Court File Number:	10-	863C -	00CC
--------------------	-----	--------	------

### Superior Court of Justice Commercial List

# FILE/DIRECTION/ORDER

_ Ke Nels	on Krancial (	Trum Hel.  Plaintiff(s)
<del></del>		Defendant(s)
Case Management Yes No by Judg	ge: <u>Lepol V</u>	
Counsel Sel attached	Telephone No.:	Facsimile No.:
☐ Order ☐ Direction for Registrar (No ☐ Above action transferred to the Commerce of Adjourned to: ☐ Time Table approved (as follows): ☐ The Applicant applicant of Applicant	see les apprometres de la company de la comp	order need be taken out)  voil of tre  len the  paintneut of  is a Paint  is ;+approval of the
a result y sor commissions a	me contract	Ey Kent care as Jeancellations,
house now agree would pay to come in sutification against	Lapparal, L La Applican amounts int	tre parties endicare et 158, 182.32 claims puis rel peu 31, 2010.
June 15 2010  Date  VAdditional Pages 2	ey gportun	DOLL) idgle's Signature
Additional Pages		

Court File Number: 10 - 8630 - 00CL

### Superior Court of Justice Commercial List

## FILE/DIRECTION/ORDER

Judges Endorsement Continued	
all of hendcare's automen (see pa	102.3.1 d
Anudonent + Tempation America	1) arresta
Hum of the settlement, the m	
Profection American david Aced	7 20, 2007,
the Amelineur algardus Fritze	re Firauup
	4 Amelyer
dated per 21,2009 between	the parties
astroninated + releases are ex	charged
	0
In my new this is a fair + M	
settlement appelment 4 moule	
	the muder
the one appeals the regner	
approval. (The schedules to the agree	news new bog
Altrend to course for rendeave, telev	Micy ply baco
A to The stay extension regr	
Applicant has madified to und	
With respect to the Ray point	cyclary
full and rements yethout	marian
The now tea continues to be	a care v
that there is a reasonable	of the cu
a a successful restructurio	The state of the s
O DECITION OF THE PROPERTY	Turning
also orphan ar a restriction	1 Low
Classes Atolicando on + and	in no one
appealed the Manust de a	Hells
Blothersian. There are adean	all huds
alcertable for the proposed	Recen
extension pained The Amplica	www
modeding alth due dilin	Mel. The
nouter to a the new that	the
splicanthatis, acting in good	fulth.
17 am prepared to accept the	Monders
approx the proposes of 7	The Hory
extension + am surespila	That ,
the extension, is appropriate	y in light
I of the circustances to the po	siteon g
Dana d	mp "
Page 2 of 3 Judges Initials <u>8</u>	1

Court File Number: 10 - 8636 - accl

### Superior Court of Justice Commercial List

## FILE/DIRECTION/ORDER

Judges Endorsement Continued
those other statishedown who are
those Aver Halleholden who are
to grade to the same of the sa
As to the regnest for the
OU TO TO THE POPULATION OF THE
and the state of t
The note of the
all Fray to alstrage w
fully to haive up consel as
Confluplated. They would then have a
collective wire which would benefit
the restriction + the interests of
the Applicant + its Pralichalders.
That Sibild in considera the selection
a up coursel, the court may couseder
a depety of factors including the
expetitives approved for the retainer.
the result.
In this case, he Turner is very
expensed correct borner bold
has expensed expensed a then
Literations to consider Mr. 100 11 110 110
man had a supplied to the also
and the sound of the sound of the sound of the
many of the nothingless reside, All
of 7000 oughly additionations in
The fuction Molting of this coil.
That said is important that up
coursel is a CCAA proceeding hours some
CCAA expenies in the cercuitaines, his
Three had already consacted my
to serie as special coursel. As ouch
to serve as special coursel As ouch
on the terms set ports in the
proposed order. I am satisfied with
the proposed wip course I direcuments.
The The od PLANV a tre Muster is also
anowed.
Page 3 of 3 Judges Initials Mexicol .

#### Nelson Financial Group Ltd. Unofficial Transcription of the Endorsement of Madam Justice Pepall

June 15, 2010

The Applicant seeks approval of the settlement agreement between the Applicant and Lendcare, the appointment of rep counsel for the noteholders, a stay extension to July 30, 2010, and approval of the Monitor's Third Report.

Dealing firstly with the Lendcare agreement, the Applicant asserted that \$270,942.08 was owing to it by Lendcare as a result of some contract cancellations, commissions improperly taken by Lendcare, and recourse contracts in PQ. Subject to court approval, the parties have now agreed that Lendcare would pay the Applicant \$158,182.32 in satisfaction of those claims plus certain sundry amounts until Dec 31, 2010. Additionally, the Applicant may now select financing opportunities from one of Lendcare's customers (see paragraph 3.1 of Amendment and Termination Agreement). Under the terms of the settlement, the Business Protection Amendment dated Aug 20, 2007, the Amendment regarding Future Financings dated Dec 6, 2007 and the Amending Agreement dated Dec 21, 2009 between the parties are terminated and releases are exchanged.

In my view this is a fair and reasonable settlement agreement and should be approved. It is supported by the Monitor and no one opposes the request for approval. (The schedules to the agreement have been returned to the counsel for Lendcare, on the relevancy being based on the amounts in total and not the individual identities.)

As to the stay extension request, the Applicant has modified its intentions with respect to the Plan particularly given the absence of external financing and the arrangements with Lendcare. The Monitor continues to be of the view that there is a reasonable prospect of a successful restructuring albeit of a scaled down business. There is also support for a restructuring from certain stakeholders and again no one is opposed the request for a stay extension. There are adequate funds available for the proposed stay extension period. The Applicant is proceeding with due diligence. The monitor is of the view that the Applicant is acting is good faith.

I am prepared to accept the Monitors opinion for the purposes of the stay extension and am satisfied that the extension is appropriate in light of the circumstances and the position of these other stakeholders who are unrepresented.

As to the request for the appointment of rep counsel for the noteholders, I am of the view that is it desirable for them to have rep counsel as contemplated. They would then have a collective voice which would benefit the restructuring and the interests of the Applicant and its stakeholders, That said, in considering the selection of rep counsel, the court may consider a variety of factors including the expertise required for the retainer.

In this case, Mr. Turner is very experienced counsel having been called to the bar in 1967 and apparently has extensive experience in tax litigation and corporate law. He also

practices in Durham Region where many of the noteholders reside. All of this is highly advantageous in the factual matrix of this case. That said, it is important that rep counsel is a CCAA proceeding have some CCAA experience. In the circumstances, Mr. Turner had already contacted Mr. Richard Jones, experienced CCAA counsel, to serve as special counsel. As such, on the terms set forth in the proposed order, I am satisfied with the proposed rep counsel arrangements.

The Third Report of the Monitor is also Approved.

Madam Justice Pepall

S:\DATA\WP\CLIENTS\NELSON\PEPEND7.WPD