

1 THE CANADIAN COURT: I think now we
2 need to deal -- Judge Gross, we need now to deal
3 with the request by the Monitor.

4 THE US COURT: Yes. Is that what you
5 were rising to address, Mr. Ruby?

6 MR. RUBY: Something else, but I can
7 wait.

8 THE US COURT: All right.

9 THE CANADIAN COURT: The Monitor has
10 requested in its memorandum of June 19, 2014 that
11 two legal issues be determined.

12 The Monitor has referred to the claims
13 on bonds where there is a guarantee and the Monitor
14 refers to these as crossover bonds, and has
15 requested that the courts now determine two legal
16 issues.

17 Firstly, whether the holders of the
18 crossover bonds claims are legally entitled in each
19 jurisdiction to claim or receive any amounts under
20 the relevant indentures, above and beyond the
21 outstanding principle debt and prepetition
22 interest; that is, namely, above and beyond \$4.092
23 billion US; and secondly, if determined that the
24 holders of the crossover bonds claims are so
25 entitled, what additional amounts are such holders

1 entitled to so claim and receive.

2 The request by the Monitor is supported
3 by Nortel Networks UK Pension Trust Limited, the
4 Canadian Creditors Committee, and Wilmington Trust
5 NA. The Monitor's request is opposed by the US
6 Debtor, by the Unsecured Creditors Committee, by
7 the Ad Hoc Bondholders, by Bank of New York Mellon,
8 and by the Law Debenture Trust Company of New York.

9 I do not intend to deal with all of the
10 arguments pro and con; rather, I will provide brief
11 reasons for my decision, and Judge Gross and I have
12 each agreed, have each come to the same conclusion,
13 and that conclusion is that these two issues raised
14 by the Monitor should now be dealt with.

15 The amount of postpetition interest
16 claimed is of crucial significance. To the end of
17 2013, it is \$1.6 billion, so it is growing beyond
18 that now. That's to be put in context of the
19 assets in the lockbox of \$7.3 billion that is
20 apparently not earning much interest at all.

21 We are not in a position to know with
22 any certainty what effect a decision on this claim
23 will have on settlement discussions. We are not
24 party to those discussions. It appears to me that
25 knowing what the position is on the issue, one way

1 or the other, cannot hurt those discussions.

2 We are told that further settlement
3 discussions can be held next week and that is all
4 to the good.

5 However, what we propose to order will
6 not affect the ability of the parties to negotiate
7 further next week. Negotiations and compromises
8 are the stuff of CCAA proceedings.

9 However, this issue has been known
10 since the Rockstar transaction in 2011 and has not
11 been settled. It is also the case that three
12 mediations and discussions for a week, a few weeks
13 ago, have all failed. It is not at all sure that
14 further discussions will achieve a settlement while
15 this issue remains outstanding.

16 I see no prejudice to anyone in having
17 this issue now dealt with. The longer it festers,
18 the higher the legal fees will undoubtedly be.
19 Legal fees in this case are of huge concern to the
20 courts and to the pensioners and other claimants,
21 and they are hardly minor.

22 If there are going to be appeals, so be
23 it. That likely would be the case in any event,
24 and if so, the sooner the better.

25 The success or failure of the

1 bondholders' claim for interest will have an
2 important and large effect on the Canadian Estate,
3 and on the claims of the pensioners and of the
4 disability claimants. The sooner that is decided,
5 the better.

6 In their allocation pleadings, the US
7 interests assert an allocation that will result in
8 the US Estate being solvent and their expert
9 evidence is to that effect. This, of course, is
10 perhaps a US bankruptcy issue, but I would observe
11 that while allocation issues have yet to be
12 decided, one cannot, at this stage, say that the US
13 Debtors' allocation position will not be accepted.

14 It is not unknown in Canada to have
15 issues decided in CCAA proceedings on claims
16 involving potential issues. In Re: Sino Forest
17 Corporation, 2012 ONSC 4377, affirmed 2012 ONCA
18 816, an issue was decided in a class action by
19 shareholders as to whether those claims were equity
20 claims, and whether the auditor's claims for
21 indemnity, if they ultimately were liable, would be
22 equity claims. It was contended, without success,
23 that the motion was premature and the issue was
24 decided.

25 It is also the case under the Ashmore

1 v. Corporation of Lloyd's principles that this
2 issue can now, and in my view should now, be
3 determined.

4 I would also add it is not at all clear
5 to me why there needs to be any Plan of Compromise
6 in Canada. The assets have been sold, there is no
7 continuing business of any kind, and liquidating
8 CCAA proceedings are now commonplace.

9 It appears to me to be a straight legal
10 issue. It would be exceedingly surprising if this
11 issue had not been thoroughly researched by now,
12 and the memoranda that we have received gives some
13 indication that that is so.

14 What we propose is the matter be
15 scheduled for argument in July, at some point after
16 the start of the claims portion of the trial. We
17 propose July 8, I beg your pardon, July the 11th,
18 it works for both courts.

19 If there is some other time in July
20 acceptable to all the interested parties and there
21 is an issue with July 11th, we will consider that
22 request if it is received this week.

23 My conclusion and Order is that the two
24 issues raised by the Monitor be scheduled for
25 argument on July the 11th, unless otherwise ordered

1 for a different date in July, and that the briefs
2 to be exchanged and filed should be done so no
3 later than July the 8th. That concludes my
4 remarks.

5 THE US COURT: Well, I join Justice
6 Newbould in his ruling that we ought to hear the
7 what I will call the interest issues at this time.

8 First let me dispel the concerns that I
9 previously ruled on this issue and determined at
10 that time that the issue was premature for
11 determination and advisory in nature. As an
12 elderly client used to tell me in her broken
13 English, "What was ain't."

14 And I have now heard or will have
15 heard -- I guess I have now heard really all of the
16 evidence on allocation. A finding that the United
17 States Estate is solvent is not assured, but I have
18 to observe that the only parties pressing a
19 methodology which would render the US Estate
20 insolvent is really persuading the Court that it
21 should proceed with this discrete legal issue at
22 this time.

23 And while it is certainly true that
24 there are other issues in the case, there is one
25 issue that can be decided and should be decided at

1 this time as this case otherwise continues really
2 without an end in sight. It is fair to say that
3 the interest issues are ones which will require
4 decision at some point, and this is as good a time
5 as any.

6 So let me observe that my earlier
7 decision not to hear the interest issue did not
8 result in the parties being able to formulate a
9 compromise. Maybe doing so now will have that
10 beneficial result.

11 As for a concern about appeals and the
12 impact of appeals on the progress of these cases, I
13 really consider that possibility to be virtually
14 nonexistent. Before anyone would take an appeal on
15 less than all of the issues in this case, in
16 effect, an interlocutory appeal, I would urge them
17 to read the decisions of the Third Circuit. And I
18 think that the Third Circuit made it clear that
19 this case has to proceed to a conclusion and
20 without interruption.

21 As far as whether this requires
22 analysis as if there were a motion for reargument
23 pending, I consider this really to be more of a
24 matter of case management. And even if the
25 reargument standard were applicable, I have heard

1 in the past few weeks nothing but new evidence,
2 evidence which I had not considered and which was
3 still in the process of being formulated when I
4 previously ruled that I would not hear the interest
5 issues.

6 The concern that this is not a matter
7 subject to the joint jurisdiction of the Canadian
8 and US Courts is similarly a nonstarter issue.
9 Justice Newbould and I will decide the issues
10 confronting us separately. But more importantly,
11 while we will do so independently, we will also be
12 acting in the spirit of Chapter 15 cases; that is,
13 with cooperation in scheduling, fair and efficient
14 administration, and for the protection and
15 maximization of debtors' assets. And that language
16 can be found in a number of cases, including the
17 ABC Learning decision by the Third Circuit.

18 It is true, as the US Debtors posit,
19 that there are other factual and legal issues in
20 these cases. So why spotlight the interest issue?
21 Because after five and a half years and a fortune
22 in administrative costs, we can and we should. It
23 may not help the parties, but it will not hurt, and
24 it will bring some semblance of resolution.

25 And I will note that before we can

1 render our decision on these interest issues,
2 perhaps the parties can use the \$1.6 billion spread
3 between no interest and interest at the contract
4 rate to come to some accommodation.

5 And with that, I would say that we are
6 prepared to consider any scheduling requests which
7 would have us hear you in July. But again, we have
8 discussed the July 11 date.

9 Mr. Lowenthal.

10 THE CANADIAN COURT: July 11 date.

11 THE US COURT: Yes.

12 THE CANADIAN COURT: Yes. And I might
13 just say on that score, Judge Gross, I know there
14 is a telephone conference scheduled for Friday
15 morning at 10:00 to deal with document issues in
16 the Canadian claims case in July. What I can
17 suggest to the parties is if there is a problem
18 with that July 11 date, perhaps you can alert us
19 and we can take it up at the conference call. We
20 can have Judge Gross participate to the extent we
21 are dealing with that date --

22 THE US COURT: Sure.

23 THE CANADIAN COURT: -- on Friday
24 morning.

25 THE US COURT: I see Mr. Lowenthal here