

CITATION: Sino-Forest Corporation (Re), 2012 ONSC 7050
COURT FILE NO.: CV-12-9667-00CL
DATE: 20121212

**SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE – ONTARIO
(COMMERCIAL LIST)**

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

**AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR
ARRANGEMENT OF SINO-FOREST CORPORATION, Applicant**

BEFORE: MORAWETZ J.

**COUNSEL: Robert W. Staley, Kevin Zych, Derek J. Bell and Jonathan Bell, for Sino-
Forest Corporation**

**Derrick Tay, Jennifer Stam, and Cliff Prophet for the Monitor, FTI
Consulting Canada Inc.**

**Robert Chadwick and Brendan O'Neill, for the Ad Hoc Committee of
Noteholders**

**Kenneth Rosenberg, Kirk Baert, Max Starnino, and A. Dimitri Lascaris, for
the Class Action Plaintiffs**

**Won J. Kim, James C. Orr, Michael C. Spencer, and Megan B. McPhee, for
Invesco Canada Ltd., Northwest & Ethical Investments LP and Comité
Syndicale Nationale de Retraite Bâtirente Inc.**

Peter Griffin, Peter Osborne and Shara Roy, for Ernst & Young Inc.

Peter Greene and Ken Dekkar, for BDO Limited

**Edward A. Sellers and Larry Lowenstein, for the Board of Directors of Sino-
Forest Corporation**

John Pirie and David Gadsden, for Poyry (Beijing)

James Doris, for the Plaintiff in the New York Class Action

David Bish, for the Underwriters

Simon Bieber and Erin Pleet, for David Horsley

James Grout, for the Ontario Securities Commission

Emily Cole and Joseph Marin, for Allen Chan

Susan E. Freedman and Brandon Barnes, for Kai Kit Poon

Paul Emerson, for ACE/Chubb

Sam Sasso, for Travelers

HEARD: DECEMBER 7, 2012

ENDORSED: DECEMBER 10, 2012

REASONS: DECEMBER 12, 2012

ENDORSEMENT

[1] On December 10, 2012, I released an endorsement granting this motion with reasons to follow. These are those reasons.

Overview

[2] The Applicant, Sino-Forest Corporation (“SFC”), seeks an order sanctioning (the “Sanction Order”) a plan of compromise and reorganization dated December 3, 2012 as modified, amended, varied or supplemented in accordance with its terms (the “Plan”) pursuant to section 6 of the *Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act* (“CCAA”).

[3] With the exception of one party, SFC’s position is either supported or is not opposed.

[4] Invesco Canada Ltd., Northwest & Ethical Investments LP and Comité Syndicale Nationale de Retraite Bâtirente Inc. (collectively, the “Funds”) object to the proposed Sanction Order. The Funds requested an adjournment for a period of one month. I denied the Funds’ adjournment request in a separate endorsement released on December 10, 2012 (*Re Sino-Forest Corporation*, 2012 ONSC 7041). Alternatively, the Funds requested that the Plan be altered so as to remove Article 11 “Settlement of Claims Against Third Party Defendants”.

[5] The defined terms have been taken from the motion record.

[6] SFC’s counsel submits that the Plan represents a fair and reasonable compromise reached with SFC’s creditors following months of negotiation. SFC’s counsel submits that the Plan, including its treatment of holders of equity claims, complies with CCAA requirements and is consistent with this court’s decision on the equity claims motions (the “Equity Claims Decision”) (2012 ONSC 4377, 92 C.B.R. (5th) 99), which was subsequently upheld by the Court of Appeal for Ontario (2012 ONCA 816).

[7] Counsel submits that the classification of creditors for the purpose of voting on the Plan was proper and consistent with the CCAA, existing law and prior orders of this court, including the Equity Claims Decision and the Plan Filing and Meeting Order.

[8] The Plan has the support of the following parties:

- (a) the Monitor;
- (b) SFC's largest creditors, the Ad Hoc Committee of Noteholders (the "Ad Hoc Noteholders");
- (c) Ernst & Young LLP ("E&Y");
- (d) BDO Limited ("BDO"); and
- (e) the Underwriters.

[9] The Ad Hoc Committee of Purchasers of the Applicant's Securities (the "Ad Hoc Securities Purchasers Committee", also referred to as the "Class Action Plaintiffs") has agreed not to oppose the Plan. The Monitor has considered possible alternatives to the Plan, including liquidation and bankruptcy, and has concluded that the Plan is the preferable option.

[10] The Plan was approved by an overwhelming majority of Affected Creditors voting in person or by proxy. In total, 99% in number, and greater than 99% in value, of those Affected Creditors voting favoured the Plan.

[11] Options and alternatives to the Plan have been explored throughout these proceedings. SFC carried out a court-supervised sales process (the "Sales Process"), pursuant to the sales process order (the "Sales Process Order"), to seek out potential qualified strategic and financial purchasers of SFC's global assets. After a canvassing of the market, SFC determined that there were no qualified purchasers offering to acquire its assets for qualified consideration ("Qualified Consideration"), which was set at 85% of the value of the outstanding amount owing under the notes (the "Notes").

[12] SFC's counsel submits that the Plan achieves the objective stated at the commencement of the CCAA proceedings (namely, to provide a "clean break" between the business operations of the global SFC enterprise as a whole ("Sino-Forest") and the problems facing SFC, with the aspiration of saving and preserving the value of SFC's underlying business for the benefit of SFC's creditors).

Facts

[13] SFC is an integrated forest plantation operator and forest products company, with most of its assets and the majority of its business operations located in the southern and eastern regions of the People's Republic of China ("PRC"). SFC's registered office is located in Toronto and its principal business office is located in Hong Kong.

[14] SFC is a holding company with six direct subsidiaries (the "Subsidiaries") and an indirect majority interest in Greenheart Group Limited (Bermuda), a publicly-traded company. Including SFC and the Subsidiaries, there are 137 entities that make up Sino-Forest: 67 companies incorporated in PRC, 58 companies incorporated in British Virgin Islands, 7 companies incorporated in Hong Kong, 2 companies incorporated in Canada and 3 companies incorporated elsewhere.

[15] On June 2, 2011, Muddy Waters LLC ("Muddy Waters"), a short-seller of SFC's securities, released a report alleging that SFC was a "near total fraud" and a "Ponzi scheme". SFC subsequently became embroiled in multiple class actions across Canada and the United States and was subjected to investigations and regulatory proceedings by the Ontario Securities Commission ("OSC"), Hong Kong Securities and Futures Commission and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

[16] SFC was unable to file its 2011 third quarter financial statements, resulting in a default under its note indentures.

[17] Following extensive arm's length negotiations between SFC and the Ad Hoc Noteholders, the parties agreed on a framework for a consensual resolution of SFC's defaults under its note indentures and the restructuring of its business. The parties ultimately entered into a restructuring support agreement (the "Support Agreement") on March 30, 2012, which was initially executed by holders of 40% of the aggregate principal amount of SFC's Notes. Additional consenting noteholders subsequently executed joinder agreements, resulting in noteholders representing a total of more than 72% of aggregate principal amount of the Notes agreeing to support the restructuring.

[18] The restructuring contemplated by the Support Agreement was commercially designed to separate Sino-Forest's business operations from the problems facing the parent holding company outside of PRC, with the intention of saving and preserving the value of SFC's underlying business. Two possible transactions were contemplated:

- (a) First, a court-supervised Sales Process to determine if any person or group of persons would purchase SFC's business operations for an amount in excess of the 85% Qualified Consideration;
- (b) Second, if the Sales Process was not successful, a transfer of six immediate holding companies (that own SFC's operating business) to an acquisition vehicle to be owned by Affected Creditors in compromise of their claims against SFC. Further, the creation of a litigation trust (including funding) (the "Litigation Trust") to enable SFC's litigation claims against any person not otherwise released within the CCAA proceedings, preserved and pursued for the benefit of SFC's stakeholders in accordance with the Support Agreement (concurrently, the "Restructuring Transaction").

[19] SFC applied and obtained an initial order under the CCAA on March 30, 2012 (the "Initial Order"), pursuant to which a limited stay of proceedings ("Stay of Proceedings") was also granted in respect of the Subsidiaries. The Stay of Proceedings was subsequently extended

by orders dated May 31, September 28, October 10, and November 23, 2012, and unless further extended, will expire on February 1, 2013.

[20] On March 30, 2012, the Sales Process Order was granted. While a number of Letters of Intent were received in respect of this process, none were qualified Letters of Intent, because none of them offered to acquire SFC's assets for the Qualified Consideration. As such, on July 10, 2012, SFC announced the termination of the Sales Process and its intention to proceed with the Restructuring Transaction.

[21] On May 14, 2012, this court granted an order (the "Claims Procedure Order") which approved the Claims Process that was developed by SFC in consultation with the Monitor.

[22] As of the date of filing, SFC had approximately \$1.8 billion of principal amount of debt owing under the Notes, plus accrued and unpaid interest. As of May 15, 2012, Noteholders holding in aggregate approximately 72% of the principal amount of the Notes, and representing more than 66.67% of the principal amount of each of the four series of Notes, agreed to support the Plan.

[23] After the Muddy Waters report was released, SFC and certain of its officers, directors and employees, along with SFC's former auditors, technical consultants and Underwriters involved in prior equity and debt offerings, were named as defendants in a number of proposed class action lawsuits. Presently, there are active proposed class actions in four jurisdictions: Ontario, Quebec, Saskatchewan and New York (the "Class Action Claims").

[24] *The Labourers v. Sino-Forest Corporation Class Action* (the "Ontario Class Action") was commenced in Ontario by Koskie Minsky LLP and Siskinds LLP. It has the following two components: first, there is a shareholder claim (the "Shareholder Class Action Claims") brought on behalf of current and former shareholders of SFC seeking damages in the amount of \$6.5 billion for general damages, \$174.8 million in connection with a prospectus issued in June 2007, \$330 million in relation to a prospectus issued in June 2009, and \$319.2 million in relation to a prospectus issued in December 2009; second, there is a \$1.8 billion noteholder claim (the "Noteholder Class Action Claims") brought on behalf of former holders of SFC's Notes. The noteholder component seeks damages for loss of value in the Notes.

[25] The Quebec Class Action is similar in nature to the Ontario Class Action, and both plaintiffs filed proof of claim in this proceeding. The plaintiffs in the Saskatchewan Class Action did not file a proof of claim in this proceeding, whereas the plaintiffs in the New York Class Action did file a proof of claim in this proceeding. A few shareholders filed proofs of claim separately, but no proof of claim was filed by the Funds.

[26] In this proceeding, the Ad Hoc Securities Purchasers Committee - represented by Siskinds LLP, Koskie Minsky, and Paliare Roland Rosenberg Rothstein LLP - has appeared to represent the interests of the shareholders and noteholders who have asserted Class Action Claims against SFC and others.

[27] Since 2000, SFC has had the following two auditors ("Auditors"): E&Y from 2000 to 2004 and 2007 to 2012 and BDO from 2005 to 2006.

[28] The Auditors have asserted claims against SFC for contribution and indemnity for any amounts paid or payable in respect of the Shareholder Class Action Claims, with each of the Auditors having asserted claims in excess of \$6.5 billion. The Auditors have also asserted indemnification claims in respect the Noteholder Class Action Claims.

[29] The Underwriters have similarly filed claims against SFC seeking contribution and indemnity for the Shareholder Class Action Claims and Noteholder Class Action Claims.

[30] The Ontario Securities Commission ("OSC") has also investigated matters relating to SFC. The OSC has advised that they are not seeking any monetary sanctions against SFC and are not seeking monetary sanctions in excess of \$100 million against SFC's directors and officers (this amount was later reduced to \$84 million).

[31] SFC has very few trade creditors by virtue of its status as a holding company whose business is substantially carried out through its Subsidiaries in PRC and Hong Kong.

[32] On June 26, 2012, SFC brought a motion for an order declaring that all claims made against SFC arising in connection with the ownership, purchase or sale of an equity interest in SFC and related indemnity claims to be "equity claims" (as defined in section 2 of the CCAA). These claims encapsulate the commenced Shareholder Class Action Claims asserted against SFC. The Equity Claims Decision did not purport to deal with the Noteholder Class Action Claims.

[33] In reasons released on July 27, 2012, I granted the relief sought by SFC in the Equity Claims Decision, finding that the "the claims advanced in the shareholder claims are clearly equity claims." The Auditors and Underwriters appealed the decision and on November 23, 2012, the Court of Appeal for Ontario dismissed the appeal.

[34] On August 31, 2012, an order was issued approving the filing of the Plan (the "Plan Filing and Meeting Order").

[35] According to SFC's counsel, the Plan endeavours to achieve the following purposes:

- (a) to effect a full, final and irrevocable compromise, release, discharge, cancellation and bar of all affected claims;
- (b) to effect the distribution of the consideration provided in the Plan in respect of proven claims;
- (c) to transfer ownership of the Sino-Forest business to Newco and then to Newco II, in each case free and clear of all claims against SFC and certain related claims against the Subsidiaries so as to enable the Sino-Forest business to continue on a viable, going concern basis for the benefit of the Affected Creditors; and
- (d) to allow Affected Creditors and Noteholder Class Action Claimants to benefit from contingent value that may be derived from litigation claims to be advanced by the litigation trustee.

[36] Pursuant to the Plan, the shares of Newco ("Newco Shares") will be distributed to the Affected Creditors. Newco will immediately transfer the acquired assets to Newco II.

[37] SFC's counsel submits that the Plan represents the best available outcome in the circumstances and those with an economic interest in SFC, when considered as a whole, will derive greater benefit from the implementation of the Plan and the continuation of the business as a going concern than would result from bankruptcy or liquidation of SFC. Counsel further submits that the Plan fairly and equitably considers the interests of the Third Party Defendants, who seek indemnity and contribution from SFC and its Subsidiaries on a contingent basis, in the event that they are found to be liable to SFC's stakeholders. Counsel further notes that the three most significant Third Party Defendants (E&Y, BDO and the Underwriters) support the Plan.

[38] SFC filed a version of the Plan in August 2012. Subsequent amendments were made over the following months, leading to further revised versions in October and November 2012, and a final version dated December 3, 2012 which was voted on and approved at the meeting. Further amendments were made to obtain the support of E&Y and the Underwriters. BDO availed itself of those terms on December 5, 2012.

[39] The current form of the Plan does not settle the Class Action Claims. However, the Plan does contain terms that would be engaged if certain conditions are met, including if the class action settlement with E&Y receives court approval.

[40] Affected Creditors with proven claims are entitled to receive distributions under the Plan of (i) Newco Shares, (ii) Newco notes in the aggregate principal amount of U.S. \$300 million that are secured and guaranteed by the subsidiary guarantors (the "Newco Notes"), and (iii) Litigation Trust Interests.

[41] Affected Creditors with proven claims will be entitled under the Plan to: (a) their *pro rata* share of 92.5% of the Newco Shares with early consenting noteholders also being entitled to their *pro rata* share of the remaining 7.5% of the Newco Shares; and (b) their *pro rata* share of the Newco Notes. Affected Creditors with proven claims will be concurrently entitled to their *pro rata* share of 75% of the Litigation Trust Interests; the Noteholder Class Action Claimants will be entitled to their *pro rata* share of the remaining 25% of the Litigation Trust Interests.

[42] With respect to the indemnified Noteholder Class Action Claims, these relate to claims by former noteholders against third parties who, in turn, have alleged corresponding indemnification claims against SFC. The Class Action Plaintiffs have agreed that the aggregate amount of those former noteholder claims will not exceed the Indemnified Noteholder Class Action Limit of \$150 million. In turn, indemnification claims of Third Party Defendants against SFC with respect to indemnified Noteholder Class Action Claims are also limited to the \$150 million Indemnified Noteholder Class Action Limit.

[43] The Plan includes releases for, among others, (a) the subsidiary; (b) the Underwriters' liability for Noteholder Class Action Claims in excess of the Indemnified Noteholder Class Action Limit; (c) E&Y in the event that all of the preconditions to the E&Y settlement with the Ontario Class Action plaintiffs are met; and (d) certain current and former directors and officers of SFC (collectively, the "Named Directors and Officers"). It was emphasized that non-released

D&O Claims (being claims for fraud or criminal conduct), conspiracy claims and section 5.1 (2) D&O Claims are not being released pursuant to the Plan.

[44] The Plan also contemplates that recovery in respect of claims of the Named Directors and Officers of SFC in respect of any section 5.1 (2) D&O Claims and any conspiracy claims shall be directed and limited to insurance proceeds available from SFC's maintained insurance policies.

[45] The meeting was carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Plan Filing and Meeting Order and that the meeting materials were sent to stakeholders in the manner required by the Plan Filing and Meeting Order. The Plan supplement was authorized and distributed in accordance with the Plan Filing and Meeting Order.

[46] The meeting was ultimately held on December 3, 2012 and the results of the meeting were as follows:

(a) the number of voting claims that voted on the Plan and their value for and against the Plan;

(b) The results of the Meeting were as follows:

a. the number of Voting Claims that voted on the Plan and their value for and against the Plan:

	Number of Votes	%	Value of Votes	%
Total Claims Voting For	250	98.81%	\$ 1,465,766,204	99.97%
Total Claims Voting Against	3	1.19%	\$ 414,087	0.03%
Total Claims Voting	253	100.00%	\$ 1,466,180,291	100.00%

b. the number of votes for and against the Plan in connection with Class Action Indemnity Claims in respect of Indemnified Noteholder Class Action Claims up to the Indemnified Noteholder Limit:

	Vote For	Vote Against	Total Votes
Class Action Indemnity Claims	4	1	5

c. the number of Defence Costs Claims votes for and against the Plan and their value:

	Number of Votes	%	Value of Votes	%
Total Claims Voting For	12	92.31%	\$ 8,375,016	96.10%
Total Claims Voting Against	1	7.69%	\$ 340,000	3.90%
Total Claims Voting	13	100.00%	\$ 8,715,016	100.00%

d. the overall impact on the approval of the Plan if the count were to include Total Unresolved Claims (including Defence Costs Claims) and, in order to demonstrate the "worst case scenario" if the entire \$150 million of the Indemnified Noteholder Class Action Limit had been voted a "no" vote (even

though 4 of 5 votes were "yes" votes and the remaining "no" vote was from BDO, who has now agreed to support the Plan):

	Number of Votes	%	Value of Votes	%
Total Claims Voting For	263	98.50%	\$ 1,474,149,082	90.72%
Total Claims Voting Against	4	1.50%	\$ 150,754,087	9.28%
Total Claims Voting	267	100.00%	\$ 1,624,903,169	100.00%

[47] E&Y has now entered into a settlement ("E&Y Settlement") with the Ontario plaintiffs and the Quebec plaintiffs, subject to several conditions and approval of the E&Y Settlement itself.

[48] As noted in the endorsement dated December 10, 2012, which denied the Funds' adjournment request, the E&Y Settlement does not form part of the Sanction Order and no relief is being sought on this motion with respect to the E&Y Settlement. Rather, section 11.1 of the Plan contains provisions that provide a framework pursuant to which a release of the E&Y claims under the Plan will be effective if several conditions are met. That release will only be granted if all conditions are met, including further court approval.

[49] Further, SFC's counsel acknowledges that any issues relating to the E&Y Settlement, including fairness, continuing discovery rights in the Ontario Class Action or Quebec Class Action, or opt out rights, are to dealt with at a further court-approval hearing.

Law and Argument

[50] Section 6(1) of the CCAA provides that courts may sanction a plan of compromise if the plan has achieved the support of a majority in number representing two-thirds in value of the creditors.

[51] To establish the court's approval of a plan of compromise, the debtor company must establish the following:

- (a) there has been strict compliance with all statutory requirements and adherence to previous orders of the court;
- (b) nothing has been done or purported to be done that is not authorized by the CCAA; and
- (c) the plan is fair and reasonable.

(See *Re Canadian Airlines Corporation*, 2000 ABQB 442, leave to appeal denied, 2000 ABCA 238, aff'd 2001 ABCA 9, leave to appeal to SCC refused July 21, 2001, [2001] S.C.C.A. No. 60 and *Re Nelson Financial Group Limited*, 2011 ONSC 2750, 79 C.B.R. (5th) 307).

[52] SFC submits that there has been strict compliance with all statutory requirements.

[53] On the initial application, I found that SFC was a "debtor company" to which the CCAA applies. SFC is a corporation continued under the *Canada Business Corporations Act* ("CBCA") and is a "company" as defined in the CCAA. SFC was "reasonably expected to run out of

liquidity within a reasonable proximity of time” prior to the Initial Order and, as such, was and continues to be insolvent. SFC has total claims and liabilities against it substantially in excess of the \$5 million statutory threshold.

[54] The Notice of Creditors’ Meeting was sent in accordance with the Meeting Order and the revised Noteholder Mailing Process Order and, further, the Plan supplement and the voting procedures were posted on the Monitor’s website and emailed to each of the ordinary Affected Creditors. It was also delivered by email to the Trustees and DTC, as well as to Globic who disseminated the information to the Registered Noteholders. The final version of the Plan was emailed to the Affected Creditors, posted on the Monitor’s website, and made available for review at the meeting.

[55] SFC also submits that the creditors were properly classified at the meeting as Affected Creditors constituted a single class for the purposes of considering the voting on the Plan. Further, and consistent with the Equity Claims Decision, equity claimants constituted a single class but were not entitled to vote on the Plan. Unaffected Creditors were not entitled to vote on the Plan.

[56] Counsel submits that the classification of creditors as a single class in the present case complies with the commonality of interests test. See *Re Canadian Airlines Corporation*.

[57] Courts have consistently held that relevant interests to consider are the legal interests of the creditors hold *qua* creditor in relationship to the debtor prior to and under the plan. Further, the commonality of interests should be considered purposively, bearing in mind the object of the CCAA, namely, to facilitate reorganizations if possible. See *Stelco Inc.* (2005), 78 O.R. (3d) 241 (Ont. C.A.), *Re Canadian Airlines Corporation*, and *Re Nortel Networks Corporation* (2009) O.J. No. 2166 (Ont. S.C.). Further, courts should resist classification approaches that potentially jeopardize viable plans.

[58] In this case, the Affected Creditors voted in one class, consistent with the commonality of interests among Affected Creditors, considering their legal interests as creditors. The classification was consistent with the Equity Claims Decision.

[59] I am satisfied that the meeting was properly constituted and the voting was properly carried out. As described above, 99% in number, and more than 99% in value, voting at the meeting favoured the Plan.

[60] SFC’s counsel also submits that SFC has not taken any steps unauthorized by the CCAA or by court orders. SFC has regularly filed affidavits and the Monitor has provided regular reports and has consistently opined that SFC is acting in good faith and with due diligence. The court has so ruled on this issue on every stay extension order that has been granted.

[61] In *Nelson Financial*, I articulated relevant factors on the sanction hearing. The following list of factors is similar to those set out in *Re Camwest Global Communications Corporation*, 2010 ONSC 4209, 70 C.B.R. (5th) 1:

1. The claims must have been properly classified, there must be no secret arrangements to give an advantage to a creditor or creditor; the approval of the plan by the requisite majority of creditors is most important;
2. It is helpful if the Monitor or some other disinterested person has prepared an analysis of anticipated receipts and liquidation or bankruptcy;
3. If other options or alternatives have been explored and rejected as workable, this will be significant;
4. Consideration of the oppression rights of certain creditors; and
5. Unfairness to shareholders.
6. The court will consider the public interest.

[62] The Monitor has considered the liquidation and bankruptcy alternatives and has determined that it does not believe that liquidation or bankruptcy would be a preferable alternative to the Plan. There have been no other viable alternatives presented that would be acceptable to SFC and to the Affected Creditors. The treatment of shareholder claims and related indemnity claims are, in my view, fair and consistent with CCAA and the Equity Claims Decision.

[63] In addition, 99% of Affected Creditors voted in favour of the Plan and the Ad Hoc Securities Purchasers Committee have agreed not to oppose the Plan. I agree with SFC's submission to the effect that these are exercises of those parties' business judgment and ought not to be displaced.

[64] I am satisfied that the Plan provides a fair and reasonable balance among SFC's stakeholders while simultaneously providing the ability for the Sino-Forest business to continue as a going concern for the benefit of all stakeholders.

[65] The Plan adequately considers the public interest. I accept the submission of counsel that the Plan will remove uncertainty for Sino-Forest's employees, suppliers, customers and other stakeholders and provide a path for recovery of the debt owed to SFC's non-subordinated creditors. In addition, the Plan preserves the rights of aggrieved parties, including SFC through the Litigation Trust, to pursue (in litigation or settlement) those parties that are alleged to share some or all of the responsibility for the problems that led SFC to file for CCAA protection. In addition, releases are not being granted to individuals who have been charged by OSC staff, or to other individuals against whom the Ad Hoc Securities Purchasers Committee wishes to preserve litigation claims.

[66] In addition to the consideration that is payable to Affected Creditors, Early Consent Noteholders will receive their *pro rata* share of an additional 7.5% of the Newco Shares ("Early Consent Consideration"). Plans do not need to provide the same recovery to all creditors to be considered fair and reasonable and there are several plans which have been sanctioned by the courts featuring differential treatment for one creditor or one class of creditors. See, for example, *Camvest Global* and *Re Armbro Enterprises Inc.* (1993), 22 C.B.R. (3d) 80 (Ont. Gen.

Div.). A common theme permeating such cases has been that differential treatment does not necessarily result in a finding that the Plan is unfair, as long as there is a sufficient rational explanation.

[67] In this case, SFC's counsel points out that the Early Consent Consideration has been a feature of the restructuring since its inception. It was made available to any and all noteholders and noteholders who wished to become Early Consent Noteholders were invited and permitted to do so until the early consent deadline of May 15, 2012. I previously determined that SFC made available to the noteholders all information needed to decide whether they should sign a joinder agreement and receive the Early Consent Consideration, and that there was no prejudice to the noteholders in being put to that election early in this proceeding.

[68] As noted by SFC's counsel, there was a rational purpose for the Early Consent Consideration. The Early Consent Noteholders supported the restructuring through the CCAA proceedings which, in turn, provided increased confidence in the Plan and facilitated the negotiations and approval of the Plan. I am satisfied that this feature of the Plan is fair and reasonable.

[69] With respect to the Indemnified Noteholder Class Action Limit, I have considered SFC's written submissions and accept that the \$150 million agreed-upon amount reflects risks faced by both sides. The selection of a \$150 million cap reflects the business judgment of the parties making assessments of the risk associated with the noteholder component of the Ontario Class Action and, in my view, is within the "general range of acceptability on a commercially reasonable basis". See *Re Ravelston Corporation*, (2005) 14 C.B.R. (5th) 207 (Ont. S.C.). Further, as noted by SFC's counsel, while the New York Class Action Plaintiffs filed a proof of claim, they have not appeared in this proceeding and have not stated any opposition to the Plan, which has included this concept since its inception.

[70] Turning now to the issue of releases of the Subsidiaries, counsel to SFC submits that the unchallenged record demonstrates that there can be no effective restructuring of SFC's business and separation from its Canadian parent if the claims asserted against the Subsidiaries arising out of or connected to claims against SFC remain outstanding. The Monitor has examined all of the releases in the Plan and has stated that it believes that they are fair and reasonable in the circumstances.

[71] The Court of Appeal in *ATB Financial v. Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corporation*, 2008 ONCA 587, 45 C.B.R. (5th) 163 stated that the "court has authority to sanction plans incorporating third party releases that are reasonably related to the proposed restructuring".

[72] In this case, counsel submits that the release of Subsidiaries is necessary and essential to the restructuring of SFC. The primary purpose of the CCAA proceedings was to extricate the business of Sino-Forest, through the operation of SFC's Subsidiaries (which were protected by the Stay of Proceedings), from the cloud of uncertainty surrounding SFC. Accordingly, counsel submits that there is a clear and rational connection between the release of the Subsidiaries in the Plan. Further, it is difficult to see how any viable plan could be made that does not cleanse the Subsidiaries of the claims made against SFC.

[73] Counsel points out that the Subsidiaries who are to have claims against them released are contributing in a tangible and realistic way to the Plan. The Subsidiaries are effectively contributing their assets to SFC to satisfy SFC's obligations under their guarantees of SFC's note indebtedness, for the benefit of the Affected Creditors. As such, counsel submits the releases benefit SFC and the creditors generally.

[74] In my view, the basis for the release falls within the guidelines previously set out by this court in *ATB Financial, Re Nortel Networks*, 2010 ONSC 1708, and *Re Kitchener Frame Limited*, 2012 ONSC 234, 86 C.B.R. (5th) 274. Further, it seems to me that the Plan cannot succeed without the releases of the Subsidiaries. I am satisfied that the releases are fair and reasonable and are rationally connected to the overall purpose of the Plan.

[75] With respect to the Named Directors and Officers release, counsel submits that this release is necessary to effect a greater recovery for SFC's creditors, rather than having those directors and officers assert indemnity claims against SFC. Without these releases, the quantum of the unresolved claims reserve would have to be materially increased and, to the extent that any such indemnity claim was found to be a proven claim, there would have been a corresponding dilution of consideration paid to Affected Creditors.

[76] It was also pointed out that the release of the Named Directors and Officers is not unlimited; among other things, claims for fraud or criminal conduct, conspiracy claims, and section 5.1 (2) D&O Claims are excluded.

[77] I am satisfied that there is a reasonable connection between the claims being compromised and the Plan to warrant inclusion of this release.

[78] Finally, in my view, it is necessary to provide brief comment on the alternative argument of the Funds, namely, the Plan be altered so as to remove Article 11 "Settlement of Claims Against Third Party Defendants". The Plan was presented to the meeting with Article 11 in place. This was the Plan that was subject to the vote and this is the Plan that is the subject of this motion. The alternative proposed by the Funds was not considered at the meeting and, in my view, it is not appropriate to consider such an alternative on this motion.

Disposition

[79] Having considered the foregoing, I am satisfied that SFC has established that:

- (i) there has been strict compliance with all statutory requirements and adherence to the previous orders of the court;
- (ii) nothing has been done or purported to be done that is not authorized by the CCAA; and
- (iii) the Plan is fair and reasonable.

[80] Accordingly, the motion is granted and the Plan is sanctioned. An order has been signed substantially in the form of the draft Sanction Order.



MORAWETZ J.

Date: December 12, 2012