riverdale. None were provided.

[32] On the following day, October 18, the Inspector received a credit note from Rose & Thistle which showed that the invoice from Rose & Thistle to Riverdale had been reversed except for \$257,065.62 for work performed in 2011. The credit note is dated December 31, 2011.

[33] In her affidavit of October 31, 2013, Ms. Walton gave an explanation for the Riverdale reversal, an explanation that has problems. She said that considerable work was done to prepare the site for construction of townhouses and condominiums. As the work was proceeding, the

project changed and the mansion will be rebuilt and become used for a woman's shelter. Rose & Thistle was owed "certain monies" for its work and the invoice for \$1,291,025 inclusive of HST was rendered by Rose & Thistle to Riverdale. She states that "the Inspector thought the amount claimed was too high" and so she issued a credit note and submitted a lower invoice for \$257,065.62 "that reflected the value of the work done by Rose & Thistle". She says she merely forgot to re-do the invoice after the plans changed.

[34] The applicants have had no chance to cross-examine Ms. Walton on her affidavit. I have considerable doubts that the Inspector told Ms. Walton that the invoice was too high, as he has had no back-up documentation to consider the validity of the invoice and was asking for it to be produced. However, even assuming that the Inspector told her the invoice was too high, which is not what the Inspector reported, one may ask why, if the new invoice of some \$257,000 reflected the work that was done, an earlier invoice had been sent for some \$1.2 million. That earlier invoice appears to have been highly improper.

[35] Dupont Developments Ltd. is one of the 31 projects. It is a contaminated industrial building and the plan according to Ms. Walton is to "gut renovate" the building and remediate the contaminated site. The Inspector requested the construction budget for it and it was provided by Mr. Goldberg, who said he was responsible for the construction project. Mr. Goldberg told Mr. Schonfeld that the budget documents were out of date. They indicate that Dupont spent \$385,000 on construction and \$20,000 on environmental renovation. The Inspector had previously been provided with an invoice issued by Rose & Thistle to Dupont for \$565,339.34 which includes an entry for construction management services of \$175,300.30, said in the invoice to be "10% of hard costs", implying that Rose & Thistle had supervised construction that cost approximately \$1.75 million. The updated general ledger for Dupont received by the Inspector on October 24 showed capitalized expenses of approximately \$248,000, construction in progress of \$36,000 and various consulting fees of approximately \$563,000. All of these documents show different construction expenditures, none nowhere near the implied cost of \$1.75 million.

[36] This Dupont budget was the only budget for any of the projects provided to the Inspector by the time of his last report dated October 31, 2013, one day before this motion was heard. The

Inspector concludes that it appears that Rose & Thistle is not maintaining project budgets on an ongoing basis to track expenses and measure construction costs against the pro forma statement prepared when the property was purchased.

[37] Fraser Properties owns property at 30 Fraser Avenue and Fraser Lands owns abutting property purchased in October 2012. Dr. Bernstein made an equity contribution of approximately \$16 million. Fraser Properties transferred \$10,281,050 to Rose & Thistle and received back \$1,215,100. Thus Rose & Thistle retained \$9,065,950. In his first report, Mr. Schonfeld said he had inspected the property and saw no construction work or evidence of recent construction work. In his supplement to his first report, after he had received the general ledger and invoices from Rose & Thistle to Fraser Properties, he reported that the invoices to Fraser Properties were approximately \$1.6 million. Assuming the invoices can be supported, that would mean that Rose & Thistle has received approximately \$7.4 million more from Fraser Properties than it invoiced to Fraser Properties. It is to be noted that at the time of the Inspector's first report, the books and records showed an intercompany receivable due to Rose & Thistle from the companies of approximately \$9.9 million. By the time of the first supplement to the Inspector's report three days later, after the invoices and general ledger had been received and reviewed, this amount was reduced to approximately \$3.9 million, due to a new debit showing as being owed by Rose & Thistle to Fraser Properties of approximately \$6.45 million.

[38] On October 31, 2013 Mr. Campion on behalf of the respondents wrote to counsel to the applicants and to the Inspector and referred to the Inspector asking which filing cabinet he could review to obtain the documents requested, such as third party invoices, contracts, payroll records or other contemporaneous documents. Mr. Campion said that the information sought can only be obtained through discussion with the staff as all documentation is on computer and not in a filing cabinet. This is troubling to the Inspector. It would mean that there is no paper of any kind in existence for \$35 million of costs said to have been incurred, or that it has all been scanned and thrown out. It would be unusual to scan it and throw it out, and questionable that it was all scanned when Rose & Thistle was two years late in their bookkeeping and according to Ms. Walton had an outdated software system.

[39] Since the Inspector was appointed, Rose & Thistle has been preparing invoices for work done going back to January 2012, and one may question where the information is coming from to do that. Mr. Campion was undoubtedly passing on what he was told by Ms. Walton, but what he was told raises concerns.

(vii) Other equity investors

[40] The agreements provided that the only shares to be issued were to Dr. Bernstein's corporations or to the Walton's corporations and neither could transfer shares to another party without the consent of the other party. However, in his prior affidavit, Mr. Reitan provided documentary evidence that disclosed that the Waltons have taken on new equity investors in at least one project, without the agreement of Dr. Bernstein. This issue was not answered by Ms. Walton in her affidavit of October 31, 2013, the failure of which is compounded in that Ms. Walton did not disclose, as previously discussed, what equity contributions have been made by the Waltons for any of the properties.

Legal principles and analysis

[41] Section 101 of the *Courts of Justice Act* provides for the appointment of a receiver/manager where it appears to a judge to be just and convenient to do so. In *Royal Bank of Canada v. Chongsim Investment Ltd.* (1997), 32 O.R. (3d) 565, Epstein J. (as she then was) discussed what should be considered in deciding whether to make such an order. She stated:

The jurisdiction to order a receiver is found in s. 101 of the *Courts of Justice Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. C.43. This section provides that a receiver may be appointed where it appears to be just and convenient. The appointment of a receiver is particularly intrusive. It is therefore relief that should only be granted sparingly. The law is clear that in the exercise of its discretion, the court should consider the effect of such an order on the parties. As well, since it is an equitable remedy, the conduct of the parties is a relevant factor.

[42] Section 248 of the OBCA also provides for the appointment of a receiver manager if there has been oppression as contained in section 248(2). Under section 248(2) a court may make an order to rectify the matters complained of and section 248(3) provides:

(3) In connection with an application under this section, the court may make any interim or final order it thinks fit including, without limiting the generality of the foregoing,

[...]

(b) an order appointing a receiver or receiver-manager;

[43] Various cases other than the *Chongsim Investment* case have discussed the principles to be taken into account. See *Anderson v. Hunking*, [2010] O.J. No. 3042 and *Bank of Montreal v. Carnival Leasing Limited* (2011), 74 C.B.R. (5th) 300 and the authorities referred to in those cases.

[44] In my view this is not a case in which the applicants are seeking an interim order appointing a receiver/manager. They do not seek an interim order. They seek the appointment on the basis of evidence that is largely uncontested by Ms. Walton. I would agree with the respondents that if the evidence relied on by the applicants for the order sought was largely contested, the relief should be considered on the basis that it is interim relief. However, that is not the case. In any event, even if the *RJR MacDonald* tri-part test were applicable, that would not be materially different in this case from the test articulated by Epstein J. in *Chongsim Investment* that requires a consideration of the effect of the order sought on the parties and their conduct.

[45] In my reasons when the Inspector was appointed on October 4, 2013, I found oppression had occurred as follows:

[27] In my view, on the record before me Dr. Bernstein has met the test required for an investigation to be ordered. To put on two mortgages for \$6 million without the required agreement of Dr. Bernstein and then refuse to disclose what happened to the money except in a without prejudice mediation meets the higher test of oppression, let alone the lesser test of unfairly disregarding the interests of Dr. Bernstein. The other examples of the evidence I have referred, as well as the failure to provide monthly reports on the projects to Dr. Bernstein, are clearly instances of the Waltons unfairly being prejudicial to and unfairly disregarding the interests of Dr. Bernstein, a 50% shareholder of each of the owner corporations.

[46] I do not see the picture as now being less clear. To the contrary, it seems much clearer. I have referred to the concerns above in some detail. They include the following:

1. \$2.1 million was improperly taken from the proceeds of the \$6 million mortgages that never had Dr. Bernstein's approval, \$400,000 of which was taken by Ms. Walton into her personal bank account. Ms. Walton was well aware that this was wrong. She is a lawyer and the agreements were drawn in her office. Her initial reaction when confronted about the mortgages by Mr. Reitan, who at the time did not know what had happened to the mortgage proceeds, that she would only discuss it in a without prejudice mediation is a clear indication she knew what she did was wrong and contrary to Dr. Bernstein's interests.
2. \$268,104.57 was improperly paid from the Tisdale Mews account to pay for renovations to the Waltons' residence. No reasonable explanation has been provided.
3. The co-mingling of accounts and the cash sweep into the Rose & Thistle accounts was a breach of agreement and unfairly prejudicial to Dr. Bernstein and a disregard of his interests. This is particularly the case in light of the lack of current books and records that should have been prepared and available rather than requiring an Inspector to try to get to the bottom of what has occurred. A lack of records is in itself unfairly disregarding the interests of Dr. Bernstein, particularly taken the size of his investment. Blaming it on outdated computer software is hardly an answer. That should have been taken care of long ago.
4. The frenzied attempts in the past month since the Inspector was appointed to update ledgers and manufacture invoices should never have been necessary and in light of the evidence, obviously casts doubt on what is now being done to update the records. Dr. Bernstein should never have had to face this prejudicial situation.
5. The Waltons have not provided equal payments of money into any of the 31 properties. The claim that their equity was provided by way of set-off for fees and

work, even if that were permissible under the agreements, is unsupported by any available documents to the Inspector. What little has been provided raises serious issues, as discussed above. As well, taking in new equity partners is not at all what Dr. Bernstein signed up for, and indicative of a lack of ability of the Waltons to fund their equity in accordance with the agreements.

6. Dr. Bernstein was entitled to monthly reports. It is now quite evident why that has not occurred.

[47] Mr. Campion contended that a receiver/manager could not be ordered over any particular property without a finding of oppressive conduct regarding that property. I am not at all sure that such a proposition in this case is correct, but in any event there has been oppressive conduct regarding each property. The co-mingling of funds and the sweep of cash from each property's account into Rose & Thistle was oppressive in these circumstances in which there were no contemporaneous books and records kept that would permit Dr. Bernstein, or now the Inspector, to fully understand what occurred to the money from each property. The setting up of alleged fees owing to Rose & Thistle for the properties to substantiate the Waltons' equity contributions, even if permissible, without readily available documentation to substantiate the validity of the fees, was oppressive. The lack of records and reports for each property was oppressive.

[48] It is contended on behalf of the respondents that they have the contractual right to manage the projects and thus no receiver/manager should be appointed. The difficulty with this argument is that the contracts have been breached and the Waltons have certainly not shown themselves to be capable managers. A basic lack of record keeping, compounded by co-mingling of funds and transferring them to Rose & Thistle, belies any notion of proper professional management. Ms. Walton acknowledges that accounting and other issues "have plainly caused him [Dr. Bernstein] to lose confidence in my management". That is a fundamental change to the relationship.

[49] It is contended that the business will be harmed if a receiver/manager is appointed. Ms. Walton states in her affidavit that she believes that the dynamic nature of this portfolio will suffer and in the end suffer unnecessary losses. What is meant by the dynamic nature is not clear.

I recognize that a receiver/manager can in certain circumstances have negative implications in the marketplace, particularly if it means that unsold properties will have to be put up for sale at less than market prices or be sold quickly. There is no indication that is the plan here at all and there is no court ordered sale being requested.

[50] It is also to be recognized that a receiver/manager can bring stability to a situation, which in this case appears to be a requirement to protect the interests of Dr. Bernstein.

[51] Dr. Bernstein with his \$100 million plus investment has a huge financial interest in this portfolio of properties. It is hardly in his interest to have the properties dealt with in less than a sound commercial way. He suffers the same risk as the Waltons, and depending on what real equity the Waltons have put in, perhaps far more. The Waltons contend that they have huge financial risk in that they have guaranteed mortgages to the tune of some \$206 million. They have not offered any evidence that there is any likelihood of being called upon on their guarantees, and to the contrary Ms. Walton says that all of the projects except perhaps one or two of them are or expected to be profitable. There is no reason why an experienced receiver/manager with capable property managers cannot continue with the success of the ventures.

[52] The respondents contend that with the controls over the bank accounts and the other provisions of the two orders made to date, there is plenty of protection for Dr. Bernstein. There may be something in this argument, but it ignores one of the basic problems caused by the way the business has been run. There is no clear evidence yet what exactly has been put into the properties by the Waltons, and that is crucial to understanding what both Dr. Bernstein and the Waltons are entitled to. In the month since the Inspector was appointed, Ms. Walton has caused back dated invoices to be prepared for past work said to have been done. What they have been prepared from is not at all clear. With some of the troubling things about changing records that have become apparent as a result of digging by Mr. Reitan and the Inspector, discussed above, and the diversion of money that has taken place, there is reason to be concerned exactly what Ms. Walton is doing to shore up her position. The Inspector is not in a position to know what is being prepared on an *ex post facto* basis or from what, and Dr. Bernstein should not have to rely

on a hope that something untoward will no longer be done. The present situation is causing considerable harm to Dr. Bernstein.

Conclusion

[53] Schonfeld Inc. is appointed as manager/receiver of all of the properties in schedule B, effective immediately. I was provided with a draft order that is based on the model order in use in our Court and approved by the Users' Committee. It appears satisfactory but there were no submissions as to its terms. If the respondents have any submissions with respect to the draft order, they are to be made in writing within three days and the applicants or Schonfeld Inc. shall have until Wednesday of next week to respond. In the meantime, the appointment of Schonfeld Inc. as manager/receiver is not to be delayed and Schonfeld Inc. shall immediately have the powers contained in the draft order pending any objection to it by the respondents.


[54] The applicants have applied to have Schonfeld Inc. appointed as receiver over four properties mortgaged to Dr. Bernstein with expired mortgages that are not schedule B corporations. Ms. Walton has stated in her affidavit that funds are being raised that will see these mortgages paid in full by the end of November, 2013. In light of that statement, this application is adjourned *sine die*. It can be brought on after the end of November in the event that the mortgages have not been paid in full.

[55] The applicants have also requested a certificate of pending litigation over 44 Park Lane Circle, the residence of the Waltons in light of the evidence that money from one of the 31 schedule Dr. Bernstein corporations was used to pay for renovations to the residence. I was advised by counsel for Ms. Walton during the hearing of the motion that the money would be repaid that day. Based on that statement, the request for a certificate of pending litigation is adjourned *sine die* and can be brought back on in the event that evidence of the payment is not provided to the applicants and Schonfeld Inc.

[56] The Inspector moved for approval of his interim reports and the actions taken as disclosed in the reports, and approval for his fees and disbursements and those of his counsel. No one opposed the request although Mr. Campion said that the respondents were not consenting to

them. In my view, the actions taken by the Inspector have been entirely proper in difficult circumstances and in her affidavit Ms. Walton acknowledges that the Inspector was necessary because of her issues. The fees and disbursements also appear reasonable. At the conclusion of the hearing I granted the order sought.

[57] The applicants are entitled to their costs from the respondents. If costs cannot be agreed, brief written submissions along with a proper cost outline may be made within 10 days and brief written reply submissions may be made within a further 10 days.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John Newbould", is written over a horizontal line.

Newbould J.

Date: November 5, 2013

2

Court File No.: CV-13-10280-00CL



**ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
COMMERCIAL LIST**

THE HONOURABLE MR.

) FRIDAY, THE 5th DAY

JUSTICE NEWBOULD

) OF NOVEMBER, 2013

B E T W E E N:

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

ORDER

THIS MOTION made by the Applicants, DBDC Spadina Ltd. and those Corporations Listed on Schedule "A" hereto for an Order appointing Schonfeld Inc. Receivers + Trustees, as manager (in such capacities, the "**Manager**") without security, of all of the assets, undertakings and properties of the Schedule "B" Corporations, or for other relief, was heard this day at 330 University Avenue, Toronto, Ontario.

ON READING the Affidavits of Jim Reitan sworn October 1, October 3 and October 24, 2013 and the Exhibits thereto, the Affidavit of Susan Lyons and the Exhibits hereto, the Affidavit of Lorna Groves and the Exhibits thereto, the First Interim Report of the Inspector,

Schonfeld Inc., the Supplemental Report to the First Interim Report of the Inspector and the Exhibits thereto, the Second Interim Report of the Inspector and the Exhibits thereto, the Affidavits of Norma Walton sworn October 3 and 31, 2013 and the Exhibits thereto and on hearing the submissions of counsel for the Applicants, counsel for the Inspector and counsel for the Respondents,

SERVICE

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

CONTINUING ORDERS

2. THIS COURT ORDERS that the Orders of the Honourable Justice Newbould dated October 4, 2013 and October 25, 2013 continue in full force and effect except as modified by this Order.

APPOINTMENT

3. THIS COURT ORDERS that the Manager is hereby appointed Manager, without security, of all of the real property owned by the Schedule "B" Companies hereto (the "**Real Estate**") and all of the current and future assets, undertakings and property, real and personal, of the Schedule "B" Corporations of every nature and kind whatsoever, and wherever situate, including all proceeds thereof (collectively with the Real Estate, the "**Property**") effective upon the granting of this Order.

MANAGER'S POWERS

4. THIS COURT ORDERS that the Manager shall have the powers of the Inspector granted pursuant to the Order of the Honourable Justice Newbould dated October 4, 2013, including but not limited to access to the premises and books and records of the Respondent The Rose & Thistle Group Ltd.
5. THIS COURT ORDERS that the Manager is hereby empowered and authorized, but not obligated, to act at once in respect of the Property and, without in any way limiting the generality of the foregoing, the Manager is hereby expressly empowered and authorized to do any of the following where the Manager considers it necessary or desirable:
 - (a) to undertake sole and exclusive authority to manage and control the Property and any and all proceeds, receipts and disbursements arising out

of or from the Property, wheresoever located, and any and all proceeds, receipts and disbursements arising out of or from the Property, and for greater certainty, the Manager shall have sole and exclusive right and control of the Schedule "B" Corporations' bank accounts wherever located in accordance with this Order;

- (b) to open bank accounts at any banking institution acceptable to the Applicant to transfer funds from the current bank accounts of the Schedule "B" Companies, as necessary, ~~with prior notice to the Parties;~~ ✓ 25
- (c) to receive, preserve, and protect and maintain control of the Property, or any part or parts thereof, including, but not limited to, the changing of locks and security codes, the relocating of Property to safeguard it, the engaging of independent security personnel, the taking of physical inventories and the placement of such insurance coverage as may be necessary or desirable;
- (d) to manage, operate, and carry on the business of the Schedule "B" Corporations, including the powers to enter into any agreements, incur any obligations in the ordinary course of business, cease to carry on all or any part of the business ~~upon prior notice to the Parties,~~ or cease to perform any contracts of any of the Schedule "B" Corporations ~~upon prior notice to the Parties;~~ ✓ 25 25
- (e) to engage consultants, appraisers, agents, experts, auditors, accountants, managers, counsel and such other persons from time to time and on whatever basis, including on a temporary basis, to assist with the exercise of the powers and duties conferred by this order including but not limited to a property manager, including but not limited to:
 - (i) DMS Properties;
 - (ii) Briarlane Property Rental Management Inc.; and

- (iii) Sterling Karamar;
- (f) to purchase or lease such machinery, equipment, inventories, supplies, premises or other assets to continue the business of the Schedule "B" Corporations or any part or parts thereof;
- (g) to receive and collect all monies and accounts now owed or hereafter owing to the Schedule "B" Corporations and to exercise all remedies of the Schedule "B" Corporations in collecting such monies, including, without limitation, to enforce any security held by any of the Schedule "B" Corporations, ~~provided that the Manager shall give prior notice to the Parties of any enforcement of security;~~ ✓ 2/15
- (h) subject to paragraph 4 below, to settle, extend or compromise any indebtedness owing to any of the Schedule "B" Corporations, ~~provided that the Manager shall give prior notice to the Parties of the settlement of any material indebtedness;~~ ✓ 2/15
- (i) to execute, assign, issue and endorse documents of whatever nature in respect of any of the Property, whether in the Manager's name or in the name and on behalf of the Schedule "B" Corporations, for any purpose pursuant to this Order;
- (j) to undertake environmental investigations, assessments, engineering and building condition or other examinations of the Real Estate;
- (k) subject to paragraph 12 below, to initiate, prosecute and continue the prosecution of any and all proceedings and to defend all proceedings now pending or hereafter instituted with respect to the Schedule "B" Corporations, the Property or the Manager, and to settle or compromise any such proceedings. The authority hereby conveyed shall extend to such appeals or applications for judicial review in respect of any order or judgment pronounced in any such proceeding;

- (l) subject to paragraph 13 below, to market the Property and in particular the Real Estate, including advertising and soliciting offers in respect of the Property and negotiating such terms and conditions of sale as the Manager in its discretion may deem appropriate;
- (m) to enter into agreements and to sell, convey, transfer, or assign the Property or any part or parts thereof of the Schedule "B" Corporations' business, with the prior approval of this Court in respect of any transaction, and in each such case notice under subsection 63(4) of the Ontario *Personal Property Security Act*, shall not be required, and in each case the Ontario *Bulk Sales Act* shall not apply;
- (n) to have on-line and electronic as well as hard copy access to the bank accounts of the Rose & Thistle Group Ltd. to review all receipts and disbursements total from such accounts and to request and receive on a timely basis from the Respondents particulars of all receipts and disbursements sufficient for the Inspector to identify such transfers, the parties involved and the reasons therefore;
- (o) upon notice to all parties and affected registered encumbrances, to apply for any vesting order or other orders necessary to convey the Property or any part or parts thereof to a purchaser or purchasers thereof, free and clear of any liens or encumbrances affecting such Property;
- (p) to report to, meet with and discuss with such affected Persons (as defined below) as the Manager considers appropriate on all matters relating to the Property, and to share information, subject to such terms as to confidentiality as the Manager deems advisable;
- (q) to apply for any permits, licences, approvals or permissions as may be required by any governmental authority and any renewals thereof for and on behalf of and, if thought desirable by the Manager, in the name of the Schedule "B" Corporations;

-6-

- (r) to do all acts and execute, in the name and on behalf of the Schedule "B" Corporations, all documents, and for that purpose use the seal of the corporation, if any; and
- (s) to take any steps reasonably incidental to the exercise of these powers.

and in each case where the Manager takes any such actions or steps, it shall, subject to paragraph 4 below, be exclusively authorized and empowered to do so, to the exclusion of all other Persons (as defined below), including the Schedule "B" Corporations, and without interference from any other Person. For greater certainty, nothing in this Management Order or to the Manager's exercise of its powers hereunder shall cause the Manager to be, or deemed to be, a receiver within the meaning of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*.

~~6. The Manager shall take reasonable steps to provide the Parties with an accounting on a monthly basis of any collections referred to in subparagraphs 5(g) above.~~ ✓ 21

DUTY TO PROVIDE ACCESS AND CO-OPERATION TO THE MANAGER

- 7. THIS COURT ORDERS that (i) the Schedule "B" Corporations and The Rose & Thistle Group Inc., (ii) all of their current and former directors, officers, employees, agents, accountants, legal counsel and shareholders, and all other persons acting on its instructions or behalf, including but not limited to the Respondents and all others having notice of this Order; (iii) all other individuals, firms, corporations, governmental bodies or agencies, or other entities having notice of this Order; and (iv) Meridian Credit Union; and (v) without limiting the generality of the foregoing, Norma Walton, Ronauld Walton, anyone acting under the instructions of anyone listed in this paragraph; and (vi) anyone with notice of this order (all of the foregoing, collectively, being "**Persons**" and each being a "**Person**") shall forthwith advise the Manager of the existence of any Property in such Person's possession or control, shall grant immediate and continued access to the Property to the Manager, and shall deliver all such Property to the Manager upon the Manager's request, and in any event no later than 36 hours following the Manager's request.
- 8. THIS COURT ORDERS that all Persons shall forthwith advise the Manager of the existence of any books, documents, securities, contracts, orders, corporate and accounting records, and any other papers, records and information of any kind related to the business or affairs of the Schedule "B" Corporations, and any computer programs, computer tapes, computer disks, or other data storage media containing any such information (the foregoing, collectively, the "**Records**") in that Person's possession or control, and shall provide to the Manager or permit the Manager to make, retain and take away copies thereof and grant to the Manager unfettered access to and use of accounting, computer, software and physical facilities relating thereto, provided however that nothing in this

paragraph 9 or in paragraph 11 of this Order shall require the delivery of Records, or the granting of access to Records, which may not be disclosed or provided to the Manager due to the privilege attaching to solicitor-client communication or litigation work product belong to a Shareholder or a director of a Schedule "B" Corporations personally or due to statutory provisions prohibiting such disclosure.

9. THIS COURT ORDERS that the Records shall, upon reasonable notice to the Manager and during normal business hours of the Manager, be open to examination by each of the parties and their respective legal counsel, and that a copy of these Records be provided by the Manager of the parties upon request, the reasonable costs associated with such access and copies to be determined by the Manager, and invoiced to and paid by the requesting party to the Manager forthwith.
10. THIS COURT ORDERS that if any Records are stored or otherwise contained on a computer or other electronic system of information storage, whether by independent service provider or otherwise, all Persons in possession or control of such Records shall forthwith give unfettered access to the Manager for the purpose of allowing the Manager to recover and fully copy all of the information contained therein whether by way of printing the information onto paper or making copies of computer disks or such other manner of retrieving and copying the information as the Manager in its discretion deems expedient, and shall not alter, erase or destroy any Records without the prior written consent of the Manager. Further, for the purposes of this paragraph, all Persons shall provide the Manager with all such assistance in gaining immediate access to the information in the Records as the Manager may in its discretion require including providing the Manager with instructions on the use of any computer or other system and providing the Manager with any and all access codes, account names and account numbers that may be required to gain access to the information.

NO PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE MANAGER

11. THIS COURT ORDERS that, except as may be provided herein, no proceeding or enforcement process in any court or tribunal (each, a "**Proceeding**"), shall be commenced or continued against the Manager except with the written consent of the Manager or with leave of this Court.

NO PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE SCHEDULE "B" CORPORATIONS OR THE PROPERTY

12. THIS COURT ORDERS that no Proceeding against or in respect of any of the Schedule "B" Corporations or the Property shall be commenced or continued except with the written consent of the Manager or with leave of this Court and any and all Proceedings currently under way against or in respect of the Schedule "B" Corporations or the Property, with the exception of the proceedings referred to in paragraph 7, are hereby stayed and suspended pending further Order of this Court. Notwithstanding any other provision in this Order, the parties shall not be precluded from taking any steps or from commencing or continuing any proceedings in Ontario Superior Court of Justice, Court File No. CV-13-10280-00CL (Commercial List), and in such circumstances the Manager

shall not be obliged to defend or participate on behalf of the Schedule "B" Corporations and the Manager shall not be liable for any costs, damages or awards related to any such proceedings.

NO EXERCISE OF RIGHTS OR REMEDIES

13. THIS COURT ORDERS that, except as may be provided herein, all rights and remedies against the Schedule "B" Corporations, the Manager, or affecting the Property, are hereby stayed and suspended except with the written consent of the Manager or leave of this Court, provided however that nothing in this paragraph shall (i) empower the Manager or the Schedule "B" Corporations to carry on any business which the Schedule "B" Corporations is not lawfully entitled to carry on, (ii) exempt the Manager or the Schedule "B" Corporations from compliance with statutory or regulatory provisions relating to health, safety or the environment, (iii) prevent the filing of any registration to preserve or perfect a security interest, or (iv) prevent the registration of a claim for lien.

NO INTERFERENCE WITH THE MANAGER

14. THIS COURT ORDERS that no Person shall discontinue, fail to honour, alter, interfere with, repudiate, terminate or cease to perform any right, renewal right, contract, agreement, licence or permit in favour of or held by the Schedule "B" Corporations, without written consent of the Manager or leave of this Court.

CONTINUATION OF SERVICES

15. THIS COURT ORDERS that all Persons having oral or written agreements with the Schedule "B" Corporations or statutory or regulatory mandates for the supply of goods and/or services, including without limitation, all computer software, communication and other data services, centralized banking services, payroll services, insurance, transportation services, utility or other services to the Schedule "B" Corporations are hereby restrained until further Order of this Court from discontinuing, altering, interfering with or terminating the supply of such goods or services as may be required by the Manager, and that the Manager shall be entitled to the continued use of the Schedule "B" Corporations' current telephone numbers, facsimile numbers, internet addresses and domain names, provided in each case that the normal prices or charges for all such goods or services received after the date of this Order are paid by the Manager in accordance with normal payment practices of the Schedule "B" Corporations or such other practices as may be agreed upon by the supplier or service provider and the Manager, or as may be ordered by this Court.
16. THIS COURT ORDERS that Respondents are enjoined from canceling or failing to renew any insurance policies or other coverage in respect of to the Rose & Thistle Group Ltd. and/or the Schedule B Companies or any property owned by them, except with the express written approval of the Manager.
17. THIS COURT ORDERS that the Inspector shall be added as a named insured to any existing insurance policies or other coverage in respect of to the Rose & Thistle Group Ltd. and/or the Schedule B Companies or any property owned by them.

MANAGER TO HOLD FUNDS

18. THIS COURT ORDERS that all funds, monies, cheques, instruments, and other forms of payments received or collected by the Manager from and after the making of this Order from any source whatsoever, including without limitation the sale of all or any of the Property and the collection of any accounts receivable in whole or in part, whether in existence on the date of this Order or hereafter coming into existence, shall be deposited into either the existing bank accounts held by Schedule "B" Corporations' or one or more new accounts to be opened by the Manager, at the Manager's discretion, as the Manager may reasonably decide and the monies standing to the credit of such accounts from time to time, net of any disbursements provided for herein, shall be held by the Manager to be paid in accordance with the terms of this Order or any further Order of this Court.

LIMITATION ON ENVIRONMENTAL LIABILITIES

19. THIS COURT ORDERS that nothing herein contained shall require the Manager to occupy or to take control, care, charge, possession or management (separately and/or collectively, "**Possession**") of any of the Property that might be environmentally contaminated, might be a pollutant or a contaminant, or might cause or contribute to a spill, discharge, release or deposit of a substance contrary to any federal, provincial or other law respecting the protection, conservation, enhancement, remediation or rehabilitation of the environment or relating to the disposal of waste or other contamination including, without limitation, the *Canadian Environmental Protection Act*, the *Ontario Environmental Protection Act*, the *Ontario Water Resources Act*, or the *Ontario Occupational Health and Safety Act* and regulations thereunder (the "Environmental Legislation"), provided however that nothing herein shall exempt the Manager from any duty to report or make disclosure imposed by applicable Environmental Legislation. The Manager shall not, as a result of this Order or anything done in pursuance of the Manager's duties and powers under this Order, be deemed to be in Possession of any of the Property within the meaning of any Environmental Legislation.

LIMITATION ON THE MANAGER'S LIABILITY

20. THIS COURT ORDERS that the Manager shall incur no liability or obligation as a result of its appointment or the carrying out the provisions of this Order, save and except for any gross negligence or wilful misconduct on its part as so found by a court of competent jurisdiction. The Manager shall further enjoy the protections from liability as would otherwise be afforded to a trustee in bankruptcy under section 14.06 of the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or under any other similar legislation applicable to trustees and receivers.

MANAGER'S ACCOUNTS

21. THIS COURT ORDERS that any expenditures or liability which shall properly be made or incurred by the Manager including the fees and disbursements of the Manager and the fees and disbursements of its legal counsel, incurred at the standard rates and charges of

the Manager and its counsel, shall be allowed to it in passing its accounts and shall form a first charge on the Property in priority to all security interests, trusts, liens, charges and encumbrances, statutory or otherwise, in favour of any Person (the "**Manager's Charge**").

22. THIS COURT ORDERS that the Manager and its legal counsel, if any, shall pass their accounts from time to time, and for this purpose the accounts of the Manager and its legal counsel are hereby referred to a judge of the Commercial List of the Ontario Superior Court of Justice.
23. THIS COURT ORDERS that prior to the passing of its accounts, the Manager shall be at liberty from time to time to apply reasonable amounts, out of the monies in its hands, against its fees and disbursements, including legal fees and disbursements, incurred at the normal rates and charges of the Manager or its counsel, and such amounts shall constitute advances against its remuneration and disbursements when and as approved by this Court.

FUNDING OF THE MANAGERSHIP

24. THIS COURT ORDERS that the Manager be at liberty and it is hereby empowered to borrow by way of a revolving credit or otherwise, such monies from time to time as it may consider necessary or desirable, provided that the outstanding principal amount does not exceed \$5 million (or such greater amount as this Court may by further Order authorize) at any time, at such rate or rates of interest as it deems advisable for such period or periods of time as it may arrange, for the purpose of funding the exercise of the powers and duties conferred upon the Manager by this Order, including interim expenditures. The whole of the Property shall be and is hereby charged by way of a fixed and specific charge (the "Manager's Borrowings Charge") as security for the payment of the monies borrowed, together with interest and charges thereon, in priority to all security interests, trusts, liens, charges and encumbrances, statutory or otherwise, in favour of any Person, but subordinate in priority to the Manager's Charge and the charges as set out in sections 14.06(7), 81.4(4), and 81.6(2) of the BIA.
25. THIS COURT ORDERS that neither the Manager's Borrowings Charge nor any other security granted by the Manager in connection with its borrowings under this Order shall be enforced without leave of this Court.
26. THIS COURT ORDERS that the Manager is at liberty and authorized to issue certificates substantially in the form annexed as Schedule "A" hereto (the "Manager's Certificates") for any amount borrowed by it pursuant to this Order.
27. THIS COURT ORDERS that the monies from time to time borrowed by the Manager pursuant to this Order or any further order of this Court and any and all Manager's Certificates evidencing the same or any part thereof shall rank on a *pari passu* basis, unless otherwise agreed to by the holders of any prior issued Manager's Certificates.

GENERAL

28. THIS COURT ORDERS that the Manager may from time to time apply to this Honourable Court for advice and directions in the discharge of the Manager's powers and duties hereunder.
29. THIS COURT ORDERS that nothing in this Order shall prevent the Manager from acting as receiver, interim receiver or trustee in bankruptcy of the Schedule "B" Companies.
30. THIS COURT HEREBY REQUESTS that aid and recognition of any court, tribunal, regulatory or administrative body having jurisdiction in Canada to give effect to this Order and to assist the Manager and its agents in carrying out the terms of this Order. All courts, tribunals, regulatory and administrative bodies are hereby respectfully requested to make such orders and to provide such assistance to the Manager, as an officer of this Court, as may be necessary or desirable to give effect to this Order or to assist the Manager and its agents in carrying out the terms of this Order.
31. THIS COURT ORDERS that the Manager be at liberty and is hereby authorized and empowered to apply to any court, tribunal regulatory or administrative body, wherever located, for the recognition of this Order and for assistance in carrying out the terms of this Order.
32. THIS COURT ORDERS that any interested party may apply to this Court to seek the advice and direction of the Court in respect of this Order or the Manager's activities on not less than seven (7) days' notice to the Manager and to any other party likely to be affected by the order sought or upon such other notice, if any, as this Court may order.
33. THIS COURT ORDERS that any court materials in these proceeds may be served by emailing a PDF or other electronic copy of such materials to counsels' email addresses as recorded on the Service List from time to time.



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

NOV 18 2013

NB

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.

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.
31. El-Ad Limited
32. 165 Bathurst Inc.

SCHEDULE "C"**MANAGER CERTIFICATE**

CERTIFICATE NO. _____

AMOUNT \$_____

1. THIS IS TO CERTIFY that [MANAGER'S NAME], the Manager (the "Manager") of the assets, undertakings and properties [DEBTOR'S NAME] acquired for, or used in relation to a business carried on by the Debtor, including all proceeds thereof (collectively, the "Property") appointed by Order of the Ontario Superior Court of Justice (Commercial List) (the "Court") dated the _____ of MONTH, 20YR (the "Order") made in an action having Court file number _____-CL-_____, has received as such Manager from the holder of this certificate (the "Lender") the principal sum of \$_____, being part of the total principal sum of \$_____ which the Manager is authorized to borrow under and pursuant to the Order.
2. The principal sum evidenced by this certificate is payable on demand by the Lender with interest thereon calculated and compounded [daily][monthly not in advance on the _____ day of each month] after the date hereof at a notional rate per annum equal to the rate of _____ per cent above the prime commercial lending rate of Bank of _____ from time to time.
3. Such principal sum with interest thereon is, by the terms of the Order, together with the principal sums and interest thereon of all other certificates issued by the Manager pursuant to the Order or to any further order of the Court, a charge upon the whole of the Property, in priority to the security interests of any other person, but subject to the priority of the charges set out in the Order and in the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, and the right of the Manager to indemnify itself out of such Property in respect of its remuneration and expenses.
4. All sums payable in respect of principal and interest under this certificate are payable at the main office of the Lender at Toronto, Ontario.
5. Until all liability in respect of this certificate has been terminated, no certificates creating charges ranking or purporting to rank in priority to this certificate shall be issued by the Manager to any person other than the holder of this certificate without the prior written consent of the holder of this certificate.
6. The charge securing this certificate shall operate so as to permit the Manager to deal with the Property as authorized by the Order and as authorized by any further or other order of the Court.
7. The Manager does not undertake, and it is not under any personal liability, to pay any sum in respect of which it may issue certificates under the terms of the Order.

DATED the _____ day of _____, 20_____.

-17-

[MANAGER'S NAME], solely in its capacity
as Manager of the Property, and not in its
personal capacity

Per: _____

Name:

Title:

DBDC SPADINA LTD., and those corporations listed on Schedule
A hereto
Plaintiffs

-and- NORMA WALTON et al.
Defendants

Court File No. CV-13-10280-00CL

**ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
COMMERCIAL LIST**

PROCEEDING COMMENCED AT TORONTO

ORDER

**LENCZNER SLAGHT ROYCE
SMITH GRIFFIN LLP**

Barristers
Suite 2600
130 Adelaide Street West
Toronto ON M5H 3P5

Peter H. Griffin (19527Q)

Tel: (416) 865-2921

Fax: (416) 865-3558

Email: pgriffin@litigate.com

Shara N. Roy (49950H)

Tel: (416) 865-2942

Fax: (416) 865-3973

Email: sroy@litigate.com

Lawyers for the Plaintiffs

DBDC SPADINA LTD., et al
Applicants

NORMA WALTON, et al
Respondents

Court File No. CV-13-10280-00CL

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
Commercial List

Proceeding commenced at Toronto

**MOTION RECORD OF THE MANAGER,
SCHONFELD INC.**

(Motion re: Discharge of Manager's obligations in
respect of 1485 Dupont, returnable October 9, 2014)

GOODMANS LLP
Barristers & Solicitors
Bay Adelaide Centre
333 Bay Street, Suite 3400
Toronto, Canada M5H 2S7

Brian Empey LSUC#: 30640G
Mark S. Dunn LSUC#: 55510L
Tel: (416) 979-2211
Fax: (416) 979-1234

Lawyers for The Manager

File No. 14-0074