

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

BETWEEN:

UDAYAN PANDYA

Plaintiff

-and-

COURTNEY WALLIS SIMPSON, YORK REGION  
REALTY INC., WALLIS SIMPSON & ASSOCIATES,  
COURTNEY WALLIS SIMPSON c.o.b. as YORK MANAGEMENT GROUP  
and as CAMCO DEVELOPMENTS and as YORK GROUP

Defendants

In the Matter of the *Class Proceedings Act, 1992*

**MOTION RECORD  
(Motion in Writing)**

**BENNETT JONES LLP**  
One First Canadian Place  
Suite 3400, P.O. Box 130  
Toronto, Ontario  
M5X 1A4

David J.N. Rainsberry  
LSUC No. 49890Q  
Tel: 416-777-6236  
Fax: 416-863-1716

Solicitors for the receiver

TO: Govedaris Professional Corporation  
Barristers and Solicitors  
6383 Main Street  
Stouffville, ON L4A 1G4

Gregory Govedaris  
Tel: 905-642-2090 ext. 302  
Fax: 905-642-2101  
Email: [gregory@govedaris.com](mailto:gregory@govedaris.com)

Plaintiff's counsel in Court File No. 05-CL-6178

AND TO: Drudi, Alexiou, Kuchar LLP  
Barristers-At-Law  
7050 Weston Road  
Suite 307  
Vaughan, ON L4L 8G7

Constantine Alexiou / Michael G. Tweedie  
Tel: 905-850-6116  
Fax: 905-850-9146

Defendants' counsel in Court File No. 07-CL-6843

**INDEX**

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

B E T W E E N:

UDAYAN PANDYA

Plaintiff

-and-

COURTNEY WALLIS SIMPSON, YORK REGION  
REALTY INC., WALLIS SIMPSON & ASSOCIATES,  
COURTNEY WALLIS SIMPSON c.o.b. as YORK MANAGEMENT GROUP  
and as CAMCO DEVELOPMENTS and as YORK GROUP

Defendants

In the Matter of the *Class Proceedings Act, 1992*

**INDEX**

**Tab Document**

1. Notice of Motion in writing
2. Receiver's Report dated July 22, 2008
- A. Exhibit "A" – Order of Justice Ground dated November 17, 2005
- B. Exhibit "B" – Decision on Motion of Justice Spies dated June 8, 2006
- C. Exhibit "C" – Endorsement of Justice Pepall dated November 15, 2007
- D. Exhibit "D" – Order of Justice Campbell dated March 5, 2007
- E. Exhibit "E" – Endorsement of Justice Campbell dated April 9, 2008
- F. Exhibit "F" – Receiver's Accounts and Billing Summary
- G. Exhibit "G" – Summary of Time and Fees and Disbursements
3. Affidavit of Lincoln Caylor sworn July 17, 2008

4. Summary of Counsel Fees (April 1, 2008 to June 15, 2008)
5. Summary of Disbursements of Bennett Jones LLP (April 1, 2008 to June 15, 2008)
6. Accounts of Bennett Jones LLP

**TAB 1**

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

BETWEEN:

UDAYAN PANDYA

Plaintiff

-and-

COURTNEY WALLIS SIMPSON, YORK REGION  
REALTY INC., WALLIS SIMPSON & ASSOCIATES,  
COURTNEY WALLIS SIMPSON c.o.b. as YORK MANAGEMENT GROUP  
and as CAMCO DEVELOPMENTS and as YORK GROUP

Defendants

In the Matter of the *Class Proceedings Act, 1992*

**NOTICE OF MOTION  
(Motion in Writing)**

The court appointed receiver will make a motion in writing to a judge presiding over the Commercial List at 330 University Avenue in Toronto or as soon after that time as a motion can be heard.

**PROPOSED METHOD OF HEARING:** The motion is to be heard in writing.

**THE MOTION IS FOR:**

1. An order that the interim fees, disbursements and GST from April 1, 2008 to June 15, 2008, are approved and are to be paid to the counsel to the receiver, Bennett Jones LLP, by the receiver, Michael J. Quilling, as a first charge on the receivership estate.

2. An order that the interim fees, disbursements and GST from April 1, 2008 to June 30, 2008 are approved and are to be paid to the receiver, Michael J. Quilling, as a first charge on the receivership estate.
3. Leave of the court to bring this motion, if necessary.
4. Such further and other Order as this Honourable Court may deem just.

**THE GROUNDS FOR THE MOTION ARE:**

**Background**

1. The defendant, Courtney Simpson ("Simpson"), is a member of the Real Estate Council of Ontario ("RECO"), a broker under the *Real Estate and Business Brokers Act* and is the principal broker and controlling mind of the defendant, York Region Realty Inc. ("York Realty") and also of the other defendant entities.
2. This proceeding has been commenced as a class action against the defendants for fraud, unjust enrichment, breach of fiduciary duty and/or misrepresentation with respect to a large number of victims or class members. The defendants have been noted in default.
3. By Order of the Honourable Mr. Justice Ground dated November 17, 2005 (the "Initial Order"), Michael J. Quilling (the "Receiver") was appointed receiver, pursuant to section 101 of the *Courts of Justice Act* and rule 41.02 of the *Rules of Civil Procedure*, over the assets of Simpson and York Realty.



**The Receiver's Fees and Counsel Fees**

4. Subject to paragraph 27 of the Order of Justice Farley dated December 23, 2005, the Receiver's fees and the fees of Bennett Jones LLP, counsel for the Receiver, form a first charge from the assets recovered in the receivership herein.

**Further Grounds**

5. Rules 2 and 37.12 of the *Rules of Civil Procedure*.

**THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE** will be used at the hearing of the motion:

1. The Affidavit of Lincoln Caylor sworn July 17, 2008;
2. The accounts of Bennett Jones LLP;
3. The Receiver's Report dated July 22, 2008;
4. The Receiver's accounts; and
5. Such other material as counsel may advise and this Honourable Court may permit.

DATE: July 23, 2008

**BENNETT JONES LLP**  
One First Canadian Place  
Suite 3400, P.O. Box 130  
Toronto, ON M5X 1A4

David Rainsberry  
LSUC No. 49890Q  
Tel: 416-777-6236  
Fax: 416-863-1716

Solicitors for the receiver

**Udayan Pandya**  
Plaintiff

v.

**Courtney Wallis Simpson et al.**  
Defendants

Court File No.: 05-CL-6159

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

In the matter of the *Class Proceedings*  
*Act, 1992*

Proceeding commenced at Toronto

**NOTICE OF MOTION**  
(Motion in Writing)

**BENNETT JONES LLP**  
One First Canadian Place  
Suite 3400, P.O. Box 130  
Toronto, Ontario  
M5X 1A4

David Rainsberry  
LSUC No. 49890Q  
Tel: 416-777-6236  
Fax: 416-863-1716

Solicitors for the receiver

**TAB 2**

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

B E T W E E N:

UDAYAN PANDYA

Plaintiff

-and-

COURTNEY WALLIS SIMPSON, YORK REGION  
REALTY INC., WALLIS, SIMPSON & ASSOCIATES,  
COURTNEY WALLIS SIMPSON c.o.b. as YORK MANAGEMENT GROUP  
and as CAMCO DEVELOPMENTS and as YORK GROUP

Defendants

In the Matter of the *Class Proceedings Act, 1992*

**Receiver's Fees Report (July 22, 2008)**

**The Receivership Orders**

1. By order dated November 17, 2005 (the "Initial Order"), Justice Ground appointed Michael J. Quilling (the "Receiver") as the receiver of the defendants' assets. Attached hereto and marked as **Exhibit "A"** is a copy of the Initial Order.

**Receiver's Fees Motions**

2. The Receiver and the Receiver's counsel sought approval of their interim accounts on a motion before Justice Spies heard on April 26, 2006. Justice Spies, in her decision on the motion dated June 8, 2006, approved the Receiver's fees. Attached and marked as **Exhibit "B"** is a copy of Justice Spies' Decision on Motion dated June 8, 2006.

3. The Receiver and the Receiver's counsel next sought approval of their interim accounts (dated up to July 31, 2006) on a motion before Justice Pepall heard on October 10 and November 15, 2006. Justice Pepall's endorsement is attached hereto as **Exhibit "C"**. Justice Pepall requested a billing summary setting out the Receiver's hours, fees and disbursements which was filed with the court and the motion was subsequently brought back as a motion in writing to deal with the remaining issues.

4. Justice Campbell heard the motion in writing and granted the requested relief. The Order of Justice Campbell dated March 5, 2007 is attached hereto as **Exhibit "D"**.

5. The Receiver next sought approval of his interim accounts (dated up to June 30, 2007) on a motion in writing (Notice of Motion dated April 4, 2008). Justice Campbell heard the motion in writing and his Endorsement is attached hereto as **Exhibit "E"**.

6. As requested by Justice Campbell in his endorsement (Exhibit "E"), the receiver's counsel submitted a supplementary motion record containing back up documents regarding disbursements. To date the receiver's counsel has not received an endorsement regarding the fees and disbursements of the receiver from August 1, 2006 to June 30, 2007.


7. The receiver and receiver's counsel next sought approval of their interim accounts (dated up to March 31, 2008) on a motion in writing (Notice of Motion dated May 2, 2008). To date the receiver and receiver's counsel have not received an endorsement regarding the fees and disbursements incurred from July 1, 2007 through to March 31, 2008.

8. In the period commencing on or about April 1, 2008 through to June 30, 2008 the receiver incurred fee accounts in the amount of \$3,520.00, disbursements in the amount of \$333.01 and GST in the amount of \$176.00.

9. The Receiver has reviewed the accounts related to this receivership and the summary of fees and disbursements (**Exhibits "F" and "G"**) and verily believes that they accurately reflect the time spent, fees incurred and disbursements made in conjunction with this matter.

**ALL OF WHICH IS RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED BY:**

Michael J. Quilling in his capacity as  
Court Appointed Receiver with no  
personal or corporate liability.



---

Michael J. Quilling

**Udayan Pandya**  
Plaintiff

v.

**Courtney Wallis Simpson et al.**  
Defendants

Court File No.: 05-CL-6159

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

In the matter of the *Class Proceedings*  
*Act, 1992*

Proceeding commenced at Toronto

**RECEIVER'S FEES REPORT**

**BENNETT JONES LLP**  
One First Canadian Place  
Suite 3400, P.O. Box 130  
Toronto, Ontario  
M5X 1A4

Lincoln Caylor / David Rainsberry  
Tel: (416) 777-6121 / 6236  
Fax: (416) 863-1716  
LSUC No. 37030L/49890Q


Solicitors for the receiver

**EXHIBIT "A"**

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

THE HONOURABLE ) THURSDAY, THE 17<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF  
 )  
MR. JUSTICE GROUND ) NOVEMBER, 2005

**BETWEEN:**



UDAYAN PANDYA

Plaintiff

- and -

COURTNEY WALLIS SIMPSON, YORK REGION  
REALTY INC., WALLIS SIMPSON & ASSOCIATES  
AND CAMEO INVESTMENTS

Defendants

In the Matter of the *Class Proceedings Act, 1992*

**ORDER FOR AN APPOINTMENT OF AN INTERIM RECEIVER**

**THIS MOTION** made by the plaintiff for an order appointing a receiver of Courtney Wallis Simpson ("Simpson") personally and for York Region Realty Inc. ("York Reality") pursuant to s. 101 of the *Courts of Justice Act* with investigatory and preservation powers was heard by the court this day at 393 University Avenue, Toronto.

**UPON READING** the affidavits of Udayan Pandya and Richard Kwasniewicz and on hearing the submissions of counsel for the plaintiff, no one appearing for the defendants



despite short notice of this matter, and upon being advised that Ms. Simpson is aware of this proceeding and that the relief sought would likely be granted if she did not attend,

1. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that Michael J. Quilling be appointed a receiver (the "Receiver") over the assets of Simpson and York Realty pursuant to s. 101 of the *Courts of Justice Act* with the powers and duties hereinafter set out.
2. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the defendants be given leave on three days notice to the plaintiff and the Receiver to bring any motion they might see fit to vary this order.
3. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that Bennett Jones LLP be appointed as counsel to the Receiver, that the Receiver shall, in its discretion be entitled to share information received by it with the plaintiff but that the information obtained under this order shall not, without further direction and order, of this Court, be used in any criminal proceedings.
4. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Receiver shall have the power to engage consultants, agents, employees, experts, auditors, accountants, managers, solicitors and counsel and such other assistants from time to time and on whatever basis, including on a temporary basis, as it may consider an the business of any of the defendants or generally exercising the powers and duties conferred by this Order.
5. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Receiver may apply to this Court for advice and directions relating to the proper exercise of its powers hereunder, or for any variations to this Order.

#### **Preservation of Assets**

6. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Receiver is hereby empowered and authorized for and on behalf of and in the name of any of the defendants to take possession and control of all of the present and future assets, undertaking and property of the defendants and any funds, proceeds or

other assets directly or indirectly related to the funds allegedly raised by the defendants as alleged in the statement of claim (the "Property") and any and all proceeds, receipts and disbursements arising out of or from the Property, until further order of this Court, and to act at once in respect of the Property. Without in any way limiting the generality of the foregoing and in furtherance thereof, the Receiver is hereby expressly empowered and authorized on the Receiver's behalf, but not obligated:

- (a) to take such steps as in the opinion of the Receiver are necessary or appropriate to receive, preserve, 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, provided that the Receiver shall not evict or dispossess any occupant of any residential dwelling without further order of this Court made on notice to such occupant;
- (b) to take such steps as in the opinion of the Receiver are necessary or appropriate to maintain control over all receipts and disbursements arising out of or from the Property;
- (c) to receive and collect all monies, debts, claims, choses in action and accounts now owed or hereafter owing to any of the defendants in respect of the Property and to exercise all remedies of any of the defendants in collecting all such monies, including, without limitation, to enforce any security held by any of the defendants and to receive and recover all funds, monies, cash, cash equivalents, negotiable securities, accounts and any other assets on deposits to banks, brokerages and other financial or other institutions;
- (d) to join in and execute, assign, issue and endorse such transfers, conveyances, contracts, leases, deeds, bills of sale, cheques, bills of lading or exchange, or other documents of whatever nature in respect of any of the Property, in the name and on behalf of any of the defendants, which are necessary, desirable or convenient in, the opinion of the Receiver for any purpose pursuant to this Order;

- (e) to initiate, prosecute and continue the prosecution of any and all proceedings as may in its judgment be necessary or desirable to properly protect or realize upon the Property and to defend all proceedings now pending or hereafter instituted against any of the defendants or the Receiver, the prosecution of or defence of which will, in the judgment of the Receiver, be necessary to properly protect or realize on the Property or to protect the administration by the Receiver of the affairs of any of the defendants and the Property, and to settle or compromise any such proceedings which in the judgment of the Receiver should be settled;
- (f) to market any or all of the Property, including advertising and soliciting offers in respect of the Property or any part thereof and negotiate such terms and conditions of sale as the Receiver in its discretion may deem appropriate, provided that any such sale or disposition of Property shall, if the defendants do not consent to the same, be subject to the Court's approval;
- (g) to report to, meet with and discuss with such creditors of the defendants and their advisors as the Receiver deems appropriate including holding town hall or other meetings on all matters relating to the Property and receivership; and
- (h) to register this order in any public registry against title to any of the Property. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing this court orders that this order be registered against the real property and other assets described at Schedules "B" and "C" hereto.

7. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that no person having notice of this order shall interfere with, obstruct or in any way hinder the Receiver in the fulfillment or pursuit of its duties hereunder and that all such persons are under an obligation to deliver up to the Receiver any Property or other thing to which the Receiver is entitled to under this order. In the event that any person contests that any asset, document or thing is Property under this order or is document or record properly producible to the Receiver then that person shall first deliver up the asset in question to the Receiver or to such third party as the Receiver in its discretion may agree for safekeeping and

the person contesting the Receiver's right may thereafter, if so advised, bring an application to this Court for directions.

8. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Receiver may receive information from persons as to the details of their deposit of trust funds investments with Simpson and the other defendant but that the Receiver shall not be under any obligation to call for claims, validate claims or make recommendations with respect the disbursement of funds to investors without further order of this Court.

9. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that no demands, actions, motions, steps, registrations, perfections, administrative proceedings, self-help remedies, or any other acts, proceedings or private remedies whatsoever in respect of the Property, including without limitation, the enforcement of security, liens or collection of any debt or liability, the exercise of any debt or liability, the exercise of any landlord's right to distrain or terminate any lease, the acceleration, amendment or termination of any contract, including any contract of insurance, the exercise of any right of set-off or combination of accounts, the exercise of any construction, mechanics' repair, storage or other lien, or the commencement or continuation of any proceedings under any Environmental Laws (as hereinafter defined) in any jurisdiction in which the Property may be located, shall be taken against the Receiver, with respect to the Property or any part thereof, without the prior written consent of the Receiver or leave of this Court first being obtained upon not less than seven days' notice to the Receiver.

10. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the defendants and anyone having knowledge of this order be and they are hereby restrained, pending consent of all parties or further order of this Court:

- (a) from removing from Ontario or in any way disposing, dealing with or diminishing the value of any of the defendants' property, whether real or personal, present or future, held in Ontario or elsewhere, whether held in the defendants' names or not, pending the final determination of this action or further order of this Court;

howsoever stored or maintained, relating to the defendants (the "Documents"). Provision of the Documents to the Receiver shall not breach any confidentiality or other non-disclosure obligations the Affected Persons might otherwise have to the defendants and it shall be deemed that the defendants shall have consented to the release of the Documents. The Receiver shall allow the defendants and their advisors reasonable access to and the ability to make copies of any and all such books and records in the possession of the Receiver. The defendants shall allow the Receiver to make, retain and take away copies of any or all of the Documents and shall forthwith grant to the Receiver access to and use of accounting, computer, software and physical facilities relating thereto promptly at the request of the Receiver.

14. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that if any of the Documents is stored or otherwise contained on a computer or other electronic system of information storage, the defendants and all Affected Persons shall forthwith give unfettered access to the Receiver for the purpose of allowing the Receiver to obtain a full copy of the Documents, whether by way of printing same onto paper or making copies of computer discs or such other manner of retrieving and copying same as the Receiver in its discretion deems expedient. For the purposes of this paragraph, the defendants and the Affected Persons shall provide the Receiver with all such assistance in gaining access to the Documents as the Receiver may in its discretion require, including, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, forthwith providing the Receiver with instructions on the use of any computer or other system and providing the Receiver with any and all access codes, passwords or other codes as may be required to gain access to the Documents.

15. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that Internet service providers or persons, corporations or individuals who provide e-mail, World Wide Web, file transfer protocol or other Internet connection services to the defendants and/or its present and former directors, officers, employees and agents to access the Internet or World Wide Web e-mail or other similar services, deliver to the Receiver, documents, server files, archive files or any other information in any form in any way recording messages, emails or other information sent or received by the defendants and/or its present and former directors, officers, employees and agents in the course of their association and in conducting their duties related to the operations and affairs of the defendants.

16. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Receiver shall have ongoing access to the defendants' current and future bank account statements and other financial records, copies of which shall be provided to the Receiver as and when demanded by the Receiver. The defendants and the third parties shall co-operate and consent to the distribution of such records to the Receiver.

17. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Receiver is empowered to demand production from third parties (including but not limited to the defendants' advisors, banks, financial institutions and the persons set out in Schedule "A") of documents relating to:

- (a) the defendants' financial affairs;
- (b) the deposit of funds received in connection with the sale of commercial real estate;
- (c) the identities of the persons who have provided deposit funds to Simpson and the other defendants;
- (d) the bank accounts or other financial records referable to the accounts into which such funds were deposited including documents referable to any withdrawal, transfer or dissipation of funds in such accounts; and
- (e) commissions, fees, expenses or other amounts paid to any persons in connection with the sale of such securities and any agreements, arrangements or any other communication with respect to the payment of such amounts;
- (f) and further directs that all such third parties (including all Affected Persons) shall co-operate fully with the Receiver, subject to claims of legal privilege.

18. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Receiver is empowered to compel the attendance, on two clear days written notice by letter from the Receiver or its counsel, of persons believed by the Receiver to have knowledge of the defendants' affairs for the purpose of being examined under oath by the Receiver or by such person as to whom the Receiver has or may delegate this power. In particular, and without limiting the general nature of the power conveyed by this

paragraph, the Receiver is empowered for the purposes of performing its duties hereunder to examine under oath the persons named in Schedule "A" to this order and any persons who may have received transfers of assets or funds from the defendants, provided that nothing herein shall apply, without further order of this Court, to compel any person who has been actually charged with a criminal offence to so testify and that any persons who so testify shall have the right to invoke the protections of the *Canada Evidence Act* and the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. If the persons to be examined have a personal residence or regular place of business within 60 kilometres of an office of Bennett Jones LLP (Toronto, Edmonton or Calgary) such examination shall take place at such office failing which it shall take place at any place where an examination of discovery may take place under the *Rules of Civil Procedure* in the province where the examination is conducted.

19. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that Simpson shall provide to the Receiver within 7 days of service of this order an affidavit under oath specifying her knowledge on the following matters:

- (a) specifics of all corporations, partnerships, or other entities in which she has a direct or indirect interest with particulars of the nature of such interest;
- (b) specifics of all bank, brokerage or other accounts, wherever situate, in her name, the name of York Region Realty Inc., the name of any of the entities in (a) hereof or over which she has any signing authority or any other direct or indirect control;
- (c) specifics of all bank, brokerage or other accounts, where funds were deposited, all accounts to which such funds may have been transferred and the present whereabouts of such funds;
- (d) whether any assets were purchased or acquired in whole or in part with such funds and, if so, the particulars of such assets and their present location with particulars of the assets involved name of the person or entity who holds title to such assets, the date of acquisition, acquisition cost and a current estimate of value; and
- (e) specifics of any disposition of assets (including transfer of funds) in excess of \$10,000 in the last 2 years and that this affidavit shall be deemed to have been

provided by compulsion of law and its further use in any other court proceeding be subject to the protections of the *Canada Evidence Act* and the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedom*.

20. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Receiver is authorised to enter upon the business premises of the persons set out in Schedule "A" (collectively the "Premises") and to examine anything and take away any documents or record found at the premises that the Receiver is authorised hereunder to require to be produced to it.

21. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Receiver shall have full power to investigate any gift, transfer, conveyance, settlement or any other disposition (a "Conveyance") of any interest in any assets, funds or any other property by the defendants to third parties (the "Conveyed Property") and to compel the production of information from any person with respect to such Conveyed Property and the circumstances surrounding the Conveyance as if such Conveyed Property was Property under this order and that the Receiver shall be at liberty to apply to the Court for any appropriate order relating to the preservation of any such Conveyed Property.

#### **Other**

22. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Receiver shall incur no liability or obligation as a result of its appointment or the fulfillment of its duties in carrying out the provisions of this order, save and except for any gross negligence or willful misconduct on its part.

23. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that no proceedings shall be brought against the Receiver in any Court or other tribunal unless leave of this Honourable Court is first obtained on motion on at least seven days notice to the Receiver and the parties.

24. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that all the costs of this receivership including without limitation the Receiver's fees and disbursements (including the amounts which the Receiver is obliged to pay others) and the fees and disbursements incurred by Bennett Jones LLP in carrying



out its duties herein shall be a first charge on any assets recovered in the receivership herein, subject to approval of the quantum of costs by the Court. The Receiver shall have the right to apply to the Court for approval and payment of its fees and disbursements on an interim basis provided that 15 days notice shall be given to the defendants of any such application. The Receiver shall also have the power, if so advised, to move to have the receivership terminated and to be discharged as Receiver.


25. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the plaintiff's costs of this motion shall be allowed in the same manner as the Receiver's fees and disbursements and shall be paid out by the Receiver as a second charge on any assets recovered in the receivership.

26. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Receiver be granted leave to apply to the Court for approval to borrow and to provide whatever security as may be appropriate, if so advised.

27. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that neither the making of this order nor anything in this order shall deem the Receiver to be an owner of any of the Property for any purpose and that neither the making of this order nor anything in this order shall vest in the Receiver the care, ownership, control, charge, occupation, possession or management or require or obligate the Receiver to occupy or to take control, care, charge, occupation, possession or management of any of the Property which may be environmentally contaminated, or a pollutant or a contaminant, or cause or contribute to spill, discharge, release or deposit of a substance contrary to any legislation enacted for the protection or preservation of the environment including, without limitation, the *Canadian Environmental Protection Act*, the *Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act* (Canada), the *Environmental Protection Act* (Ontario), the *Emergency Plans Act 1963* (Ontario), the *Ontario Water Resources Act*, the *Occupational Health and Safety Act* (Ontario) or the regulations hereunder, or any federal or provincial legislation, or rule of law or equity in any jurisdiction affecting the environment, the transportation of goods, or hazardous waste (collectively, "Environmental Laws"). The Receiver shall not be deemed as a result of this order to be in

control, charge, occupation, possession or management of any of the Property within the meaning of any Environmental Laws.

28. **THIS COURT SEEKS AND REQUESTS** the aid and recognition of any court or any judicial, regulatory, or administrative body in any province of Canada and the Federal Court of Canada and any judicial, regulatory or administrative tribunal or other court constituted pursuant to the Parliament of Canada and any court or any judicial, regulatory or administrative body of any other nations and states and the provinces, states or other subdivisions of such nations and states to act in aid of and to be complementary to this Court in carrying out the terms of this order.



Joseph P. Van Tassel  
Registrar, Superior Court of Justice

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

NOV 17 2005

PER/PAR:

MB

## Schedule "A"

1. Wayne Simpson  
587 Cam Fella Boulevard  
Stouffville, Ontario  
L4A 7H3
2. York Management Group  
587 Cam Fella Boulevard  
Stouffville, Ontario  
L4A 7G9
3. Royal Bank of Canada  
Transit No. 02982  
47 Main Street  
Markham, Ontario
4. Royal Bank of Canada  
Davis and Highway 404 Branch  
Toronto, Ontario
5. Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce  
Transit No. 01642  
4360 Highway 7  
Unionville, Ontario
6. Bank of Montreal  
Town Square Branch  
Richmond Hill, Ontario
7. TD Canada Trust  
Town Square Branch  
Richmond Hill, Ontario
8. TD Canada Trust  
Davis and Highway 404 Branch  
Toronto, Ontario
9. Bank of Nova Scotia  
Davis and Highway 404 Branch  
Toronto, Ontario
10. HSBC  
Richmond Hill
11. Laurentian Bank  
Newmarket, Ontario

Schedule "B"

1. 587 Cam Fella Boulevard  
Stouffville, Ontario  
L4A 7H3

Legal Description:

PCL 19-1 SEC 65 M2296: LT 19 PL 65R2296: Whitchurch-Stouffville

2. PIN 03715-0004  
Whitechurch, Ontario

Legal DescriptionL

PT LT 30 PL 54 Stouffville: PT LT 31 PL54 Stouffville, PT LT 40 PL 54 Stouffville; PT  
LT 41 PL 54 Stouffville PTS 1, 7 65R2555; S/T R221467, R221469

3. 1038 Kawagama Lake Road  
Dorset, Ontario

Legal Description:

Con 13 PT LOT 1 RP19R3154, Parts 1, 6, 7  
Dorset, Algonquin Highlands Township

4. PIN 03710-0193/0194  
Stouffville, Ontario

Legal Description:

PT LTS 49 & 50  
PL 70 Stouffville PT 2 65R256J4 Whitchurch-Stouffville

## Schedule "C"

1. Royal Bank of Canada  
Transit No. 02982  
47 Main Street  
Markham, Ontario
2. Royal Bank of Canada  
Davis and Highway 404 Branch  
Toronto, Ontario
3. Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce  
Transit No. 01642  
4360 Highway 7  
Unionville, Ontario
4. Bank of Montreal  
Town Square Branch  
Richmond Hill, Ontario
5. TD Canada Trust  
Town Square Branch  
Richmond Hill, Ontario
6. TD Canada Trust  
Davis and Highway 404 Branch  
Toronto, Ontario
7. Bank of Nova Scotia  
Davis and Highway 404 Branch  
Toronto, Ontario
8. HSBC  
Richmond Hill
9. Laurentian Bank  
Newmarket, Ontario

Udayan Pandya  
Plaintiff

v.

Courtney Wallis Simpson *et al.*  
Defendants

Court File No.: 05-CL-6159

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

In the matter of the *Class Proceedings*  
*Act, 1992*

Proceeding commenced at Toronto

**ORDER**

**BENNETT JONES LLP**  
Barristers and Solicitors  
One First Canadian Place  
Suite 3400, P.O. Box 130  
Toronto, Ontario  
M5X 1A4

Lincoln Caylor / M. Joanne MacMillan  
Tel: (416) 777-6121 / 4629  
Fax: (416) 863-1716  
LSUC Reg. No. 37030L/43529J

Solicitors for the plaintiff

**EXHIBIT "B"**

**COURT FILE NO.:** 05-CL-6159  
**DATE:** 2006-06-08

**SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE - ONTARIO**

**RE:** UDAYAN PANDYA, Plaintiff

**A N D:**

COURTNEY WALLIS SIMPSON, YORK REGION REALTY INC., WALLIS,  
SIMPSON & ASSOCIATES, COURTNEY WALLIS SIMPSON c.o.b. as YORK  
MANAGEMENT GROUP and as CAMCO DEVELOPMENTS and as YORK  
GROUP, Defendants

**BEFORE:** SPIES J.

**COUNSEL:** *Lincoln Caylor* for the Plaintiff/Receiver

*Gregory Govedaris*, for the Plaintiffs in Action # 05-CL-6178, Glenn E.  
Cohen for Atlas Holdings, D.R. Rothwell for Ajay Pahwa and Courtney  
Wallis Simpson in person

**HEARD:** April 26, 2006

**DECISION ON MOTION**

**OVERVIEW**

[1] This is a motion by the court appointed Receiver for an order that the Interim fees, disbursements and GST of counsel for the Receiver, for the period October 11, 2005 to April 12, 2006, be approved and be paid to counsel by the Receiver as the first charge on the receivership estate.

[2] By order of Ground J. dated November 17, 2005, Michael J. Quilling was appointed Receiver, pursuant to s. 101 of the Courts of Justice Act and Rule 41.02 of the Rules of Civil Procedure, over the assets of Courtney Wallis Simpson and York Region Realty Inc. (the "Initial Order").

[3] The Receiver subsequently provided four reports to the court, on four separate attendances. As explained further below, those reports set out in summary fashion the



- 2 -

activities of the Receiver and its counsel Bennett Jones LLP. It was not until the motion returnable March 9, 2006, that the Receiver sought court approval of the fees and disbursements of the Receiver and its counsel.

[4] At the attendance before Mesbur J. on March 9, 2006, the Receiver sought approval for its own fees in the amount of \$35,253.39 and for the fees and disbursement of Bennett Jones in the amount of \$234,434.79 (\$207,537.50 for fees and \$11,674.31 for disbursements plus GST).

[5] The material filed in support of the approval of the fees of Bennett Jones was only an invoice, which simply stated that the fees and disbursements were for "professional services rendered" for the period in question. Counsel also filed a one page "Summary of Time and Fees" which listed the lawyers/students who worked on the matter, their position within the firm, year of call, the total hours spent and hourly rate.

[6] Objection was taken to the fees of the Receiver and its counsel, by counsel for some of the claimants to the assets of the estate. Mesbur J. adjourned the Receiver's motion so that its counsel could particularize the fees and deliver particulars of the fees to the other parties.

[7] Further to the order of Mesbur J., the matter came on before me on April 6, 2006. At that time, after hearing the submissions of counsel appearing, I approved the interim fees and disbursements and GST of the Receiver for the period November 17, 2005 to February 28, 2006 in the amount of \$35,253.39.

[8] The motion with respect to the approval of the fees and disbursements of Bennett Jones was adjourned to April 26, 2006. The difficulty was that the Receiver had prepared a summary of counsel fees, which summarized the work done by each lawyer, but it did not set out the date on which the work was done and more importantly did not break down the work done into various categories of services rendered. Furthermore, no dockets were provided.

[9] Because of the way that the summary was prepared, it was impossible for counsel and for the court to assess the reasonableness of the fees and so unfortunately the motion to approve the fees and disbursements of Bennett Jones had to be adjourned again. Counsel for the Receiver was directed to provide to counsel appearing that day copies of dockets of Bennett Jones, redacted if necessary if there were concerns about solicitor/client privilege, along with a summary of the fees, grouping the time by lawyer in accordance with the main areas of work undertaken, so that an assessment of the fees could be made. The dockets and summary of fees were to be served by April 13, 2006. For any dockets that were redacted, counsel for the Receiver was directed to file unredacted copies in a sealed envelope with the court.

- 3 -

[10] The motion returned before me on April 26th. Counsel for the Receiver had prepared a new motion record with a summary of counsel fees broken down into some categories of services rendered, along with copies of the dockets. No dockets were redacted.

### ISSUES

[11] Pursuant to the Initial Order, the fees of Bennett Jones LLP, counsel for the Receiver, form a first charge from the assets recovered in the receivership, subject to approval of the quantum of costs by the court.

[12] On the return of the motion before me, the Receiver sought approval of the fees of its counsel in the amount of \$207,537.50 and disbursements in the amount of \$11,674.31 for a total with GST of \$234,434.79 for the period October 11, 2005 to February 21, 2006 and \$153,985 for fees and \$5,146.46 for disbursements for a total of \$170,230.30 with GST for the period from February 21, 2006 to April 12, 2006. The grand total that is submitted for approval is \$404,665.09 of which \$361,522.50 is fees.

[13] Counsel opposing the motion objected to the approval of the fees, asserting that the fees are excessive, particularly given the recovery and size of the receivership estate and that the hourly rates charged are too high in all of the circumstances. There was no real issue with the disbursements, nor was it asserted that the Receiver or his counsel had exceeded their jurisdiction.

[14] The issues before me are what principles should I apply in considering the fees of counsel to the Receiver and what quantum of fees should I approve?

### THE FACTS

[15] There are currently at least two proceedings against the defendants and both are class proceedings. They each relate to alleged fraudulent activity on the part of Simpson and her companies. The plaintiff in the class action herein, (the "Deposit Fraud Class Action"), first approached Bennett Jones in the fall of 2005 alleging that Simpson, who is a real estate agent, and her companies, defrauded him by retaining his deposit for the purported purchase of a commercial property. It is alleged that Simpson purported to "sell" the same two commercial properties in excess of a hundred times each and as a result there are many claimants in this class who claim for deposits paid on purchases that were a sham.

[16] Mr. Govedaris is counsel for plaintiffs in class action #05-CL-6178 (the "Mortgage Fraud Class Action"). In that action, it is alleged that Simpson and others defrauded the victims through the operation of a "Ponzi Scheme", convincing people to "invest" in interim occupancy mortgages that never existed.

- 4 -

### Initial Order

[17] The Initial Order of Ground J. approved the appointment of Bennett Jones LLP as counsel to the Receiver but hourly rates were not approved. The order gives the Receiver the usual powers to preserve property of the defendants including investigatory powers and the Receiver is of course permitted to apply to this Court for advice and directions related to the proper exercise of its powers or for any variations to the order.

### The First Report

[18] Counsel for the Receiver attended before Farley J. on December 13, 2005 and filed the First Report of the Receiver of the same date. That report summarized the nature of the two alleged frauds. At that time the Receiver estimated that there were eighteen victims of the deposit scheme fraud owed approximately \$3.6 million and at least 54 victims of the Ponzi Scheme/mortgage fraud with a total loss of approximately \$11 million.

[19] At that stage, counsel for the Receiver had issued the statement of claim in the Deposit Fraud Class Action. In the First Report, the Receiver recommended that the Mortgage Fraud Class Action be tried together with the Deposit Fraud Class Action and that the Initial Order be amended to add the mortgage fraud victims as a class of creditors to be considered by the Receiver.

[20] The Receiver reported on the various activities undertaken by the Receiver and its counsel since the date of the Initial Order, which included serving the Initial Order on all banks to which Simpson and York Realty had a relationship, asking that the bank accounts be frozen, registering the Initial Order on title to all properties owned by Simpson, attending at all properties owned by Simpson, (with the exception of the cottage property), speaking to the agent who had listed the real properties for sale (at the request of Simpson), reviewing Simpson's business records, examining Simpson under oath, communicating with the York Regional Police and dealing with claimants.

[21] The Receiver was in attendance with counsel for the examination of Simpson on November 29, 2005. On the same date the Receiver, accompanied by counsel, met with a detective from York Regional Police and conducted a cursory review of documents in the possession of the police as a result of the criminal charges pending against Simpson. Simpson consented to the Receiver reviewing this material.

[22] Simpson also co-operated with the Receiver in identifying the real property that she owned and in fact advised the Receiver of two properties that were registered in the name of Lia Hurst that Simpson claimed ownership to. The report stated that it appeared that the equity in the real property owned by Simpson might be

- 5 -

anywhere from approximately \$654,000 to approximately \$1.3 million depending on whether the Receiver was successful in setting aside certain charges.

[23] At that time, the Receiver recommended listing the real property with the agent that Simpson had already listed the properties with and that the proceeds from sale be deposited and held in an interest bearing account, that the Receiver, in consultation with counsel, determine whether a law suit was warranted against Hurst, including certificates of pending litigation, in order to regain those two properties, reviewing documents in the possession of York Regional Police (17 boxes), selling the contents of Simpson's business premises and conducting an examination of a third party, Adam Cox, who had been identified by Simpson as someone who likely had relevant information.

[24] At the time of this First Report, the Receiver was aware that the members of the Deposit Fraud Class Action had made claims to the Real Estate Council of Ontario ("RECO") with respect to their deposits, and had been informed by RECO that it was its position that Simpson's actions constituted one "occurrence" and that therefore there was a \$500,000 limit to the amount to be paid by RECO for all class members. The Receiver recommended that he deal directly with RECO and assist individuals who had yet to make a claim to do so and then report to the court. He reported that any payments from RECO be used for the benefit of the deposit fraud class only. I am advised by Mr. Govedaris however, that the claimants in the Mortgage Fraud Class Action may also have claims against RECO and so the Receiver and counsel for the Receiver will need to be concerned about this conflict, as Bennett Jones also represents the Deposit Fraud Class.

[25] The First Report also disclosed an issue concerning Ajay Pahwa who has asserted a claim in the receivership estate as a secured creditor. The Receiver takes the position that the three mortgages Pahwa has on properties belonging to Simpson have been paid off, or, in the alternative, are not valid because of illegal rates of interest.

[26] The Receiver also advised the court at this time that it had established a website to post information regarding the case.

[27] Farley J. by order dated December 15, 2005, authorized the Receiver to amend the statement of claim to add Simpson carrying on business as York Management Group as a defendant and to try the Mortgage Fraud Class Action together or immediately after the Deposit Fraud Class Action (subject to confirmation by the appointed judge in the class proceedings).

[28] A second order of Farley J. of the same date headed "First Amended and Restated Initial Order" restated all of the relief granted by Ground J. in the Initial Order and added other terms, which authorized the Receiver to enter into new listing agreements to sell the real property owned by Simpson, deal directly with RECO on

- 6 -

behalf of all victims of the Deposit Fraud scheme, examine Cox, and open a bank account to accept deposits from Simpson. That order also stayed all proceedings in respect of the defendants and their properties and approved a claim form and its distribution<sup>1</sup>.

### The Second Report

[29] The matter returned again before Farley J. on December 22, 2005 with the Second Report of the Receiver of the same date. In that report, the Receiver reported that the Receiver's counsel had continued to follow up with banks to ensure that accounts were frozen, met with Simpson for further investigation, that a separate interest bearing bank account had been opened to receive the proceeds from the sale of Simpson's assets and any funds that Simpson might be receiving, as Simpson was still working (subject to a living allowance for Simpson), that counsel had communicated with the agent that Simpson had already arranged, regarding the sale of various Simpson properties pursuant to a new listing agreement, and that a real estate agent had been retained to undertake a fair market assessment of the cottage property. Furthermore contact with Cox in order to compel his attendance at an examination had been made, the Statutory Declaration to be utilized as a claim form had been prepared and information had been posted to the website.

[30] With respect to the Hurst action, the Receiver reported that the properties were valued at between \$250,000 and \$275,000 each, but that there were mortgages registered on each of the properties in the amount of approximately \$221,000 and \$225,000. The Receiver advised it would continue to investigate to determine if there was sufficient equity to merit a lawsuit and, if in consultation with counsel, a lawsuit was warranted, that Hurst would be sued.

[31] With respect to RECO, the Receiver advised the court that the Receiver and its counsel had met with the manager of investigations of RECO. It appears the purpose of that meeting was simply to inform the manager of the activities of the Receiver to date and the orders that had been made.

[32] With respect to the Pahwa mortgages, counsel for Pahwa had served a notice of sale under mortgage with respect to one property. Based on the Receiver's investigation, which included a review of all documents registered on title, the Receiver recommended that the validity of the mortgages be challenged, that in the mean time no proceeds from any sale be paid to Pahwa and that funds claimed by Pahwa be held in the Receiver's bank account pending further order of the court.

<sup>1</sup> As I advised counsel for the Receiver, particularly as the amended Initial Order is not black lined, in order to determine the relief granted by Farley J. as compared to the relief previously granted by Ground J., it is necessary to do a paragraph by paragraph review of the two orders. Preferably the new order should have simply stated the additional relief and any amendments without restating the Initial Order.

- 7 -

[33] The Second Amended and Restated Initial Order of Farley J. dated December 23, 2005, authorized the Receiver to assert challenges to the validity, quantum and priority of the Pahwa, restrained Pahwa's power of sale proceedings and provided that upon approval of the sale of properties, that the amount claimed by Pahwa be held in a separate bank account pending further order.

### Third Report

[34] The Receiver attended in court again on January 20, 2006 before Cumming J. with the Receiver's Third Report dated January 13, 2006. In that report, the Receiver reported that bankruptcy proceedings had been commenced against Simpson and York Realty and two receiving orders dated December 30, 2005 had been obtained. The Receiver recommended and obtained an order from Cumming J. that the bankruptcy proceedings be stayed, as were the related receiving orders.

[35] The Receiver also reported on its on-going review of Simpson's bank accounts, but there was still no statement that any of those accounts had contained funds.

[36] A new issue arose in this report concerning certain shares of Dianor Resources Inc. that had been owned by Simpson and had been transferred into two individual accounts held at RBC Dominion Securities, allegedly in breach of the Initial Order. This information came to the Receiver from a detective of the York Regional Police squad. Counsel for the Receiver requested that the share transfers be reversed and currently that is a further issue for the Receiver to pursue. RBC is holding approximately 500,000 shares which fluctuate in value and could be worth anywhere from \$.255 (the rolling 52 week low price) to \$2.18 (the rolling 52 week high) per share.

[37] The Third Report to the court also updated the court with respect to the progress on the sale of the various properties owned by Simpson which had all been listed for sale, with the exception of the cottage property, and the fact that an action had been commenced against Hurst and that certificates of pending litigation on title had been obtained. The Receiver recommended acceptance of an offer concerning one property.

[38] With respect RECO, the report disclosed that counsel for the Receiver had sent a letter requesting disclosure of information and that there had been no response. By that point it was estimated that eighteen victims of the Deposit Fraud had made claims to RECO.

[39] With respect to Cox, after several attempts, he finally attended at an examination but then refused to answer questions once he realized he was there to give evidence about the Simpson fraud. The Receiver had continued its review of

- 8 -

Simpson documents and discovered the existence of two other corporations for which it sought amendment, to have them added to the receivership.

[40] The Receiver also reported that counsel had written to the Crown assigned to the Simpson case requesting that a Restitution Order be sought against Simpson in the amount of approximately \$14.6 million representing the estimated loss occasioned by both the fraudulent deposit and mortgage schemes.

[41] Based on the report, the Third Amended and Restated Initial Order of Cumming J. dated January 20, 2006 directed that one property be sold with the amount of \$336,080, which is the amount of Pahwa's claim, to be held in a separate bank account to await the outcome of the Pahwa claim. A separate order of the same date added Simpson carrying on business as York Group and as Camco Developments as defendants.

#### **Fourth Report**

[42] When the matter proceeded before Mesbur J. on March 9th, she had the Fourth Report of the Receiver dated March 3, 2006. In that report the Receiver advised that it was using documents recovered from the police to verify and validate the claims of potential class members, particularly the alleged Mortgage Fraud class, in order to determine whether each Individual Investor had received less or more than their principal investment back. This was described as a complicated task for various reasons.

[43] By that date the actual claims made by members of both classes totaled approximately \$3.7 million. The Receiver stated that he had been in touch with the majority of the victims known to that date and had distributed the claim form to those individuals.

[44] The Receiver's estimate of the value of the assets in the estate at that time was set out in a chart outlining assets and potential recovery through the receivership. This chart listed total assets at \$3,225,000 with total liabilities at \$1,416,809 with a net estate total of \$1,808,191. The only assets listed were the real properties owned by Simpson, including the Hurst properties, the RECO claim at \$500,000 and the Dianor Resources shares at \$400,000, which appears to be a conservative number. The Pahwa claim was taken into account in the amount of \$336,080. As set out below, the interest of Simpson's husband in the matrimonial home was not considered.

[45] With respect to the Dianor Resources shares, the Receiver had communicated further with counsel for RBC Dominion. They were advised that the shares were frozen and that RBC would require a court order before complying with the

- 9 -

Receiver's request to reverse the transfer. RBC had not produced the requested documents to the Receiver by that date.

[46] The Receiver provided further reports with respect to the real property and the court approved the sale of a second property. He recommended that the sale price of the sale approved by Cumming J. be reduced because of substantial issues disclosed in the property inspection. The Receiver recommended listing the cottage property in the spring. With respect to the Hurst properties, the Receiver reported that Hurst was willing to sign an acknowledgement and direction transferring title and the properties back to Simpson. The Receiver recommended that once that was done, that the properties be sold.

[47] With respect to RECO, the Receiver reported that twenty victims of the Deposit Fraud class had made claims to RECO totaling \$3,215,000. RECO agreed to provide disclosure of certain documents but continued to maintain its position that Simpson's actions constituted "one" occurrence and that therefore no more than \$500,000 would be available to all claimants under RECO's Consumer Deposit Insurance coverage. The Receiver stated that after reviewing the documentation, it would seek directions from the court regarding commencing an action against RECO's insurer.

[48] The Receiver reported on the examination of Cox and advised that based on that examination, it was not recommended that Cox be added as a defendant. The Receiver also reported on obtaining bank records from the ten bank branches, which the defendants were known to have used, which had been served with the Initial Order. By this point the Receiver had a complete compilation of the bank records for the past 6 years and stated that he was confident that he would be able to discern some patterns from the movement of funds.

[49] Pursuant to the order of Mesbur J., RBC Dominion Securities was ordered to produce documents related to the Dianor Resources shares to the Receiver, and the shares were frozen until April 6, 2006. In addition, the sale of one property was approved, as was a listing of the Hurst properties after they had been reconveyed to Simpson.

#### **Affidavit of M. Joanne MacMillan sworn March 31, 2006**

[50] When the matter proceeded on April 6, 2006 before me, no further report was filed but I did have the Affidavit of M. Joanne MacMillan sworn March 31, 2006. Further information was provided on the Dianor Resources shares issue and the fact that RBC had provided the Receiver's counsel with documents related to the transfer of the shares. Copies of these documents had been provided to the transferees of the shares and Mr. Govedaris in accordance with Justice Mesbur's order.



- 10 -

### Receiver's Action Plan

[51] In accordance with my endorsement of April 6, 2006, the Receiver served and filed a proposed Action Plan. A review of this plan assists in considering the work the Receiver and its counsel has done and what is yet to be done in order to realize all of the assets of the receivership estate and determine and pay out the claims.

[52] The proposal with respect to the various issues is as follows:

- (a) **Dianor Resources Inc. Shares**-the Receiver recommends challenging the share transfer and ask that it be reversed and that the shares be returned to the receivership estate on the basis that the transfer took place after the freezing order had taken effect. The method of determining this issue is to be resolved at a 9:30 appointment to be scheduled on notice to all interested parties.
- (b) **The Pahwa Mortgages**- the Receiver proposes examining the lawyer who assisted placing the mortgages on title to Simpson's properties and then challenging the validity of the Pahwa mortgages and proceeding via an application seeking to discharge the Pahwa mortgages on various grounds. Various alternative relief is also proposed. A draft application was included with the Plan. This is another matter that is to be timetabled at a 9:30 appointment on notice to all interested parties.
- (c) **RECO Claim**- RECO's has an insurance policy with Lloyds that has limits of \$100,00 per claim and \$500,000 for each "occurrence". Twenty-six claims have been made to RECO. If they are characterized as individual claims, the maximum possible insurance coverage would be \$1,965 million. The Receiver is considering proceeding against RECO and Lloyds by adding them as defendants to the Deposit Fraud Class Action and a draft Fresh as Amended Statement of Claim was provided to the court. Research that considered the merits of such a claim was summarized in the affidavit of Ms. MacMillan. A decision on this claim was deferred. Recovery from RECO will raise other issues in that the Receiver is only proposing to distribute any recoveries to the Deposit Fraud Class. These issues were also deferred.
- (d) Finally a proposal for claims administration was set out. A statutory declaration that was approved by Farley J. has been provided to each claimant requiring claimants to indicate whether they are part of the Deposit or Mortgage Fraud classes. The Receiver will review each claim along with supporting documents and decide whether to reject, approve or amend the claim. Only the principal amount of the deposit or mortgage

- 11 -

investment will be validated. No procedure has yet been determined for claimants to contest the Receiver's determination.

### THE LAW

[53] Counsel did not provide any law to me with respect to the principles that I should consider in deciding this matter. It is my understanding that the leading case, at least in terms of the approval of the fees of a receiver, is *Re Bakermates Int'l Inc.*<sup>2</sup>, a decision of the Ontario Court of Appeal.

[54] In the *Bakermates* case Borins J.A., speaking for the court, stated that when a receiver asks the court to approve its compensation, there is an onus on the receiver to prove that the compensation for which it seeks the court's approval is fair and reasonable (at para. 31). That is the test that I intend to apply, along with the other principles set out in *Bakermates*, in determining the approval of the Receiver's counsel's fees.

[55] Borins J.A. stated that the court could adjust the fees and charges of the receiver, just as it can in the passing of an estate trustee's accounts, and that the applicable standard of review is whether those fees and charges are "fair and reasonable" (at para. 35). He went on to refer to Bennett on *Receiverships*<sup>3</sup> with approval and accepted as correct Bennett's discussion of the purpose of the passing of a receiver's accounts:

to afford the debtor, the security holder and any other interested person the opportunity to question the receiver's activities and conduct to date. On the passing of accounts, the court has the inherent jurisdiction to review and approve or disapprove of the receiver's present and past activities even though the order appointing the receiver is silent as to the court's authority (at para. 36 quoting Bennett at pp. 459-60)

[56] In determining what is fair and reasonable remuneration, Borins J.A. observed that there is no guideline controlling the quantum of fees as there is in respect to a trustee's fees. He referred to what he described as the "leading case" in the area of receiver's compensation, *Belyea & Fowler v. Federal Business Development Bank*<sup>4</sup>, a decision of the New Brunswick Court of Appeal, and adopted with approval the observations of Stratton J.A. in *Belyea* that compensation is

usually allowed either as a percentage of receipts or a lump sum based upon time, trouble and degree of responsibility involved. The governing

<sup>2</sup> [2002], O.J. 3569

<sup>3</sup> F. Bennett, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. (Scarborough Cohen Carswell, 1999)

<sup>4</sup> (1983) 46 C.B.R. (N.S.) 244

- 12 -

principle appears to be that the compensation allowed a receiver should be measured by the fair and reasonable value of his service and while sufficient fees should be paid to induce competent persons to service receivers, receiverships should be administered as economically as reasonably possible (at para. 44).

[57] Where a percentage of receipts is used, a court may look to the rate afforded to a trustee in bankruptcy as a guideline, which is seven and one-half percent of receipts after payment to secured creditors, subject to variation by the court.<sup>5</sup> As I explain below however, this is not a receivership where in my view a fixed percentage would be fair to counsel for the Receiver. In my view the fees in this case must be assessed on a *quantum meruit* basis.

[58] The court in *Bakemates* approved of the *Beylea* factors to be applied when using a *quantum meruit* basis to assess a receiver's compensation, which include:

the nature, extent and value of the assets handled, the complications and difficulties encountered, the degree of assistance provided by the company, its officers or its employees, the time spent, the receiver's knowledge, experience and skill, the diligence and thoroughness displayed, the responsibilities assumed, the results of the receiver's efforts, and the cost of comparable services when performed in a prudent and economical manner (at para. 45).

[59] Although Borins J.A. stated that the factors in *Beylea* are a "useful guideline", he was careful to point out that they should not be considered as exhaustive of the factors to be taken into account, as other factors may be material depending on the circumstances of the receivership (at para. 51).

[60] - With these principles in mind, I turn to the positions of counsel in this case and the fees I have been asked to approve.

### **ANALYSIS**

[61] Opposing counsel complained that the additional billing summaries prepared by counsel for the Receiver were not provided within the time that I specified, which left counsel with inadequate time to prepare for this motion. It appears from the Affidavits of Service, that the Summaries of Counsel Fees were not served until April 18<sup>th</sup>. The Motion Record was served on April 20<sup>th</sup> by email but part of the transmission was unsuccessful and so it was sent by same day courier on April 21<sup>st</sup>. No explanation was given for why the timeline in my order was not complied with. This is unfortunate

---

<sup>5</sup> Bennett, supra at p. 472

- 13 -

as the court relies on parties with an interest in the receivership estate to act as a check on the activities of the Receiver and its counsel. However opposing counsel did not request an adjournment and so I have considered the matter based on the evidence before me.

[62] Opposing counsel did not suggest that the hours claimed by counsel for the Receiver had not been spent, but challenged the hourly rates and whether or not the work was done efficiently and whether all the time spent was warranted, particularly as it was argued that counsel for the Receiver should have known the nature of Simpson's assets and the value of the estate early on. As counsel observed, if the fees sought are approved as claimed, a very significant portion of the proceeds from the real estate assets will be committed to the legal fees incurred to date and recoveries for the claimants in the two class actions will largely depend upon the outcome of litigation concerning the Dianor Resource share issue, the Pahwa mortgage issue and the proposed action against RECO.

[63] Opposing counsel noted that up to the time of the Initial Order granted by Ground J. on November 17, 2005, counsel for the Receiver had incurred approximately \$40,000 in fees and there is not much dispute about that amount. The fees quickly escalated however and opposing counsel had no idea of how expensive the receivership had become until served with the motion record returnable March 9, 2006, which was served on March 4th. This meant that they did not have an opportunity to complain about the escalating costs before they were incurred. Counsel also complained that the Receiver's counsel has still left too much time unallocated to a particular category of work, leaving it difficult to assess the reasonableness of the time spent.

[64] Having considered the submissions of all counsel, and having reviewed the evidence filed in support of the fees claimed, including a line by line review of the actual dockets, and having considered the activities of the Receiver and its counsel as reflected in the Receiver's reports to the court, I have concluded that the Receiver's fees should be reduced by \$102,000 before GST. Counsel for the Receiver has not satisfied me that the hourly rates charged and all of the time spent is "fair and reasonable", given the factors I have considered that are relevant to the approval of the fees in this matter. My reasons are as follows.

[65] In coming to my decision, a significant consideration has been the amount of the fees to date, considering where we are in the receivership and the prospect of recovery for the claimants. In a passage from the *Belyea* case, not referred to by the Court of Appeal in *Bakemates*, Stratton J.A. stated:

Even though a professional is entitled to a fair, just and reasonable compensation measured by the reasonable value of the services rendered, the fees charged must bear some reasonable proportion to the amount of

- 15 -

recovery from the RECO insurance policy, which is the minimum recovery from RECO and the Dianor Resources shares claim at a value of the shares at \$400,000. This estimate of the share value may be conservative because the shares have recently been worth in excess of \$900,000, but the strength of this claim is unknown. With respect to the real estate, the estimate takes into account a liability with respect to Pahwa in the amount of \$336,080, which could be reduced if the Receiver is successful challenging the Pahwa mortgages. Simpson advised at the time of the argument of this motion that her husband was asserting his half interest in the matrimonial home, which is one of the properties to be sold by the receiver. The Receiver had not taken this into account before and this claim is not reflected in this estimate.

[70] Although precise amounts cannot be known at this time, it seems clear that the quantum of claims will by far outstrip the available assets. Furthermore, as I have already stated, the available assets are modest, particularly considering the quantum of fees sought by the receiver. Apart from the sale of Simpson's real estate, which represents approximately \$900,000 of the approximate amount of the estimated \$1.8 million recovery, which is subject to reduction by the claim of Simpson's husband, the disputes concerning RECO, the Dianor Resources shares and Pahwa are still to be litigated. Although this court can control the efficiency of the manner in which the Pahwa and Dianor Resources disputes are determined, it is likely that pursuit of the RECO insurance will require a full-blown lawsuit. Furthermore the quantification of the claims is ongoing but not completed, nor have any disputes resulting from that process been determined. In other words, there is still considerable cost to be incurred before all of the possible assets of the estate have been realized and the claims paid.

[71] It is also important to note that the Receiver and its counsel have been assisted by the fact that Simpson has cooperated. She identified all of her assets for the Receiver and has consented to the police sharing the information they have obtained in their investigation of the criminal charges. Furthermore she is not defending the class actions. Her co-operation was somewhat of a problem however, when she decided to consent to individual judgments early on. The Receiver's counsel has dealt with that.

[72] Finally it is important to observe that the complaints of opposing counsel, that the quantum of the fees of counsel for the Receiver has caught them by surprise, are legitimate. There is no obligation on counsel for the Receiver to come to the court more often in order to seek approval of fees, but when counsel wait for several months to do so, particularly in a case like this where significant costs are running up relative to the size of the estate, counsel for the Receiver is at risk that when they do come to court, the way in which they have done the work and the fees incurred may legitimately be criticized. It is not enough in these circumstances to rely on the fact that the work done was approved in a general way by the various orders of the court already referred to. When counsel wait to bring their accounts to the court for approval, they do so at their own risk.

- 16 -

[73] With this background in mind, I considered both the hourly rates charged by the Receiver's counsel, the time spent and the work done, in assessing the reasonableness and fairness of the accounts.

[74] I was advised by counsel for the Receiver, that the rates charged, are the usual rates charged by the various members of the firm in these matters. He acknowledged that they are at the "high end of the scale". Counsel advised however, that notwithstanding the Deposit Fraud Class Action was commenced by way of class action; counsel would not be seeking a multiplier or premium.

[75] The rates charged range from \$150.00 per hour for students at law to \$725.00 per hour for a tax partner (although I am told that that time has been written off). The bulk of the work was done by Lincoln Caylor, a 1995 call, at the rate of \$575.00 per hour (98 hours-\$78,000), M. Joanne MacMillan, a 2000 call, at the rate of \$450.00 per hour (160 hours-\$132,000), and Emily Atkinson, a 2005 call, at the rate of \$275.00 per hour (208 hours-\$114,000). All three lawyers are litigation counsel. There is some supervisory time by James Patterson, a 1988 call, at \$625.00 per hour. As well a real estate partner, who is a 1992 call, has time on the file at the rate of \$550.00 per hour. Other lawyers with specialty in bankruptcy and insolvency (\$650.00 per hour), class actions (\$525.00 per hour), as well as real estate law clerks at \$150.00 per hour, a litigation law clerk at \$175.00 and students at law ranging from \$150.00 to \$175.00 per hour have all worked on the file.

[76] Mr. Cohen, counsel for a deposit fraud claimant, argued that the hourly rates claimed should be reduced by as much as a third, and referred to the old cost grid. Counsel for the Receiver responded that this was not relevant to the task before me. I agree, in the sense that the cost grid reflects, in terms of substantial indemnity costs, costs that the opposing party is ordered to pay, and those rates are not necessarily reflective of the costs as between the lawyer and his or her own client. Normally, with competition in the marketplace and informed clients, rates will be established as between a lawyer and a client that are reasonable in all of the circumstances, although some clients I am sure will disagree with that proposition. Here, however the client is a member of a class and he is not paying the fees personally. The plaintiff in this action and a few others had retained Bennett Jones individually at the outset and as submitted by opposing counsel, it is extremely unlikely that they could have afforded or would have agreed to pay the hourly rates now charged by counsel for the Receiver.

[77] There are many "clients" who will be impacted by the fees charged. They did not negotiate the hourly rates, nor did the court ever approve them. The assumption that the court will automatically approve a "usual" hourly rate for Receiver's counsel is a faulty one in my view. In a case like this, the court, with the assistance of opposing counsel, has to play the role of what a client would ordinarily do, namely

- 17 -

consider whether the hourly rate is fair and reasonable in light of the nature of the work involved and the amount in issue.

[78] Although I accept the submissions of counsel for the Receiver, that this case is not a typical receivership, neither is the case complex. Setting aside whether or not two separate class actions or for that matter any class actions are needed, this case is primarily involved in the investigation and preservation of assets, dealing with victims and considering how best to pursue the litigation concerning the issues in dispute. This however, is a case where the amount of work involved may be somewhat disproportionate to the size of the receivership estate and so a percentage of the recovery would not be fair to counsel.

[79] The size of the receivership estate however should have some bearing on the hourly rates of counsel. I am of the view that an adjustment ought to be made to reflect the fact that, particularly after the size of the estate became known, the "usual" rates of counsel were too high relative to the size of the estate. Although the first statement of assets and liabilities was not put before the court until March 9, 2006, it is clear from the reports of the Receiver, that the Receiver and his counsel, had a general sense of the of the assets and liabilities of the defendants well before that. Certainly in early December, when preparation of the First Report dated December 13, 2005 was well underway, although the precise value of the estate would not have been known, the fact that the estate was a relatively modest one and that the potential claims were significant and would by far outstrip the amount of the estate, ought to have been known to the Receiver's counsel. Certainly at that point counsel should have considered whether or not the firm's usual hourly rates were suitable for this receivership. In fact in my opinion the usual rates, which Mr. Caylor acknowledged are at the "high end" of the scale, were not warranted from the outset.

[80] Although I would not reduce the hourly rates as significantly as suggested by opposing counsel, in my view they ought to be reduced by approximately 15%. Based on these considerations I find that there should be a reduction of the fees before GST in the amount of \$46,000 to reflect the fact that the hourly rates claimed are too high for this matter. In arriving at this amount, I have not applied a 15% reduction to the time docketed before early December 2005 of approximately \$80,000, by which point the information in the First Report was clearly known to counsel. I have however made an adjustment of 5% to that \$80,000 as well, as the rates were too high from the outset.

[81] I come then to the amount of time that is claimed.

[82] Counsel for the Receiver has not filed an affidavit that deals with any of the factors in the *Bakemates* case. The affidavits of Ms. Atkinson and Ms. MacMillan filed in support of this motion only identify the accounts, the summaries and the

- 18 -

dockets and depose that they accurately reflect the time spent, fees incurred and disbursements made in conjunction with this matter. The onus however is on counsel for the Receiver to satisfy me that the amount claimed for fees is fair and reasonable.

[83] Counsel for the Receiver has filed a Summary of Counsel Fees for the period of November 4, 2005<sup>9</sup> to February 21, 2006 and a similar summary for the period February 21, 2006 to April 12, 2006. These summaries break the time spent by counsel for the Receiver into the following categories and amounts:

- (a) The total fees claimed with respect to real property is \$46,750.
- (b) The total fees claimed with respect to RECO is \$25,295.
- (c) The total fees claimed with respect to the Dianor shares is \$5,642.50.
- (d) The total fees claimed with respect to the Pahwa mortgages is \$17,585.
- (e) The total fees claimed with respect to "general receivership activities" comprises the balance claimed of \$227,745.<sup>10</sup>

[84] With respect to the fees claimed with respect to real property, according to the summary this reflects the time spent maintaining properties, communicating with insurance companies, utilities companies, real estate agents, land registry office, counsel for purchasers, dealing with power of sale issue and inquiries (i.e. Pahwa), dealing with mortgages, registering orders on title, obtaining and registering certificates of pending litigation on title, transferring properties into receivership, obtaining vesting orders and getting the title of the properties cleared.

[85] As I have already stated, Simpson identified the properties and a decision was made to use her agent as she had already listed some of the properties. Time was spent finalizing the sale of two of those properties, although only one sale had closed in the time frame of the accounts submitted. In addition it appears that the time spent on the Hurst action, which included obtaining certificates of pending litigation, and some of the time spent on Pahwa is included in this category.

[86] Many of the matters listed such as maintaining the properties, communicating with insurance and utilities companies and matters of that sort is work which I would have expected the Receiver's staff to take care of at a lower cost<sup>11</sup>. The fact that the Receiver is from Texas likely explains this, which is consistent with the fact that the Receiver's account was a small fraction of the fees of counsel for the Receiver. Counsel for the Receiver however, chose the Receiver and clearly counsel for the

<sup>9</sup> I note that this is after the date when the fees claimed began to be incurred of October 11, 2005.

<sup>10</sup> These amounts total \$323,017.50, which is almost \$40,000 less than the total fees claimed of \$361,522.50. The difference was explained on the basis that the summaries were estimates of the break down of fees. I expect that most of the explanation is that these summaries commence November 4, 2005 whereas the fees claimed commence October 11, 2005.

<sup>11</sup> The Receiver's hourly rate is \$400 US/hour so presumably its staff would be at lower rates.



- 19 -

Receiver chose to do much of the Receiver's work. This however exacerbates the problem of high rates, as the rates claimed for the lawyers involved in these activities are as high as \$575 and \$450. In my view others should have done much of this work at significantly lower rates. I have considered this in my reduction for inefficiency discussed further below.

[87] The real estate partner who presumably was mostly responsible for the work done on the sale of the properties is Scott Martyn and his rate is \$550. He was assisted by two real estate law clerks at the rate of \$150 per hour. This time however only reflects \$10,595 of the fees. It is impossible to determine how much of the time claimed relates to the Hurst action but clearly the total fee claimed for this category of work done seems excessive.

[88] With respect to the fees claimed with respect to RECO, again the amount claimed seems high. RECO's position was known by the time of the First Report and essentially what has happened since then is a meeting and correspondence with RECO, demanding and receiving documents in response to a request for disclosure of documents, a consideration of the legal issue including research (over \$8,000 for research done by two students is part of this category) and assisting victims with making claims. It is not clear how much of the time claimed includes the time spent preparing the opinion that was filed with the court concerning the RECO action, but I expect that some of that time is not part of the time claimed now, as the cut off for fees was April 12, 2006. I note that the costs of this aspect of the matter will have to be carefully considered before any further work is undertaken given that it is unclear whether or not the RECO claim benefits both class actions or not.

[89] I do not have any difficulty with the quantum of time claimed with respect to the Dianor Resource shares issue and the Pahwa mortgages issue, which, if successful, will benefit all victims.

[90] The most difficult issue arises with respect to the heading "general receivership activities". Although some effort has been made to break out some of the motion time and the dealings with the banks in that category, it essentially is a category reserved for all of the other time spent that is not included in the other categories set out. Opposing counsel complain that this is in breach of my direction and does not give them a real opportunity to assess the value of the work done. I agree. We do not know for example, how much time was spent preparing the statement of claim or the Hurst action or a particular Report for the court. This means, for example, that we can not assess the value of the work done in connection with the Hurst action relative to the limited equity in the two properties at issue in that action.

[91] The court in the *Bakemates* case stated that although there is no prescribed process, the accounts must be detailed including the total charges "for each

- 20 -

of the categories of services rendered" and in a form that can be easily understood by those affected by the receivership so that such persons can determine the amount of time spent by the receiver's employees and others that the receiver may have hired in respect to the "various discrete aspects of the receivership" (at para. 37). This was not done with respect to this general category and as a result the task of opposing counsel and the court is that much more difficult. It was not an option however to ask counsel for the Receiver to particularize this category further, as that would have necessitated yet another adjournment.

[92] The general receivership activities category includes, but is not limited to, commencing the proceedings, obtaining the receivership order, contacting victims, disseminating, collecting, processing and validating claim forms, obtaining bank records, reviewing bank records, tracing funds, reviewing records in the possession of York Regional Police, examining parties (Simpson and Cox), preparing reports for the court (4), reporting to the court and obtaining approval for steps taken (6 court attendances up to and including the attendance before me on April 6th), communicating with various parties including clients and class members and "developing and carrying out strategy for recovery". Again the Receiver's staff should have done some of this work if distance had not been an issue, such as the work done contacting victims and disseminating and processing claim forms. Again the fact this was done by lawyers at higher hourly rates means a deduction is required.

[93] The assessment of the fees in this category is a difficult task given the information that I have to consider. However, no one suggested that an assessment before an assessment officer or a line-by-line review was warranted, as the cost of that would be astronomical. Furthermore, opposing counsel did not go to the expense of cross-examining Ms. Atkinson on her affidavit or otherwise questioning counsel for the Receiver with respect to the accounts. That however, is understandable, as opposing counsel represent various claimants and do not have any certain access to the estate to cover their costs. Furthermore, the material in question was delivered too late to permit cross-examination without a further adjournment.

[94] Notwithstanding these concerns, fixing costs is not an unusual task for the court. Judges are expected now to fix costs following not only routine motions but also lengthy trials. Although the factors for assessing party and party costs may be different, the type of analysis required is similar and in fact the overriding direction now from the Court of Appeal is to assess what in our view is fair and reasonable in all of the circumstances.<sup>12</sup>

[95] In considering the number of hours and the nature of the work done on this matter, I am of the view that the sheer number of hours put in, given where we

---

<sup>12</sup> See *Boucher v. Public Accountants Council for the Province of Ontario* (2004), 71 O.R. (3d) 291

- 21 -

are in this receivership, reflects a significant degree of inefficiency when I consider what work has been done based on the material filed. They are excessive and greatly exceed what I view as fair and reasonable.

[96] Part of this concern about efficiency and whether all of the work done was warranted, can be explained by the fact that eighteen different professionals charged time to the file. Although some of that can be justified on the basis that different expertise was needed (particularly litigation versus real estate), this always raises a concern about duplication of effort. In that regard I considered particularly the dockets of Mr. Caylor, Ms. MacMillan and Ms. Atkinson, as they have by far, the most time on the file and they all worked on the very same matters. In other words it cannot be said that either Ms. MacMillan or Ms. Atkinson handled discreet issues under the supervision of Mr. Caylor. Based on my review of the dockets, it appears that there was, as a result, unnecessary duplication. Mr. Caylor delegated many tasks to Ms. MacMillan who in turn delegated them to Ms. Atkinson.

[97] For example, with respect to materials for court including the Receiver's Reports, although Ms. Atkinson would usually bear the main responsibility for drafting the materials, both Ms. MacMillan and Mr. Caylor would review and often revise these materials, (see for example pp. 134-135, 138, 149-150, 153, 154, 219-220 of the Motion Record returnable April 26, 2006). In addition, although Ms. Atkinson was the one who typically accompanied Mr. Caylor on court attendances or on examinations, this necessitated bringing Ms. MacMillan (or in some cases Ms. Atkinson, where it was Ms. MacMillan who went to court or Mr. Caylor when Ms. MacMillan conducted the examination of Cox) up to speed after those attendances and this is reflected in the dockets, (see for example pp. 132, 140, 149, 224 of the Motion Record). In some cases all three attended court, (see page 142 of the Record) and naturally there were many occasions when all three met together to review the matter. These are intended only as examples. Clearly with all three lawyers working on the very same issues, coupled with the extraordinary number of other lawyers and students who worked on this file, duplication was inevitable.

[98] Furthermore there does not appear to have been a very clear demarcation if at all, between the various tasks undertaken by Ms. MacMillan and Ms. Atkinson. There are many references to Ms. MacMillan doing research, notwithstanding that she is more senior than Ms. Atkinson and of course the students at law who worked on the file, (see for example pp.124, 129, 140, 145, 150, 222, 223, 230 of the Motion Record).

[99] Although I accept that it may have been necessary for all three lawyers to work on the file at the early stages, when it was important to move quickly to freeze assets, once that phase was over, in my view much of the litigation work should have been delegated to Ms. Atkinson under the supervision of Mr. Caylor. This would have resulted in less unnecessary duplication and much of the work done by Ms. MacMillan

- 22 -

would have been done at a lower rate. Alternatively Ms. MacMillan should have been given more responsibility so that Mr. Caylor's time could be significantly reduced. Although three levels of counsel of varying experience may be warranted in a complex and large (in monetary terms) receivership, it is not warranted here. I have already commented on the particular need to conduct this receivership efficiently given the quantum of claims and the size of the estate. Furthermore, the matter is not complex. Accordingly, a deduction for this unnecessary duplication must be made.

[100] In considering the amount of this deduction, I have considered the fact that the duplication of effort reflects primarily on the time spent by Mr. Caylor, Ms. MacMillan and Ms. Atkinson and that accordingly the time they have spent should be reduced to eliminate this duplication, and as well a deduction should be made to reflect the fact that some of the work done by Mr. Caylor could have been done by Ms. MacMillan or alternatively a great deal of her work could have been done by Ms. Atkinson, under the direct supervision of Mr. Caylor, at a significantly lower hourly rate. Either way, unnecessary duplication would have been reduced and work would have been done at a lower hourly rate.

[101] In addition, consideration must be given to the number of hours docketed to accomplish particular tasks. As I have already noted, the time for the real property category seems high. Furthermore the time in the general category is excessive given the nature of the work done. For example a great deal of time was spent preparing the various reports of the Receiver to the court and the time seems high particularly given that each report repeated a great deal of the early report(s). I note that Ms. Atkinson docketed time to reviewing precedents for these reports (see Record at page 129). That is to be expected for inexperienced counsel, but all of that time should not have been billed to the file.

[102] It is apparent from reviewing the dockets that there was no consideration given to whether or not some docketed time should have been written off. I was advised that in the final analysis, approximately \$3,000 has been written off which in part reflects the time of the tax partner and presumably other time, although that has not been specified. Nevertheless, in my view there ought to have been a more substantial write-off of time. There are numerous examples of dockets where lawyers have recorded time spent to research and ascertain what type of procedure was necessary in order to accomplish a particular step in the proceeding.

[103] For example, Ms. Atkinson docketed time determining how to bring a motion in the Commercial List to appoint a receiver (page 125 of the Motion Record) and researching between the role of a trustee in bankruptcy and a court appointed receiver (page 144 of the Motion Record. Ms. Atkinson also docketed time to reviewing the protocol to obtain fee approval and determining the requirements of vesting orders (pp. 208, 235 of the Record). There was also repeated research done on class actions

- 23 -

by Ms. MacMillan notwithstanding that I am advised that Mr. Hoaken has expertise in that area and worked on the file.

[104] This type of basic information may not be known to inexperienced counsel but is fundamental knowledge that a client can reasonably expect his or her lawyer to know. It is not time that can be billed to the file. In commenting on this, I do not wish to be critical of the lawyers in question, as they need to take time to consider what to do when the process is unfamiliar to them. That is how one gains experience in the practice of law. That, however, cannot be at the expense of the client when it involves the fundamentals. I would have expected that the supervising lawyer would have written off these types of dockets and not include them in the accounts when rendered. That clearly was not done in this case and so again an adjustment to the fees claimed on this basis is warranted.

[105] In summary counsel for the Receiver has not satisfied me that the fees submitted are fair and reasonable. Simply put, in my opinion, counsel for the Receiver has not properly staffed or administered the work and resulting billing on this file. Considering all of these various deductions that in my view are necessary, I find that a deduction in the amount of \$50,000 of fees before GST for duplication and overall inefficiency is warranted. In arriving at this amount, I have taken into account the fact that I have already made a reduction to the hourly rates so that I do not "double count".

[106] I am also of the view that there must be a further reduction for the time spent by counsel for the Receiver in seeking court approval of its fees. The information provided to opposing counsel and the court before Mesbur J. was woefully inadequate and there is no explanation for why proper materials were not prepared at that time. Accordingly part of the time spent for that attendance was wasted in terms of this issue. Similarly, the problems opposing counsel raised with the further material provided in the first attendance before me on April 6, 2006 were predictable as well and so much of the time spent in court on that occasion was wasted. In addition, as already stated the third draft of the materials in support of this motion is still problematic and was served late. Had counsel for the Receiver prepared the necessary information for consideration by Mesbur J., a great deal of cost for all concerned would have been spared. Certainly the time spent by counsel for the Receiver for these wasted efforts should not be compensated.

[107] Accordingly there will be a further reduction of the fees (before GST) to take this consideration into account in the amount of \$6,000. The time spent with respect to the approval of fees was not separately categorized. I have calculated this amount by including some of the time spent by K. McPhie, who prepared the summaries, and part of the time spent by litigation counsel preparing for and attending

- 24 -

before Mesbur J. and again before me on April 6, 2006 and some of the time spent by counsel preparing the information that I directed.

[108] For these reasons, the fees claimed by Bennett Jones will be reduced by these various deductions in the total amount of \$102,000 before GST, in order to arrive at an amount for fees that in my opinion is fair and reasonable in all of the circumstances.

### DISPOSITION

[109] Accordingly, the fees and disbursement of Bennett Jones LLP for the period from October 11, 2005 to April 12, 2006 are approved in the amount of \$259,522.50 for fees plus GST in the amount of \$18,166.58 and disbursements, inclusive of GST, in the amount of \$17,998.22 for a total of \$295,687.30.

[110] I do not intend to impose hourly rates on counsel for the Receiver with respect to future accounts submitted to the court but I trust that the conclusions that I have come to in reaching this decision will be taken into account. I expect that the number of lawyers working on this matter will be pared down significantly and that my concern about duplication will be dealt with.

[111] As for the approval of future accounts, I expect counsel for the Receiver to follow the procedure in the *Bakamates* decision. That decision makes it clear what information is required to support such a motion and I expect that counsel will include all of that information in the material filed with the court on the next motion for approval and that that motion record will be served well in advance and posted on the website so that all interested parties may make an informed assessment of the reasonableness of the fees claimed and if necessary, prepare to defend the motion. The categories for all services rendered must be more refined so that in addition to assessing the reasonableness of the future accounts, consideration can be given to what a client would normally want to know, namely, is the cost to pursue a particular course of action warranted given the likely outcome and the amount in issue. This will be necessary to determine how the remaining issues should be dealt with.

[112] Mr. Cohen, counsel for Atlas Holdings and Investments Inc., one of the claimants in the Deposit Fraud Class Action who has made a claim for a deposit of \$200,000, requested costs of his attendance on the motion in the amount of \$2,000 on a substantial indemnity basis, to be paid from the estate when Receiver's counsel is paid. He submits that this is fair if his efforts reduced the quantum of costs payable to Receiver's counsel. Atlas has been on the service list since the Initial Order and counsel has appeared on certain motions brought by the Receiver, including the attendances

- 25 -

before me on April 6<sup>th</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup>. He submits that his client has a direct and substantial interest in the outcome of the motion and that I have the discretion to award costs pursuant to both section 131 of the *Courts of Justice Act* and Rule 57 of the Rules of Civil Procedure.

[113] Counsel for Atlas submits that these proceeding may be compared to pension surplus distribution litigation and estate litigation where it is not unusual for the court to allow cost to all persons interested in the fund and who made submissions of assistance to the court, to be paid out of the fund.

[114] Counsel for the Receiver submits that it is unusual for a creditor to seek legal costs for court attendances in the context of a receivership unless the receiver has acted beyond his authority or inconsistent with his appointment. Typically, if a creditor has to attend or bring a motion, the creditor bears his own costs. This prevents multiple creditors' counsel from attending on the receiver's motions and seeking fees. It is submitted that the court ought not to encourage creditors by a cost award to unnecessarily attend at future hearings. No issue is taken as to the quantum claimed.

[115] Mr. Govedaris submits that there is no authority that he is aware of to support costs paid to third parties who retain counsel after a receiver has been appointed unless there has been impropriety *inter alia* by the receiver, which has been identified, by that third party. He agrees with the submission of counsel for the Receiver that even if I have the discretion to award costs I ought not to as it would encourage other parties to seek costs and that would increase costs for all potential claimants.

[116] In my view I have the discretion to make a costs award pursuant to section 131 of the Courts of Justice Act. Atlas is clearly a party affected by the relief sought. Although it is not usual for counsel for creditors to ask for costs, in these circumstances, the submissions from opposing counsel were of some assistance, although since they did not have adequate time to prepare, unfortunately most of the detailed review of the accounts was left to me.

[117] I see no reason why Mr. Cohen's client, who chose to have counsel attend to contest the accounts, should bear all of the expense for the benefit of all claimants to the estate. In my view however, costs on a partial indemnity basis for this attendance is warranted, particularly as Mr. Cohen had not previously asserted an intention to ask for costs.

[118] For these reasons, I award costs to Atlas Holdings and Investments Inc. in the amount of \$1,500 on a partial indemnity basis, to be paid from the estate when Receiver's counsel is paid.


[119] I must add that this order as to costs is not an invitation for counsel who did not participate on the assessment of the costs on this motion to appear on future

- 26 -

motions and seek such an award. If more claimants wish to be represented on future motions to approve the fees, they will need to choose and rely on one counsel to represent all of their interests on the issue of costs.

[120] That brings me to Mr. Govedaris who has not asked for costs and in fact opposed the request by Mr. Cohen for costs. Had Mr. Govedaris sought costs, I would have awarded costs to him on the same basis. Going forward, I expect Mr. Cohen to cooperate with Mr. Govedaris on the issue of the fees and I will only be prepared to consider awarding one set of costs on future motions to approve fees. Mr. Cohen represents a member of the class represented by counsel for the Receiver. As Mr. Govedaris represents the Mortgage Fraud Class Action, I would prefer to hear from him given the potential for conflict with the Deposit Fraud Class Action that I have already referred to.

[121] Finally, I ask that counsel for the Receiver ensure that this decision is posted on the Receiver's website as soon as possible.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
SPIERS J.

RELEASED: JUNE 8, 2006



COURT FILE NO.: 05-CL-6159

DATE: 2006-06-08

**SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE -  
ONTARIO**

**RE:** UDAYAN PANDYA, Plaintiff

**A N D:**

COURTNEY WALLIS SIMPSON,  
YORK REGION REALTY INC.,  
WALLIS, SIMPSON &  
ASSOCIATES, COURTNEY  
WALLIS SIMPSON c.o.b. as  
YORK MANAGEMENT GROUP  
and as CAMCO DEVELOPMENTS  
and as YORK GROUP, Defendants

**COUNSEL:** *Lincoln Taylor* for the  
Plaintiff/Receiver

*Gregory Govedaris*, for the  
Plaintiffs in Action # 05-CL-6178,  
Glenn E. Cohen for Atlas  
Holdings, D.R. Rothwell for Ajay  
Pahwa and Courtney Wallis  
Simpson in person

---

**DECISION ON MOTION**

---

SPIES J.

JUN - 8 2006

**EXHIBIT "C"**

Superior Court of Justice  
Commercial List

FILE/DIRECTION/ORDER

Udayan Panda

Plaintiff(s)

AND

Courtney Wallis Simpson et al

Defendant(s)

Case Management  Yes  No by Judge: \_\_\_\_\_

Counsel	Telephone No.:	Facsimile No.:

- Order  Direction for Registrar (No formal order need be taken out)
- Above action transferred to the Commercial List at Toronto (No formal order need be taken out)

- Adjourned to: \_\_\_\_\_
- Time Table approved (as follows): \_\_\_\_\_

Items 5+6 of the notice of motion originally returnable Oct 10, 06 were adjourned to be heard by me today so that additional materials could be placed before the court.

The Receiver + Receiver's counsel had originally sought approval of their interim accounts before Sep 2. In her decision of June 8, 06 she observed that there was duplication of legal work + also suggested that the hourly rates should be reduced by about 15%. She also noted that others should have done much of the work for which fees were claimed at lower rates. She also noted that the accounts should be detailed + include total charges for each category of services. She reduced the fees claimed substantially.

Counsel for the Receiver now seeks approval of its fees for the period Apr 1, 2006 to July 31, 2006 in the amount of \$103,893.15. This does

Nov 15, 06  
Date

[Signature]  
Judge's Signature

Additional Pages 3

Superior Court of Justice  
Commercial List

## FILE/DIRECTION/ORDER

## Judges Endorsement Continued

not included disbursements. A separate outline of these has not been provided + are to be addressed on the next occasion that the receiver is in court. The fees of the receiver have not been adequately addressed + approval is also similarly adjourned. A breakdown of time is required.

The receiver's ~~the~~ counsel have done much to attempt to address the issues raised by s. 10. In this regard, the fees allocated to the senior wards, the Bahamas mortgages + the General Receivership Act duties have all been reduced by 15%. In addition, with respect to the real property realizations a flat fee of \$10,000 is requested rather than the full fees of \$23,492.50. Although significant time was devoted to this category, recovery was disappointing. An effort was also made to reduce the number of timekeepers on the file + to replace work done by a lawyer with work done by articling students for which there has been no charge.

I must be satisfied that the fees claimed are fair + reasonable. For the most part I am but I am of the view that the numbers of lawyers working on the file for the relevant time periods was excessive. In light of the size of the estate, I am hard pressed to understand the need for a litigation counsel called in 2000 + another in 1995. I accept that special expertise may be required for real estate + insolvency matters. In all of these circumstances, I am reducing the fees claimed by \$10,000. Accordingly fees of \$93,893.17 are approved as disbursements of the fees of receiver's counsel.

On Oct 10, 200, I granted the receiver

Superior Court of Justice  
Commercial List

## FILE/DIRECTION/ORDER

## Judges Endorsement Continued

authority to resolve Mr Simpson's family law Act claim. The Reciever advised the court + others that for a period of time, Mrs. Simpson had moved back into the family home at 587 Cam Kellor Blvd in Strathville. The Reciever continues to recommend that he proceed with the agreement in principle reached with Mr. Simpson. Both Mr + Mrs. Simpson advised the Reciever + the court that they are separated + living separate + apart; that the separation agreement entered into by them is real + that Mrs. Simpson has moved out; that Mr. Simpson has brought proceedings for divorce. Both were advised by me of the provisions of R 59.06 + that a court order may be set aside on the grounds of fraud or facts arising or discovered after the order was made. Both assured me that the representations made to the court are accurate. On that basis, the Reciever is at liberty to carry out the settlement with Mr. Simpson. Both Mr + Mrs. Simpson were also told that they should not construe my comments as suggesting that they should be separated or divorced. They must simply be forthright + honest with the Reciever + the court.

Lastly with respect to the written request of Mr Cavendish which I authorized in the interests of reducing costs, Mr Caylor did file an affidavit + as mentioned, further supporting materials are required before I approve the Reciever's

Superior Court of Justice  
Commercial List

FILE/DIRECTION/ORDER

Judges Endorsement Continued

fees.  
not including the planor shares which  
currently would have a value of  
\$410,000 the estimated value of the  
estate is \$1.4 million before any fees or  
other expenses.

SRP

**EXHIBIT "D"**

ONTARIO  
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE  
(COMMERCIAL LIST)


THE HONOURABLE MR. )  
JUSTICE CAMPBELL ) MONDAY, THE 5<sup>th</sup> DAY OF  
MARCH, 2007

BETWEEN:

UDAYAN PANDYA

Plaintiff

-and-



COURTNEY WALLIS SIMPSON, YORK REGION  
REALTY INC., WALLIS, SIMPSON & ASSOCIATES,  
COURTNEY WALLIS SIMPSON c.o.b. as YORK MANAGEMENT GROUP  
and as CAMCO DEVELOPMENTS and as YORK GROUP

Defendants

In the matter of the *Class Proceedings Act, 1992*

ORDER


*M* *without notice*  
THIS MOTION, made by the receiver for an Order approving the receiver's interim fees, disbursements and GST and the disbursements of counsel for the receiver, Bennett Jones LLP, was heard this day *at Toronto*.

ON READING the materials filed,

1. THIS COURT ORDERS that the receiver's interim fees in the total amount of \$35,808.00, disbursements in the total amount of \$6,585.72 and GST thereon are approved and are to be paid to the receiver, Michael J. Quilling, as a first charge on the receivership estate.



2. THIS COURT FURTHER ORDERS that the disbursements of the counsel for the receiver, Bennett Jones LLP, in the total amount of \$8,887.24 and GST thereon, are approved and are to be paid to counsel for the receiver by the receiver, Michael J. Quilling, as a first charge on the receivership estate.



A-K Fedson  
Registrar

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

DEC 12 2007

PER/PAR:



Udayan Pandya  
Plaintiff

v.

Courtney Wallis Simpson *et al.*  
Defendants

Court File No.: 05-CL-6159

ONTARIO  
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE  
(Commercial List)

In the matter of the *Class Proceedings*  
*Act, 1992*

Proceeding commenced at Toronto

ORDER

BENNETT JONES LLP  
One First Canadian Place  
Suite 3400, P.O. Box 130  
Toronto, Ontario  
M5X 1A4

M. Joanne MacMillan  
LSUC Reg. No. 43529J  
Tel: 416-777-4629  
Fax: 416-863-1716

Solicitors for the receiver

**EXHIBIT "E"**

Udayan Pandya  
Plaintiff

v.

Courtney Wallis Simpson et al.  
Defendants

Apr. 9/08

This motion proceeded in writing but appears in notice to the other parties as set out in the Affidavit of Service.

I have no hesitation in affirming the fees of the Receiver & the disbursements of the Receiver of the Acccountants fee. This letter item of \$30.00 does not have any back up material in support to explain what was done & what time was involved. Assuming I am satisfied with the fee in Order 11/07 when forwarded for signing

Ph. Conner J.

Court File No.: 05-CL-6159

ONTARIO  
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE  
(Commercial List)

In the matter of the *Class Proceedings Act, 1992*


Proceeding commenced at Toronto

MOTION RECORD  
(Motion Returnable in Writing)

BENNETT JONES LLP  
One First Canadian Place  
Suite 3400, P.O. Box 130  
Toronto, Ontario  
M5X 1A4

M. Joanne MacMillan  
LSUC Reg. No. 43529J  
Tel: 416-777-4629  
Fax: 416-863-1716

Solicitors for the receiver



**EXHIBIT "F"**



Michael J. Quilling, Receiver for

Page: 1  
 04/30/2008  
 Client No: 911-0140M  
 Invoice No: 58925

RE: Simpson and York Realty

ITEMIZED SERVICES BILL

			Hours	
04/01/2008	MJQ	Review and respond to emails from Bennett Jones.	0.30	120.00
04/02/2008	MJQ	Telephone conference with Linc Caylor regarding scheduling and settlement issues.	0.40	160.00
04/03/2008	MJQ	Review and respond to email from Courtney Simpson.	0.20	80.00
04/04/2008	MJQ	Review and respond to email regarding Dianor shares issues.	0.30	120.00
04/08/2008	MJQ	Review and respond to email from Courtney Simpson regarding bank records.	0.20	80.00
04/11/2008	MJQ	Review and execute materials from Bennett Jones.	0.20	80.00
04/14/2008	MJQ	Telephone conference with Courtney Simpson regarding bank records.	0.20	80.00
04/16/2008	MJQ	Review of materials relating to Dianor hearing (.8); review of materials relating to RECO mediation (.8); email to Linc Caylor regarding same (.1); telephone conference with Courtney Simpson regarding bank documents (.2).	1.90	760.00
04/17/2008	MJQ	Telephone conference with Courtney Simpson regarding case issues (.2); telephone conference with Bennett Jones regarding availability for examination in Dianor matter (.2).	0.40	160.00
04/18/2008	MJQ	Conference call with Linc Caylor regarding RECO mediation (.3); forward affidavits to Courtney Simpson for review (.2).	0.50	200.00
04/25/2008	MJQ	Review and execute materials from Bennett Jones regarding receiver's report.	0.20	80.00
	BR	Update website to reflect recent pleadings and investor updates (.4)	0.40	80.00
		For Current Services Rendered	5.20	2,000.00

Recapitulation

<u>Timekeeper</u>	<u>Hours</u>	<u>Hourly Rate</u>	<u>Total</u>
Michael J. Quilling	4.80	\$400.00	\$1,920.00
Brent Rodine	0.40	200.00	80.00

Express Mail Service

99.26

Bryan Tower 2001 Bryan St., Suite 1800 Dallas, TX 75201

ph. 214.871.2100 fx. 214.871.2111 www.qsclpc.com

A P R O F E S S I O N A L C O R P O R A T I O N

A T T O R N E Y S A N D C O U N S E L O R S

Michael J. Quilling, Receiver for

Page: 2  
04/30/2008

Client No: 911-0140M  
Invoice No: 58925

RE: Simpson and York Realty

Photocopies	0.80
Total Expenses Thru 04/30/2008	100.06
Total Current Work	2,100.06
Balance Due	<u>\$2,100.06</u>

NOTE: PLEASE REFERENCE THE CLIENT MATTER NO. WITH PAYMENT



QUILLING · SELANDER · CUMMISKEY · LOWNDS

Federal ID #75-2459334

Michael J. Quilling, Receiver for

Page: 1

05/31/2008

Client No: 911-0140M  
Invoice No: 60060

RE: Simpson and York Realty

ITEMIZED SERVICES BILL

			Hours	
05/01/2008	MJQ	Telephone conference with Linc Caylor regarding RECO issues (.2); telephone conference with Courtney Simpson regarding same (.2).	0.40	160.00
05/02/2008	MJQ	Review and respond to emails from Linc Caylor (.3); telephone conferences with Courtney Simpson regarding case issues (.4).	0.70	280.00
05/12/2008	MJQ	Telephone conference with Courtney Simpson regarding case issues.	0.20	80.00
05/14/2008	MJQ	Review and respond to email from Linc Caylor.	0.20	80.00
05/28/2008	MJQ	Review of proposed letter regarding Dianor settlement and emails with counsel regarding same (.4); telephone conference with Courtney Simpson regarding same (.2).	0.60	240.00
05/30/2008	MJQ	Review and respond to email regarding Dianor settlement.	<u>0.20</u>	<u>80.00</u>
		For Current Services Rendered	2.30	920.00

Recapitulation

<u>Timekeeper</u>	<u>Hours</u>	<u>Hourly Rate</u>	<u>Total</u>
Michael J. Quilling	2.30	\$400.00	\$920.00

Long-Distance Telephone	205.66
Express Mail Service	24.97
Photocopies	<u>1.60</u>
Total Expenses Thru 05/31/2008	232.23
 Total Current Work	 1,152.23
 Balance Due	 <u>\$1,152.23</u>

NOTE: PLEASE REFERENCE THE CLIENT MATTER NO. WITH PAYMENT

Bryan Tower 2001 Bryan St., Suite 1800 Dallas, TX 75201

ph. 214.871.2100 fx. 214.871.2111 www.qscilpc.com

A P R O F E S S I O N A L C O R P O R A T I O N

A T T O R N E Y S A N D C O U N S E L O R S





QUILLING SELANDER CUMMISKEY LOWNDS

Federal ID #75-2459334

Michael J. Quilling, Receiver for

Page: 1  
06/30/2008

Client No: 911-0140M  
Invoice No: 61886

RE: Simpson and York Realty

ITEMIZED SERVICES BILL

			Hours	
06/03/2008	MJQ	Review of materials to submit in support of RECO claims and telephone conference with Linc Caylor regarding same.	0.60	240.00
06/10/2008	MJQ	Review and approve materials from Bennett Jones.	0.40	160.00
06/25/2008	MJQ	Telephone conference with Courtney Simpson regarding inheritance money.	0.30	120.00
06/27/2008	MJQ	Preparation of letter to Courtney Simpson.	<u>0.20</u>	<u>80.00</u>
		For Current Services Rendered	1.50	600.00

Recapitulation

<u>Timekeeper</u>	<u>Hours</u>	<u>Hourly Rate</u>	<u>Total</u>
Michael J. Quilling	1.50	\$400.00	\$600.00

Postage	<u>0.72</u>
Total Expenses Thru 06/30/2008	0.72
Total Current Work	600.72
Balance Due	<u>\$600.72</u>

NOTE: PLEASE REFERENCE THE CLIENT MATTER NO. WITH PAYMENT

Bryan Tower 2001 Bryan St., Suite 1800 Dallas, TX 75201

ph. 214.871.2100 fx. 214.871.2111 www.qsclpc.com

A P R O F E S S I O N A L C O R P O R A T I O N

A T T O R N E Y S A N D C O U N S E L O R S

**EXHIBIT "G"**

**SUMMARY OF TIME AND FEES**

**April 1, 2008 to June 30, 2008**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Experience</b>	<b>Total Hours</b>	<b>Rate Per Hour</b>	<b>Billing</b>
M.J. Quilling	Called to the bar in 1982	8.6	\$400.00	\$3,440.00
B. Rodine	Called to the bar in 2004	0.4	\$200.00	\$80.00
<b>Total</b>				<b>\$3,520.00</b>

**SUMMARY OF DISBURSEMENTS**

**April 1, 2008 to June 30, 2008**

<b>Expenses</b>	
Long Distance	\$205.66
Photocopies	\$2.40
Postage	\$0.72
Express Mail	\$124.23
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$333.01</b>

**TAB 3**

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

BETWEEN:

UDAYAN PANDYA

Plaintiff

-and-

COURTNEY WALLIS SIMPSON, YORK REGION  
REALTY INC., WALLIS, SIMPSON & ASSOCIATES,  
COURTNEY WALLIS SIMPSON c.o.b. as YORK MANAGEMENT GROUP  
and as CAMCO DEVELOPMENTS and as YORK GROUP

Defendants

In the Matter of the *Class Proceedings Act, 1992*

**AFFIDAVIT OF LINCOLN CAYLOR**


I, Lincoln Caylor, of the City of Toronto, in the Province of Ontario, **MAKE OATH  
AND SAY AS FOLLOWS:**


1. I am a partner with the law firm Bennett Jones LLP solicitors for the receiver herein, and as such have knowledge of the matters hereinafter deposed to. Where I make statements in the context of this affidavit which are not within my personal knowledge, I have identified the source of that information and belief, all of which information I have deposed to I verily believe.

2. This affidavit is sworn in support of the motion to approve disbursements and accounts of Bennett Jones LLP, counsel for the receiver, for the period from in or about April 1, 2008 to June 15, 2008.

3. In the period commencing in or about April 1, 2008 to June 15, 2008, counsel for the receiver incurred accounts and disbursements totaling \$68,667.81 (inclusive of GST).

4. I have reviewed the Summary of Counsel Fees located at Tab 4 of the receiver's motion record, the Summary of Disbursements of Bennett Jones LLP located at Tab 5 of the receiver's motion record, and the Bennett Jones Invoices numbered 762766, 762767 and 762809 located at Tab 6 of the receiver's motion record and I verily believe that they accurately reflect the time spent, fees incurred and disbursements made in conjunction with this matter.

SWORN BEFORE ME at the City of )  
Toronto, in the Province of Ontario, this )  
17<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2008. )  
 )  
A commissioner, etc. )

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
LINCOLN CAYLOR

**Udayan Pandya**  
Plaintiff

v.

**Courtney Wallis Simpson et al.**  
Defendants

Court File No.: 05-CL-6159

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

In the matter of the *Class Proceedings*  
*Act, 1992*

Proceeding commenced at Toronto

**AFFIDAVIT OF LINCOLN CAYLOR**

**BENNETT JONES LLP**  
One First Canadian Place  
Suite 3400, P.O. Box 130  
Toronto, Ontario  
M5X 1A4

David Rainsberry  
LSUC No. 49890Q  
Tel: 416-777-6236  
Fax: 416-863-1716

Solicitors for the receiver

**TAB 4**



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

BETWEEN:

UDAYAN PANDYA

Plaintiff

-and-

COURTNEY WALLIS SIMPSON, YORK REGION  
REALTY INC., WALLIS, SIMPSON & ASSOCIATES,  
COURTNEY WALLIS SIMPSON c.o.b. as YORK MANAGEMENT GROUP  
and as CAMCO DEVELOPMENTS and as YORK GROUP

Defendants

In the Matter of the *Class Proceedings Act, 1992*

**SUMMARY OF COUNSEL FEES  
(April 1, 2008 to June 15, 2008)**

## Interim Summary 5

Individual	Fee Items	Time	Rate
D. Bell	<i>May 5, 2008 to May 6, 2008 – RECO/Lloyd's</i> Researching interpretations of insurance contracts; Meeting with D. Rainsberry regarding same;	1.50	\$185.00
L. Caylor	<i>April 1, 2008 to May 14, 2008 – Dianor Shares</i> Conference with D. Rainsberry regarding status; Call to solicitors regarding Dianor shares; Conferences with D. Rainsberry; Calls with defendants' solicitor regarding Dianor issues and potential settlement; Email to M. Quilling.	0.80	\$625.00
	<i>April 18, 2008 to June 10, 2008 – RECO/Lloyd's</i> Conference with D. Rainsberry; Call with M. Quilling; Review and revise draft agreed statement of facts; Conference with D. Rainsberry; Attend meeting with B. Falby regarding agreed facts; Conference with D. Rainsberry; Review draft materials; Prepare and attend court mediation;	4.70	\$625.00

Individual	Fee Items	Time	Rate
D. Rainsberry	<p><i>April 1, 2008 to June 15, 2008 – Receivership</i></p> <p>Emails to receiver; Draft letter to U. Pandya; Telephone call to receiver regarding C. Simpson inquiry regarding Cam Fella property; Voicemail from victim of fraud; Telephone call from victim of fraud regarding update; Draft memo regarding Cam Fella property; Review correspondence from Simpson regarding Cam Fella property; Review settlement agreement and discharge statement; Review restitution order; Telephone call to victims in deposit scheme and mortgage scheme; Review endorsement of Justice Campbell; Telephone call from Court; Review chart regarding recoveries and expenses of receivership; Review accounts regarding receiver counsel fees; Finalize draft investor update for use with website; Letter to receiver; Email from C. Simpson regarding additional information required regarding bank accounts; Voicemail from victim regarding status; Review counsel fee summaries; Revise supplementary receiver's report; Engaged regarding approval letter; Review revised report and related email; Telephone call to J. MacMillan; Telephone call from L. Caylor; Email to L. Caylor regarding fees; Telephone conference with receiver regarding status; Strategy regarding remaining issues in receivership; Met with L. Caylor; Emails regarding calculations regarding receivership amounts; Email regarding investor update; Obtain court dates; Email from counsel to claimant; Voicemail from K. Simpson; Draft revisions to receiver's tenth report; Review previous asset report; Telephone call to K. Simpson; Email regarding victim communication; Review/finalize Commercial List appointment form; Email to L. Caylor regarding Commercial List appointment; Telephone call from A. Ojo; Telephone call to victim regarding status; Email regarding preparation for court appearance; Email to L. Caylor regarding strategy; Redraft Affidavit of L. Caylor; Email regarding Cam Fella property and inquiry from K. Simpson; Email from receiver; Facilitate finalization and filing of fees materials; Met with L. Caylor; Telephone call to E. Manning; Review class retainer; Various emails regarding inheritance of C. Simpson; Review reciprocal enforcement legislation; Email from counsel to E. Manning; Prepare for motion appearance; Review initial order regarding scope of property; Attend at Commercial List; Draft letter to counsel for E. Manning as executor of estate; Review initial order; Fax from E. Manning; Telephone call to E. Manning; Email regarding service on Govedaris; Various emails regarding inheritances; Draft letters regarding recoveries/liabilities; Review same; Coordinate service; Instruct regarding research into priorities at time of distribution; Letter from G. Govedaris; Draft letter; Coordinate motion material filing; Review letter from G. Govedaris; Draft reply letter; Email from victim; Met with L. Caylor regarding letter concerning conflict and case conference; Draft revised reply; Telephone call to G. Govedaris; Email to L. Caylor regarding proposed case conference; Various letters from G. Govedaris regarding case conference, among other things; Email regarding telephone case conference with Justice Perell; Email to L. Caylor; Telephone conference with Justice Perell, G. Govedaris and L. Caylor regarding status of receivership; Prepare for telephone conference; Review letter regarding inheritance of C. Simpson.</p>	67.40	\$425.00

	<p><i>April 1, 2008 to June 6, 2008 – Dianor</i></p> <p>Review letter from opposing counsel; Telephone conference with receiver and L. Caylor; Email from receiver; Draft letter to opposing counsel; Met with L. Caylor; Review correspondence from opposing counsel regarding receivership; Email to M. Quilling; Draft letter to opposing counsel regarding Dianor shares; Review prior correspondence; Review correspondence from opposing counsel regarding cross-examination; Email regarding draft letter to opposing counsel; Draft Notices of Examination; Email to receiver regarding use of affidavits; Review affidavits for cross-examination preparation; Dictate cross-examination notes; Revise; Review affidavit; Review revised cross-examination memo; Revise letter to opposing counsel regarding receiver interaction with C. Simpson; Revise settlement offer; Emails regarding settlement; Review offer; Compare with previous offer; Consult share price; Telephone call to C. Alexiou; Research regarding agreement to agree; Verify stock price; Perform calculations; Revise draft letter reply; Research law regarding acceptance of terms of settlement; Enforceability; Met with D. Bell regarding VWAP calculation; Revise offer; Review VWAP calculations; Email to receiver regarding proposed settlement; Instruct regarding VWAP calculations; Various emails regarding settlement of Dianor share dispute; Review correspondence; Review stock info.</p>	<p>30.80</p>	<p>\$425.00</p>
	<p><i>April 8, 2008 to June 13, 2008 – RECO/Lloyd's</i></p> <p>Email from L. Caylor regarding Lloyd's conference; Review and revise memo regarding reply to Lloyd's position in the settlement conference; Review and revise letter to Justice Pepall regarding settlement conference; Review settlement briefs in preparation for conference; Review draft memo; Email from receiver regarding brief; Email to L. Caylor regarding brief; Review RECO claims; Compare with Statutory Declarations; Meeting with law clerk; Calculation of amounts; Mortgage scheme victim list; Review commercial list hearing schedule; Summary of case law; Attend at settlement conference; Met with U. Pandya; Draft investor update; Telephone call from L. Caylor; Instruct regarding research into insurance policy; Review conference brief; Draft letter to opposing counsel; Met with L. Caylor; Instruct regarding Agreed Statement of Facts; Review and revise draft Statement of Facts; Update regarding research into occurrence and related acts; Review results of research; Review Rules of Civil Procedure; Instruct regarding outstanding items; Integrate Affidavits; Distinguishing characteristics of Deposit scheme; Review various claim forms; Incorporate further file material/facts; Finalize Agreed Statement of Facts; Letter to R. Falby; Letter to receiver; Meeting with B. Falby regarding Agreed Statement of Facts; Prepare for meeting; Integrate opposing counsel's comments to Agreed Statement of Facts; Identify and copy exhibits; Telephone call to receiver; Arrange courier; Telephone call from B. Falby; Letter to B. Falby</p>	<p>41.40</p>	<p>\$425.00</p>

### General Receivership Activities

**Primary Tasks:** Contacting victims, communicating with clients, the receiver, class members and counsel to certain class members, preparing reports for the court, conducting research, preparing for and attending case conference.

#### Summary of Time and Fees (Interim Summary 5)

Individual	Title	Rate	Total Time	Total Fees
D. Rainsberry	Associate	\$425.00	67.40	\$28,645.00
<b>TOTALS</b>				<b>\$28,645.00</b>
<b>Reduced by 15%</b>				<b>\$24,348.25</b>

### Dianor Shares

**Primary Tasks:** Communicating with the receiver and opposing counsel, reviewing Dianor Resources Inc. shares stock information, performing VWAP calculations, negotiating settlement of the issues.

#### Summary of Time and Fees (Interim Summary 5)

Individual	Title	Rate	Total Time	Total Fees
L. Caylor	Partner	\$625.00	0.80	\$500.00
D. Rainsberry	Associate	\$425.00	30.80	\$13,090.00
<b>TOTALS</b>				<b>\$13,590.00</b>
<b>Reduced by 15%</b>				<b>\$11,551.50</b>

**RECO/Lloyd's**

**Primary Tasks:** Communicating with the receiver and opposing counsel, conducting research, preparing the Application Record, preparing the Agreed Statement of Facts, preparing for the Application hearing.

**Summary of Time and Fees (Interim Summary 5)**

<b>Individual</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Rate</b>	<b>Total Time</b>	<b>Total Fees</b>
D. Bell	Partner	\$185.00	1.50	\$277.50
L. Caylor	Partner	\$625.00	4.70	\$2,937.50
D. Rainsberry	Associate	\$425.00	41.40	\$17,595.00
<b>TOTALS</b>				<b>\$20,810.00</b>
<b>Reduced by 15%</b>				<b>\$17,688.50</b>

**TOTALS**

<b>Individual</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Rate</b>	<b>Total Time</b>	<b>Total Fees</b>
D. Bell	Partner	\$185.00	1.50	\$277.50
L. Caylor	Partner	\$625.00	5.5	\$3,437.50
D. Rainsberry	Associate	\$425.00	139.60	\$59,330.00
<b>TOTALS</b>				<b>\$63,045.00</b>
<b>Reduced by 15%</b>				<b>\$53,588.25</b>

**TAB 5**

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

BETWEEN:

UDAYAN PANDYA

Plaintiff

-and-

COURTNEY WALLIS SIMPSON, YORK REGION  
REALTY INC., WALLIS, SIMPSON & ASSOCIATES,  
COURTNEY WALLIS SIMPSON c.o.b. as YORK MANAGEMENT GROUP  
and as CAMCO DEVELOPMENTS and as YORK GROUP

Defendants

In the Matter of the *Class Proceedings Act, 1992*

**SUMMARY OF DISBURSEMENTS  
OF BENNETT JONES LLP  
(April 1, 2008 to June 15, 2008)**

*Receivership (Invoice No. 762766):*

Disbursement	Taxable Amount
Long Distance Phone Charges	\$2.58
Fax Charges	\$218.00
Photocopy Charges	\$305.25
Courthouse Charges*	\$254.00
Process Servers	\$276.00
Pre-Tax Total	\$1,046.83
5% GST	\$39.64
Non-Taxable or Tax Included	\$254.00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,086.47</b>

\*Non-taxable or tax included

*Dianor Shares (Invoice No. 762767):*

<b>Disbursement</b>	<b>Taxable Amount</b>
Photocopy Charges	\$138.00
Courier Charges	\$29.23
Pre-Tax Total	\$167.23
5% GST	\$8.36
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$175.59</b>

*RECO/Lloyd's (Invoice No. 764119):*

<b>Disbursement</b>	<b>Taxable Amount</b>
Library Computer Search	\$60.00
Long Distance Phone Charges	\$0.66
Fax Charges	\$13.00
Photocopy Charges	\$277.25
Courier Charges	\$53.54
Pre-Tax Total	\$404.45
5% GST	\$20.22
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$424.67</b>

\*Non-taxable or tax included

**SUMMARY OF BENNETT JONES LLP DISBURSEMENTS:**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Amount (including G.S.T.)</b>
Receivership (Invoice No. 762766)	\$1,086.47
Dianor Shares (Invoice No. 762767)	\$175.59
RECO/Lloyd's (Invoice No. 764119)	\$424.67
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,686.73</b>



**TAB 6**

# **Bennett Jones** LLP

Bennett Jones LLP  
Suite 3400, 1 First Canadian Place  
P.O. Box 130  
Toronto, Ontario M5X 1A4  
(416) 863-1200

UDAYAN PANDYA  
4822 DERRYDOWN DRIVE  
MISSISSAUGA, ON L5M 7M7

Our File Number: 056445.00002

UDAYAN PANDYA  
Re: SIMPSON- RECEIVERSHIP/JDP/DJNR

Date: 15/07/08  
Invoice: 766021

Date	Lawyer	Professional Services	Hours
01/04/08	DJNR	Email to receiver; Email regarding time/place of hearing; Review Affidavit of Service; Draft letter to U. Pandya; Review draft receiver's report regarding interim fees; Email to receiver	3.90
02/04/08	DJNR	Telephone call to receiver regarding Simpson inquiry regarding Cam Fella property; Preliminary review of correspondence; Email to L. Caylor; Email to receiver; Email regarding Pepall J.; Voicemail from victim of fraud	1.50
04/04/08	DJNR	Telephone call from victim of fraud regarding update; Review motion material regarding interim fees; Emails regarding GST; Draft memo regarding Cam Fella	0.90
06/04/08	DJNR	Review correspondence from Simpson regarding Cam Fella property; Draft memorandum to file; Review settlement agreement and discharge statement; Review writ notes regarding restitution order; Email regarding fee approval	4.50
07/04/08	DJNR	Telephone call to victims in deposit scheme and mortgage scheme; Telephone call from Victim; GST emails	0.60
09/04/08	DJNR	Review GST remittance; Related correspondence; Revise draft letter; Review endorsement of Justice Campbell; Telephone call from Court; Update to Accounting; Review chart regarding recoveries and expenses of receivership; Review accounts regarding receiver counsel fees; Email to L. Caylor; Instruct regarding preparation of fees motion	5.00
10/04/08	DJNR	Finalize draft investor update for use with website; Review supplementary fees report	1.10
11/04/08	DJNR	Review supplementary report; Letter to receiver; Draft order; Review endorsement of Justice Campbell; Telephone call to victim	1.50
15/04/08	DJNR	Email from C. Simpson regarding additional information required regarding bank accounts; Review letter regarding fees approval	0.30
16/04/08	DJNR	Voicemail from victim regarding status; Review counsel fee summaries	0.80
17/04/08	DJNR	Revise supplementary receiver's report; Engaged regarding approval letter; Review revised report and related email; Telephone call to J. MacMillan; Review counsel	6.80

Date	Lawyer	Professional Services	Hours
		fee summaries; Telephone call from L. Caylor	
18/04/08	DJNR	Email to L. Caylor regarding fees; Telephone conference with receiver regarding status; Strategy regarding remaining issues in receivership; Met with L. Caylor; Telephone call with J. MacMillan	1.30
21/04/08	DJNR	Emails regarding calculations regarding receivership amounts; Follow up regarding unapproved fees	0.20
22/04/08	DJNR	Email regarding investor update; Met with L. Caylor; Obtain court dates; Email to L. Caylor; Email from counsel to claimant; Voicemail from K. Simpson; Review draft fees motion material	1.80
23/04/08	DJNR	Review fees to date; Calculate assets/liabilities; Met with L. Caylor; Telephone call to L. Caylor; Draft revisions to receiver's tenth report; Review previous asset report; Compare with recoveries; review receiver's fees report; Telephone call to K. Simpson	4.40
24/04/08	DJNR	Review draft receiver's report; Email regarding victim communication; Discussion regarding fees/strategy; Email to L. Caylor; Meeting	1.20
25/04/08	DJNR	Review/finalize Commercial List appointment form; Email to L. Caylor regarding Commercial List appointment; Telephone call from A. Ojo; Telephone call to victim regarding status; Review fees summary; Supplementary Receiver's report; Follow up regarding receiver's fees report; Email regarding preparation for court appearance; Email to L. Caylor regarding strategy	3.00
28/04/08	DJNR	Redraft Affidavit of L. Caylor; Email regarding Cam Fella property and inquiry from K. Simpson; Email from receiver; Facilitate finalization and filing of fees materials; Met with L. Caylor; Telephone call to E. Manning; Review class retainer	2.90
29/04/08	DJNR	Review motion materials; Email regarding affidavit of service; Various emails regarding inheritance of C. Simpson; Review reciprocal enforcement legislation; Telephone call from victim; Email from counsel to E. Manning; Met with L. Caylor; Prepare for motion appearance; Review initial order regarding scope of property	4.20
30/04/08	DJNR	Attend at Commercial List; Draft letter to counsel for E. Manning as executor of estate; Review initial order; Met with L. Caylor; Email to receiver; Fax from E. Manning; Telephone call to E. Manning; Email regarding service on Govedaris	4.00
02/05/08	DJNR	Various emails regarding inheritances; Email to receiver; Email to counsel for E. Manning; Draft letters regarding recoveries/liabilities; Review same; Coordinate service; Filing of fees material; Email regarding service	3.40
05/05/08	DJNR	Instruct regarding research into priorities at time of distribution	0.30
06/05/08	DJNR	Telephone call from victim regarding status	0.40
07/05/08	DJNR	Review memo to process server; Letter from G. Govedaris; Draft letter; Coordinate motion material filing; Email to L. Caylor	1.00
08/05/08	DJNR	Review letter from G. Govedaris; Draft reply letter; Email regarding victim	0.90
09/05/08	DJNR	Review letter from G. Govedaris; Email to L. Caylor; Met with L. Caylor regarding letter concerning conflict and case conference; Draft revised reply	2.60

Date	Lawyer	Professional Services	Hours
12/05/08	DJNR	Email regarding victim update; Email regarding Govedaris	1.10
20/05/08	DJNR	Letter regarding victim update	0.40
27/05/08	DJNR	Review process server memo regarding pending endorsements of the court; Related emails	0.50
28/05/08	DJNR	Telephone call to G. Govedaris; Email to L. Caylor regarding proposed case conference; Review letter	1.00
29/05/08	DJNR	Various letters from G. Govedaris regarding case conference, among other things	1.10
30/05/08	DJNR	Letter to G. Govedaris; Letter from G. Govedaris; Email to L. Caylor regarding case conference	0.70
04/06/08	DJNR	Telephone call to victim; Met with L. Caylor; Email regarding telephone case conference with Justice Perell; Email to L. Caylor; Various emails regarding case conference	1.90
05/06/08	DJNR	Email to L. Caylor regarding victim	0.20
06/06/08	DJNR	Telephone conference with Justice Perell, G. Govedaris and L. Caylor regarding status of receivership; Prepare for telephone conference; Review letter regarding inheritance of C. Simpson; Email to receiver; Email to L. Caylor	1.60
12/06/08	DJNR	Review letter of G. Govedaris; Coordinate response	0.30

Total Hours 67.30

Total Fees \$ 28,602.50

**Other Charges**

Long Distance Phone Charges	2.58
Fax Charges	218.00
Photocopy Charges	305.25

Total Other Charges \$ 525.83

Total Fees and Other Charges \$ 29,128.33

**Disbursements**

Process Servers 276.00

Total Disbursements \$ 276.00

**Disbursements Incurred As Your Agent (Nontaxable)**

Courthouse Charges 254.00

Total Disbursements Incurred As Your Agent \$ 254.00



UDAYAN PANDYA  
15/07/08  
Page 4

Client: 056445.00002  
Invoice No.: 766021

GST \$ 1,470.22  

---

TOTAL DUE \$ 31,128.55

Lawyer	Title	Hours	Rate	Amount
D. J. N. Rainsberry	Associate	67.30	425.00	28,602.50

BENNETT JONES LLP

PER \_\_\_\_\_



# **Bennett Jones** LLP

Bennett Jones LLP  
Suite 3400, 1 First Canadian Place  
P.O. Box 130  
Toronto, Ontario M5X 1A4  
(416) 863-1200

UDAYAN PANDYA  
4822 DERRYDOWN DRIVE  
MISSISSAUGA, ON L5M 7M7

Our File Number: 056445.00003

UDAYAN PANDYA  
Re: SIMPSON- DIANOR SHARES/JDP/DJNR

Date: 15/07/08  
Invoice: 766022

Date	Lawyer	Professional Services	Hours
01/04/08	DJNR	Review letter from opposing counsel	0.20
01/04/08	LC	Conference with D. Rainsberry regarding status	0.10
02/04/08	DJNR	Telephone conference with receiver and L. Caylor; Email from receiver; Draft letter to opposing counsel; Met with L. Caylor	1.80
03/04/08	DJNR	Met with L. Caylor	0.10
03/04/08	LC	Call to solicitors regarding Dianor shares; Conferences with D. Rainsberry; Calls with defendants solicitor regarding Dianor issues and potential settlement	0.50
04/04/08	DJNR	Review correspondence from opposing counsel regarding receivership; Email to M. Quilling	0.70
06/04/08	DJNR	Draft letter to opposing counsel regarding Dianor shares; Revise; Review prior correspondence	1.60
08/04/08	DJNR	Met with L. Caylor; Review correspondence from opposing counsel regarding cross-examination; Email to receiver; Draft letter to opposing counsel	0.90
09/04/08	DJNR	Email regarding draft letter to opposing counsel; Review	0.30
10/04/08	DJNR	Email regarding letter to opposing counsel regarding dates for cross-examination; Email to L. Caylor	1.20
15/04/08	DJNR	Emails regarding cross-examination scheduling	0.20
16/04/08	DJNR	Email regarding dates for cross-examination; Preliminary review regarding letters to opposing counsel; Notices of Examination	0.50
17/04/08	DJNR	Letter to opposing counsel; Email to L. Caylor; Email to receiver	0.60
18/04/08	DJNR	Email to receiver regarding use of affidavits; Consider issue; Review affidavits for cross-examination preparation	1.40
21/04/08	DJNR	Dictate cross-examination notes; Revise; Review affidavit	4.20
22/04/08	DJNR	Review revised cross-examination memo; Review letter from opposing counsel; Draft response; Revise separate letter to opposing counsel regarding receiver interaction with C. Simpson	3.90

Date	Lawyer	Professional Services	Hours
23/04/08	DJNR	Review correspondence to opposing counsel; Review draft cross-examination memorandum	0.70
01/05/08	DJNR	Draft letter to opposing counsel; Met with L. Caylor	0.80
02/05/08	DJNR	Revise settlement offer; Met with L. Caylor	0.80
14/05/08	LC	Calls from counsel regarding Dianor shares; Email to M. Quilling	0.20
14/05/08	DJNR	Emails regarding settlement of Dianor shares on the basis of a split regarding ownership; Review offer; Compare with previous offer; Email from L. Caylor; Email from M. Quilling	1.40
20/05/08	DJNR	Review offer; Consult share price	0.30
21/05/08	DJNR	Telephone call to C. Alexiou; Research regarding agreement to agree; Verify stock price; Perform calculations; Revise draft letter reply	2.30
22/05/08	DJNR	Email to L. Caylor; Telephone call to C. Alexiou; Review offers of settlement; Research law regarding acceptance of terms of settlement; Enforceability; Met with D. Bell regarding VWAP calculation; Revise offer; Review VWAP calculations; Email to receiver	4.20
26/05/08	DJNR	Email to receiver regarding proposed settlement	0.30
28/05/08	DJNR	Revise Letter; Email from receiver; Instruct regarding VWAP calculations	0.50
30/05/08	DJNR	Various emails regarding settlement of Dianor share dispute; Review correspondence; Consult VWAP calculations	1.20
03/06/08	DJNR	Review offer	0.30
06/06/08	DJNR	Review stock info; Met with L. Caylor	0.40

Total Hours 31.60

Total Fees \$ 13,590.00

**Other Charges**

Photocopy Charges 138.00

Total Other Charges \$ 138.00

Total Fees and Other Charges \$ 13,728.00**Disbursements**

Courier Charges 29.23

Total Disbursements \$ 29.23




GST \$ 687.86

TOTAL DUE \$ 14,445.09

Lawyer	Title	Hours	Rate	Amount
L. Caylor	Partner	0.80	625.00	500.00
D. J. N. Rainsberry	Associate	30.80	425.00	13,090.00

BENNETT JONES LLP

PER \_\_\_\_\_



# **Bennett Jones** LLP

Bennett Jones LLP  
Suite 3400, 1 First Canadian Place  
P.O. Box 130  
Toronto, Ontario M5X 1A4  
(416) 863-1200

UDAYAN PANDYA  
4822 DERRYDOWN DRIVE  
MISSISSAUGA, ON L5M 7M7

Our File Number: 056445.00006

UDAYAN PANDYA  
Re: SIMPSON- RECO/LLOYDS/JDP/DJNR

Date: 15/07/08  
Invoice: 766023

Date	Lawyer	Professional Services	Hours
01/04/08	DJNR	Email from L. Caylor regarding Lloyd's conference	0.10
08/04/08	DJNR	Review and revise memo regarding reply to Lloyd's position in the settlement conference	0.90
09/04/08	DJNR	Review and revise letter to Justice Pepall regarding settlement conference	0.50
11/04/08	DJNR	Review settlement briefs in preparation for conference; review draft memo	1.80
16/04/08	DJNR	Email from receiver regarding brief; Email to L. Caylor regarding brief; Review	0.50
17/04/08	DJNR	Review process server memo regarding settlement conference	0.20
18/04/08	DJNR	Review RECO claims; Compare with Statutory Declarations; Meeting with law clerk; Calculation of amounts; Review receivership recoveries; Review brief; Mortgage scheme victim list; Review commercial list hearing schedule; Summary of case law	2.60
18/04/08	LC	Conference with D. Raninsberry; Call with M. Quilling	0.50
21/04/08	LC	Prepare and attend court mediation	1.80
21/04/08	DJNR	Attend at settlement conference; Met with U. Pandya; Draft investor update; Revise; Telephone call from L. Caylor	3.10
05/05/08	JGB	Researching interpretations of insurance contracts; Meeting with D. Rainsberry regarding same	0.20
05/05/08	DJNR	Instruct regarding research into insurance policy; Related Acts; Review conference brief	0.70
06/05/08	DJNR	Draft letter to opposing counsel; Met with L. Caylor; Instruct regarding Agreed Statement of Facts; Review Settlement Conference Brief	1.60
06/05/08	JGB	Researching interpretations of insurance contracts	1.30
07/05/08	DJNR	Review and revise draft Statement of Facts	1.20
08/05/08	DJNR	Update regarding research into occurrence and related acts	0.30
09/05/08	DJNR	Review results of research	0.50
20/05/08	DJNR	Review draft Statement of Facts; Revise; Review Rules of Civil Procedure	1.60

Statement of Account TERMS: Due upon receipt. Bennett Jones LLP reserves the right to charge interest at a rate not greater than 3.3% per annum on outstanding invoices after 30 days. G.S.T.: R119346757  
We collect, use and disclose information pursuant to our Privacy Policies. For further information visit our website at [www.bennettjones.ca](http://www.bennettjones.ca) or contact our Privacy Officer by writing to our offices in Calgary, Edmonton or Toronto.

Date	Lawyer	Professional Services	Hours
24/05/08	DJNR	Review and revise Agreed Statement of Facts	1.90
25/05/08	DJNR	Draft, revise and finalize the Agreed Statement of Facts; Instruct regarding outstanding items	5.40
26/05/08	DJNR	Revise Agreed Statement of Facts; Integrate Affidavits; Distinguishing characteristics of Deposit scheme; Met with L. Caylor; Review various claim forms	4.20
27/05/08	DJNR	Revise Statement of Agreed Facts	1.30
28/05/08	LC	Review and revise draft agreed statement of facts	0.80
28/05/08	DJNR	Revise Agreed Statement of Facts; Incorporate further file material/facts; Email to L. Caylor	1.20
29/05/08	DJNR	Finalize Agreed Statement of Facts; Letter to R. Falby; Letter to receiver; Met with L. Caylor	2.00
29/05/08	LC	Review and revise agreed facts; Conference with D. Rainsberry	0.80
02/06/08	LC	Attend meeting with B. Falby regarding agreed facts	0.50
02/06/08	DJNR	Meeting with B. Falby, counsel for Lloyd's regarding Agreed Statement of Facts; Prepare for meeting	1.40
03/06/08	DJNR	Integrate opposing counsel's comments to Agreed Statement of Facts; Identify and copy exhibits; Email to receiver; Telephone call to receiver; Met with L. Caylor	4.20
04/06/08	DJNR	Revise and finalize the Agreed Statement of Facts; Integrate comments	1.90
06/06/08	DJNR	Review agreed statement of facts; related exhibits; Email to client; Met with L. Caylor	0.80
10/06/08	DJNR	Finalize Agreed Statement of Facts; Review draft letter to opposing counsel; Arrange courier; Met with L. Caylor	1.00
10/06/08	LC	Conference with D. Rainsberry; Review draft materials	0.30
13/06/08	DJNR	Telephone call from B. Falby; Letter to B. Falby	0.60

Total Hours 47.70

Total Fees \$ 20,852.50

**Other Charges**

Library Computer Search	60.00
Long Distance Phone Charges	0.66
Fax Charges	13.00
Photocopy Charges	277.25
<b>Total Other Charges</b>	<b>\$ 350.91</b>

**Total Fees and Other Charges \$ 21,203.41**

**Disbursements**

Courier Charges			53.54
	Total Disbursements	\$	53.54
	GST	\$	1,062.85
	<b>TOTAL DUE</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b><u>22,319.80</u></b>

Lawyer	Title	Hours	Rate	Amount
L. Caylor	Partner	4.70	625.00	2,937.50
D. J. N. Rainsberry	Associate	41.50	425.00	17,637.50
J. G. Bell	Student	1.50	185.00	277.50

BENNETT JONES LLP

PER \_\_\_\_\_

**Udayan Pandya**  
Plaintiff

v.

**Courtney Wallis Simpson et al.**  
Defendants

Court File No.: 05-CL-6159

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

In the matter of the *Class Proceedings*  
*Act, 1992*

Proceeding commenced at Toronto

**MOTION RECORD**  
(Motion in Writing)

**BENNETT JONES LLP**  
One First Canadian Place  
Suite 3400, P.O. Box 130  
Toronto, Ontario  
M5X 1A4

David J.N. Rainsberry  
LSUC No. 49890Q  
Tel: 416-777-6236  
Fax: 416-863-1716

Solicitors for the receiver