

CITATION: Nortel Networks Corporation (Re), 2010 ONSC 1977  
COURT FILE NO.: 09-CL-7950  
DATE: 20100408

**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 NORTEL NETWORKS CORPORATION, NORTEL  
NETWORKS LIMITED, NORTEL NETWORKS GLOBAL CORPORATION,  
NORTEL NETWORKS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION AND NORTEL  
NETWORKS TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION, Applicants

**BEFORE:** MORAWETZ J.

**COUNSEL:** Derrick Tay and Jennifer Stam, for the Applicants

J. A. Carfagnini, G. Rubenstein, M. Wagner and C. Armstrong, for Ernst &  
Young Inc., Monitor

Susan Philpott, for the Former Employees and Disabled Employees

Kevin Zych, for the Informal Nortel Noteholder Group

Arthur Jacques, for the Nortel Canada Current Employees

Deborah McPhail, for the Superintendent of Financial Services (non-PBGF)

Alex MacFarlane, for the Official Unsecured Creditors' Committee of Nortel  
Networks Inc.

Ken Rosenberg and Lily Harmer, for the Superintendent of Financial Services of  
the Pension Benefit Guarantee Fund (PBGF)

Rupert Chartrand and Adam Hirsh, for the Nortel Board of Directors

Robin Schwill, for Nortel Networks UK Limited (In Administration)

Pamela Huff, for Northern Trust Company, Canada

Barry Wadsworth, for the CAW-Canada

Joel P. Rochon and Sakie Tambakos, for the Opposing Long-Term Disability  
Employees

Guy Martin, In Person, on behalf of Marie Josee Perrault

**HEARD &**

**DECIDED:** MARCH 31, 2010

**REASONS**

**RELEASED:** APRIL 8, 2010

**ENDORSEMENT**

[1] At the conclusion of argument, the record was endorsed:

“Motion granted. Settlement Agreement approved. Reasons will follow. Order to go in the form presented, as amended.”

[2] These are those reasons.

[3] The motion was brought by the Applicants to approve the Amended and Restated Settlement Agreement, dated as of March 30, 2010 (the “Amended and Restated Settlement Agreement”), entered into by the Settlement Parties.

[4] The Amended and Restated Settlement Agreement was entered into following the release of my decision on March 26, 2010, in which I did not approve the original Settlement Agreement, which included the “No Preclusion Clause” found in Clause H.2.

[5] The Amended and Restated Settlement Agreement is identical to the Settlement Agreement, except that Clause H.2 has been deleted and the schedules to the Settlement Agreement have been updated to account for the deletion of Clause H.2.

[6] The court was advised that in connection with the Amended and Restated Settlement Agreement, the Applicants and the Superintendent, in his capacity as Administrator of the PBGF, also entered into a letter agreement with respect to certain matters pertaining to the Pension Plans.

[7] In view of obvious overlap between the Settlement Agreement and the Amended and Restated Settlement Agreement, it is appropriate to incorporate, by reference, the March 26, 2010 reasons (the “March 26 Reasons”) into this endorsement. The March 26 Reasons are reported at 2010 ONSC 1708.

[8] The defined terms in this endorsement have the same meaning as set out in the March 26 Reasons.

[9] In addition to the motion to approve the Amended and Restated Settlement Agreement, ancillary issues were raised, including issues of sufficiency of notice, an adjournment request and certain alternatives to the Amended and Restated Settlement Agreement.

## **SUFFICIENCY OF NOTICE**

[10] Concerns have been raised with respect to the short service of this motion. Counsel to the Monitor supports the expedited approval of the Amended and Restated Settlement Agreement and urges that the abridged notice be approved for two reasons. First, the pending cessation of benefits on March 31, 2010, in the absence of approval of the Amended and Restated Settlement Agreement, necessitated a hearing on an urgent basis, and second, the March 26 Reasons found that the Monitor (i) undertook a comprehensive notice process, (ii) gave the opportunity for any affected person to file a notice of appearance and appear before the court and, (iii) properly implemented the notice process.

[11] In my view, this motion did not raise any new issues in respect of Clause H.2. Arguments with respect to Clause H.2 were detailed at the hearings from March 3 – 5, 2010 and were referenced in the March 26 Reasons commencing at [83]. Furthermore, all parties were represented in court and counsel were in a position to argue the matter on March 31, 2010. I accept that there was a degree of urgency to hear the motion.

[12] In addition, there was a comprehensive notice process for the March 3, 2010 settlement approval motion properly implemented by the Monitor. Given that the only change from the Settlement Agreement, that was the subject of the March 3, 2010 settlement approval motion, and the Amended and Restated Settlement Agreement, is the removal of Clause H.2, notice and service with respect to the March 3, 2010 settlement approval motion is, in my view, sufficient for all purposes including, validating service of this motion.

[13] In my view, it was both necessary and appropriate to hear the motion on short notice. Short service is validated.

## **MOTION TO ADJOURN**

[14] Counsel for the Opposing LTD Employees requested an adjournment of this motion. The adjournment request was denied, with reasons to follow. The reasons for the denial are the same reasons which I rely upon to approve short service: urgency, full representation of employees in court and counsel were in a position to argue the motion on the merits.

## **ALTERNATIVE RELIEF**

[15] Counsel for the Opposing LTD Employees also requested that the benefits in place at the time of the hearing be continued for another 60 days while the parties, including representatives from the Opposing LTD Employees, participate in court-ordered negotiations with Campbell J. This alternative requested relief is addressed in these reasons.

## **THE AMENDED AND RESTATED SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT**

[16] Counsel to the Applicants makes four points:

1. Unless the Amended and Restated Settlement Agreement was approved, the Applicants had no authority to continue making preferred payments to the employees.

2. Without the settlement, the Applicants would wind up or terminate the Pension Plan and medical, dental and other benefits in the near future.
3. The approval of the Amended and Restated Settlement Agreement provides clarity and certainty to the parties who depend on receiving benefits on a daily basis.
4. The Amended and Restated Settlement Agreement is not only the best deal available, it is the only deal.

[17] Counsel to the Applicants also submits that the concerns expressed by the court in the March 26 Reasons have been addressed in the Amended and Restated Settlement Agreement, and that this motion does not provide for an opportunity to re-argue the settlement approval motion heard on March 3, 4, and 5, 2010. Effectively, counsel submits that there is nothing new to consider in this motion.

[18] The Applicants' position is supported by the Former and LTD Employees, the CAW, the Superintendent, in all capacities, the Nortel Canada Continuing Employees, the Nortel Board of Directors, the Noteholders, the Unsecured Creditors' Committee, and the Monitor.

[19] The record in support of the motion includes the affidavit of Ms. Elena King, the Forty-Second Report of the Monitor, affidavits from Mr. Donald Sproule and Mr. Michael Campbell, two of the three court-appointed Former Employees' Representatives who were appointed on behalf of all Former Employees, including pensioners of Nortel, and the affidavit of Ms. Susan Kennedy, the court-appointed LTD Representative.

[20] The affidavits stressed the importance of the continuation of the members' medical benefits and pension plans for a further period of time, as well as the anxiety of employees concerned with the imminent cessation or reduction in payments. The affidavits establish that the certainty associated with the preservation and continuation of benefits negotiated in the Settlement Agreement outweigh the limited concession associated with the deletion of Clause H.2.

[21] In its recommendation in support of the requested relief, the Monitor states that it believes the Amended and Restated Settlement Agreement and the Settlement Approval Order take into account the March 26 Reasons, and represents a fair balancing of the interests of the Applicants' stakeholders. The Monitor is of the view that the Amended and Restated Settlement Agreement represents an important step in the implementation of the Applicants' restructuring, which was arrived at after extensive negotiations.

[22] The Opposing LTD Employees request the continuation of benefits for another 60 days, and court-ordered mediation with Campbell J., or alternatively that the Amended and Restated Settlement Agreement not be approved. The motion record of the Opposing LTD Employees consists of the affidavit of Ms. Urquhart and various exhibits. Ms. Urquhart also swore an affidavit March 1, 2010 in support of the Opposing LTD Employees in respect of the hearing for the approval of the Settlement Agreement.

[23] Counsel to the Opposing LTD Employees submits that the stated urgency of the March 31, 2010 "cutting off" of benefits was exaggerated and that the reality is that, while the income

replacement benefits for the disabled may cease to be funded from Nortel's operations, the HWT remains in place as a source of funding for income replacement benefits for the LTD Employees.

[24] Counsel also submits that, in terms of extending the payment of benefits from Nortel's operations, the evidence demonstrates that there are sufficient assets to do this. No specifics were provided in support of this statement.

[25] Further, counsel submitted that there are additional facts to justify rejection of the deal and he summarizes from Ms. Urquhart's affidavit that there are legislative initiatives regarding the status of LTD Employee creditor claims that may be addressed by way of amendments to both the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* and the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*.

[26] Mr. Rochon also stated that the Opposing LTD Employees rely upon and incorporate by reference the submissions made in their factum submitted in opposition to the Settlement Agreement. These submissions primarily relate to the issue of Third Party Releases.

[27] Submissions were also made in person by Mr. Guy Martin on behalf of Ms. Marie Josée Perrault. Mr. Martin also made submissions on the settlement approval motion. He remains passionate in his opposition to the Amended and Restated Settlement Agreement, for similar reasons to those expressed on the earlier settlement approval motion.

[28] I cannot accept the Opposing LTD Employees' proposal to extend benefits for 60 days while court-ordered negotiations transpire as being an acceptable outcome. There is no evidence to suggest the March 31, 2010 deadline is not genuine. Further, ordering payments out of the HWT corpus will deplete the corpus of the trust, to the potential detriment of the LTD Employees. In addition, the payment by the Applicants of any benefits to the LTD Employees outside of the Amended and Restated Settlement Agreement would be preferential in nature and ignores the fact that there is no statutory priority for the Former and LTD Employees.

[29] Circumstances require that the position of the Former and LTD Employees be considered in light of the current reality. The current reality is that Nortel is insolvent and the benefits and payments promised by Nortel cannot continue indefinitely. Absent approval of the Amended and Restated Settlement Agreement, benefits can cease as at March 31, 2010.

[30] There is uncertainty as to what would occur if the Amended and Restated Settlement Agreement was not approved.

[31] Counsel to the Opposing LTD Employees was specifically asked whether he had any assurances that the Amended and Restated Settlement Agreement, supported by a \$57 million charge, would be on the table at the end of a 60-day extension period. Counsel could provide no such assurances.

[32] In contrast, counsel to the Noteholders was emphatic in stating that either the Amended and Restated Settlement Agreement be approved or benefits should cease. This position was supported by counsel to the Unsecured Creditors' Committee. These two groups are significant creditors of the Applicants.

[33] The reality is that, absent approval of the Amended and Restated Settlement Agreement, the Former and LTD Employees face cessation of benefits, or at best, uncertainty, a position that was consistently stated by Representative Counsel to be unacceptable.

[34] It seems to me that the Former Employees' Representatives and the LTD Representative fully considered the impact of the March 26 Reasons and, after consultations with Representative Counsel and communications with a significant number of Former and LTD Employees, came to the conclusion that the Amended and Restated Settlement Agreement represented an acceptable compromise. The Amended and Restated Settlement Agreement does provide the Former and LTD Employees with preferential treatment, at the expense of the remaining unsecured creditors of the Applicants, in exchange for certain concessions.

[35] The Opposing LTD Employees constitute between 37 and 39 people, all of whom, with one or two possible exceptions, are represented by Representative Counsel or the CAW, the latter of who particularly asserts exclusive representation rights for its members. The total number of former employees is approximately 20,000 and the total number of LTD Employees is about 350. The Opposing LTD Employees consist of approximately 10% of all LTD Employees. I have not been persuaded by the arguments of counsel to the Opposing LTD Employees that the matters in issue be deferred or that approval of the Amended and Restated Settlement Agreement be denied. In my view, it is not appropriate for the objections of a 10% minority override the views of 90% of the LTD Employees, who support the settlement through their court-appointed representative.

[36] The Settlement Agreement and the Amended and Restated Settlement Agreement are products of extensive negotiations between the parties. The Settlement Parties participated in "best efforts" negotiations that resulted in these agreements. In my view, the very existence of the Amended and Restated Settlement Agreement indicates that effective mediation has occurred.

[37] In the March 26 Reasons, I recognized that the Settlement Agreement was arrived at after hard-fought and lengthy negotiations and that the parties to the Settlement Agreement considered it to be the best agreement achievable under the circumstances. In my view, the same can be said with respect to the Amended and Restated Settlement Agreement.

[38] In particular, I note that Representative Counsel consulted with the representatives immediately after the March 26 Reasons were released and there was significant communication with a number of the members of the group. There is strong evidence of support from the employees to the Amended and Restated Settlement Agreement. On the other hand, there are approximately 37 to 39 employees opposing court approval.

[39] Finally, I note that this endorsement does not directly address the third party releases in the Amended and Restated Settlement Agreement, which the Opposing LTD Employees referenced in their submissions. The issue of third party releases was fully argued in the earlier motion and the March 26 Reasons reflect my findings. Nothing in the Amended and Restated Settlement Agreement alters these findings or conclusions.

## DISPOSITION

[40] The Amended and Restated Settlement Agreement is not perfect but, in my view, under the circumstances, it balances competing interests of all stakeholders and represents a fair and reasonable compromise, and accordingly, it is appropriate to approve same.

[41] A formal order giving effect to the foregoing was prepared by counsel to the Applicants. Nothing in the order granted, including in particular paragraphs 5 and 11, is intended to prevent the Northern Trust Company, Canada, from claiming and recovering its fees and expenses from the trust funds, as it may be entitled pursuant to law and the trust agreements. All rights of the Northern Trust Company, Canada to recover its fees and expenses and any right of indemnification from the HWT and Pension Plan trust assets that it may have under the terms of the HWT trust or the Pension Plan trusts or under applicable law are not affected or prejudiced by the order.

[42] I would again like to express my appreciation to all counsel for the quality of their written and oral submissions. The efforts of the Former Employees' Representatives, the LTD Representative and Representative Counsel are specifically recognized for the dignified manner in which they have discharged their responsibilities.



MORAWETZ J.

**Date:** April 8, 2010