

CITATION: Nortel Networks Corporation (Re), 2010 ONSC 1708
COURT FILE NO.: 09-CL-7950
DATE: 20100326

SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE -- ONTARIO

(COMMERCIAL LIST)

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR
ARRANGEMENT OF NORTEL NETWORKS CORPORATION, NORTEL
NETWORKS LIMITED, NORTEL NETWORKS GLOBAL CORPORATION,
NORTEL NETWORKS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION AND NORTEL
NETWORKS TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION, Applicants

BEFORE: MORAWETZ J.

COUNSEL: Derrick Tay, Jennifer Stam and Suzanne Wood, for the Applicants

Lyndon Barnes and Adam Hirsh, for the Nortel Directors

Benjamin Zarnett, Gale Rubenstein, C. Armstrong and Melaney Wagner, for
Ernst & Young Inc., Monitor

Arthur O. Jacques, for the Nortel Canada Current Employees

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

Mark Zigler and Susan Philpott, for the Former and Long-Term Disability
Employees

Ken Rosenberg and M. Stamino, for the Superintendent of Financial Services in
its capacity as Administrator of the Pension Benefit Guarantee Fund

S. Richard Orzy and Richard B. Swan, for the Informal Nortel Noteholder Group

Alex MacFarlane and Mark Dunsmuir, for the Unsecured Creditors' Committee
of Nortel Networks Inc.

Leanne Williams, for Flextronics Inc.

Barry Wadsworth, for the CAW-Canada

Pamela Huff, for the Northern Trust Company, Canada

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

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

Sorin Gabriel Radulescu, In Person

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

Peter Burns, In Person

Stan and Barbara Arnelien, In Person

HEARD: MARCH 3, 4, 5, 2010

ENDORSEMENT

INTRODUCTION

[1] On January 14, 2009, Nortel Networks Corporation ("NNC"), Nortel Networks Limited ("NNL"), Nortel Networks Global Corporation, Nortel Networks International Corporation and Nortel Networks Technology Corporation (collectively, the "Applicants") were granted a stay of proceedings pursuant to the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA") and Ernst & Young Inc. was appointed as Monitor.

[2] The Applicants have historically operated a number of pension, benefit and other plans (both funded and unfunded) for their employees and pensioners, including:

- (i) Pension benefits through two registered pension plans, the Nortel Networks Limited Managerial and Non-Negotiated Pension Plan and the Nortel Networks Negotiated Pension Plan (the "Pension Plans"); and
- (ii) Medical, dental, life insurance, long-term disability and survivor income and transition benefits paid, except for survivor termination benefits, through Nortel's Health and Welfare Trust (the "HWT").

[3] Since the CCAA filing, the Applicants have continued to provide medical, dental and other benefits, through the HWT, to pensioners and employees on long-term disability ("Former and LTD Employees") and active employees ("HWT Payments") and have continued all current service contributions and special payments to the Pension Plans ("Pension Payments").

[4] Pension Payments and HWT Payments made by the Applicants to the Former and LTD Employees while under CCAA protection are largely discretionary. As a result of Nortel's insolvency and the significant reduction in the size of Nortel's operations, the unfortunate reality is that, at some point, cessation of such payments is inevitable. The Applicants have attempted to address this situation by entering into a settlement agreement (the "Settlement Agreement") dated as of February 8, 2010, among the Applicants, the Monitor, the Former Employees' Representatives (on their own behalf and on behalf of the parties they represent), the LTD

Representative (on her own behalf and on behalf of the parties she represents), Representative Settlement Counsel and the CAW-Canada (the "Settlement Parties").

[5] The Applicants have brought this motion for approval of the Settlement Agreement. From the standpoint of the Applicants, the purpose of the Settlement Agreement is to provide for a smooth transition for the termination of Pension Payments and HWT Payments. The Applicants take the position that the Settlement Agreement represents the best efforts of the Settlement Parties to negotiate an agreement and is consistent with the spirit and purpose of the CCAA.

[6] The essential terms of the Settlement Agreement are as follows:

- (a) until December 31, 2010, medical, dental and life insurance benefits will be funded on a pay-as-you-go basis to the Former and LTD Employees;
- (b) until December 31, 2010, LTD Employees and those entitled to receive survivor income benefits will receive income benefits on a pay-as-you-go basis;
- (c) the Applicants will continue to make current service payments and special payments to the Pension Plans in the same manner as they have been doing over the course of the proceedings under the CCAA, through to March 31, 2010, in the aggregate amount of \$2,216,254 per month and that thereafter and through to September 30, 2010, the Applicants shall make only current service payments to the Pension Plans, in the aggregate amount of \$379,837 per month;
- (d) any allowable pension claims, in these or subsequent proceedings, concerning any Nortel Worldwide Entity, including the Applicants, shall rank *pari passu* with ordinary, unsecured creditors of Nortel, and no part of any such HWT claims shall rank as a preferential or priority claim or shall be the subject of a constructive trust or trust of any nature or kind;
- (e) proofs of claim asserting priority already filed by any of the Settlement Parties, or the Superintendent on behalf of the Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund are disallowed in regard to the claim for priority;
- (f) any allowable HWT claims made in these or subsequent proceedings shall rank *pari passu* with ordinary unsecured creditors of Nortel;
- (g) the Settlement Agreement does not extinguish the claims of the Former and LTD Employees;
- (h) Nortel and, *inter alia*, its successors, advisors, directors and officers, are released from all future claims regarding Pension Plans and the HWT, provided that nothing in the release shall release a director of the Applicants from any matter referred to in subsection 5.1(2) of the CCAA or with respect to fraud on the part of any Releasee, with respect to that Releasee only;

- (i) upon the expiry of all appeals and rights of appeal in respect thereof, Representative Settlement Counsel will withdraw their application for leave to appeal the decision of the Court of Appeal, dated November 26, 2009, to the Supreme Court of Canada on a with prejudice basis;¹
- (j) a CCAA plan of arrangement in the Nortel proceedings will not be proposed or approved if that plan does not treat the Pension and HWT claimants *pari passu* to the other ordinary, unsecured creditors ("Clause H.1"); and
- (k) if there is a subsequent amendment to the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* ("BIA") that "changes the current, relative priorities of the claims against Nortel, no party is precluded by this Settlement Agreement from arguing the applicability" of that amendment to the claims ceded in this Agreement ("Clause H.2").

[7] The Settlement Agreement does *not* relate to a distribution of the HWT as the Settlement Parties have agreed to work towards developing a Court-approved distribution of the HWT corpus in 2010.

[8] The Applicants' motion is supported by the Settlement Parties and by the Board of Directors of Nortel.

[9] The Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors of Nortel Networks Inc. ("UCC"), the informal Nortel Noteholder Group (the "Noteholders"), and a group of 37 LTD Employees (the "Opposing LTD Employees") oppose the Settlement Agreement.

[10] The UCC and Noteholders oppose the Settlement Agreement, principally as a result of the inclusion of Clause H.2.

[11] The Opposing LTD Employees oppose the Settlement Agreement, principally as a result of the inclusion of the third party releases referenced in [6h] above.

¹ On March 25, 2010, the Supreme Court of Canada released the following: *Donald Sproule et al. v. Nortel Networks Corporation et al.* (Ont.) (Civil) (By Leave) (33491) (The motions for directions and to expedite the application for leave to appeal are dismissed. The application for leave to appeal is dismissed with no order as to costs./La requête en vue d'obtenir des directives et la requête visant à accélérer la procédure de demande d'autorisation d'appel sont rejetées. La demande d'autorisation d'appel est rejetée; aucune ordonnance n'est rendue concernant les dépens.): <http://scc.lexum.umontreal.ca/en/news_release/2010/10-03-25.3a/10-03-25.3a.html>

THE FACTS

A. Status of Nortel's Restructuring

[12] Although it was originally hoped that the Applicants would be able to restructure their business, in June 2009 the decision was made to change direction and pursue sales of Nortel's various businesses.

[13] In response to Nortel's change in strategic direction and the impending sales, Nortel announced on August 14, 2009 a number of organizational updates and changes including the creation of groups to support transitional services and management during the sales process.

[14] Since June 2009, Nortel has closed two major sales and announced a third. As a result of those transactions, approximately 13,000 Nortel employees have been or will be transferred to purchaser companies. That includes approximately 3,500 Canadian employees.

[15] Due to the ongoing sales of Nortel's business units and the streamlining of Nortel's operations, it is expected that by the close of 2010, the Applicants' workforce will be reduced to only 475 employees. There is a need to wind-down and rationalize benefits and pension processes.

[16] Given Nortel's insolvency, the significant reduction in Nortel's operations and the complexity and size of the Pension Plans, both Nortel and the Monitor believe that the continuation and funding of the Pension Plans and continued funding of medical, dental and other benefits is not a viable option.

B. The Settlement Agreement

[17] On February 8, 2010 the Applicants announced that a settlement had been reached on issues related to the Pension Plans, and the HWT and certain employment related issues.

[18] Recognizing the importance of providing notice to those who will be impacted by the Settlement Agreement, including the Former Employees, the LTD Employees, unionized employees, continuing employees and the provincial pension plan regulators ("Affected Parties"), Nortel brought a motion to this Court seeking the approval of an extensive notice and opposition process.

[19] On February 9, 2010, this Court approved the notice program for the announcement and disclosure of the Settlement (the "Notice Order").

[20] As more fully described in the Monitor's Thirty-Sixth, Thirty-Ninth and Thirty-Ninth Supplementary Reports, the Settlement Parties have taken a number of steps to notify the Affected Parties about the Settlement.

[21] In addition to the Settlement Agreement, the Applicants, the Monitor and the Superintendent, in his capacity as administrator of the Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund, entered

into a letter agreement on February 8, 2010, with respect to certain matters pertaining to the Pension Plans (the "Letter Agreement").

[22] The Letter Agreement provides that the Superintendent will not oppose an order approving the Settlement Agreement ("Settlement Approval Order"). Additionally, the Monitor and the Applicants will take steps to complete an orderly transfer of the Pension Plans to a new administrator to be appointed by the Superintendent effective October 1, 2010. Finally, the Superintendent will not oppose any employee incentive program that the Monitor deems reasonable and necessary or the creation of a trust with respect to claims or potential claims against persons who accept directorships of a Nortel Worldwide Entity in order to facilitate the restructuring.

POSITIONS OF THE PARTIES ON THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

The Applicants

[23] The Applicants take the position that the Settlement is fair and reasonable and balances the interests of the parties and other affected constituencies equitably. In this regard, counsel submits that the Settlement:

- (a) eliminates uncertainty about the continuation and termination of benefits to pensioners, LTD Employees and survivors, thereby reducing hardship and disruption;
- (b) eliminates the risk of costly and protracted litigation regarding Pension Claims and HWT Claims, leading to reduced costs, uncertainty and potential disruption to the development of a Plan;
- (c) prevents disruption in the transition of benefits for current employees;
- (d) provides early payments to terminated employees in respect of their termination and severance claims where such employees would otherwise have had to wait for the completion of a claims process and distribution out of the estates;
- (e) assists with the commitment and retention of remaining employees essential to complete the Applicants' restructuring; and
- (f) does not eliminate Pension Claims or HWT Claims against the Applicants, but maintains their quantum and validity as ordinary and unsecured claims.

[24] Alternatively, absent the approval of the Settlement Agreement, counsel to the Applicants submits that the Applicants are not required to honour such benefits or make such payments and such benefits could cease immediately. This would cause undue hardship to beneficiaries and increased uncertainty for the Applicants and other stakeholders.

[25] The Applicants state that a central objective in the Settlement Agreement is to allow the Former and LTD Employees to transition to other sources of support.

[26] In the absence of the approval of the Settlement Agreement or some other agreement, a cessation of benefits will occur on March 31, 2010 which would have an immediate negative impact on Former and LTD Employees. The Applicants submit that extending payments to the end of 2010 is the best available option to allow recipients to order their affairs.

[27] Counsel to the Applicants submits that the Settlement Agreement brings Nortel closer to finalizing a plan of arrangement, which is consistent with the spirit and purpose of the CCAA. The Settlement Agreement resolves uncertainties associated with the outstanding Former and LTD Employee claims. The Settlement Agreement balances certainty with clarity, removing litigation risk over priority of claims, which properly balances the interests of the parties, including both creditors and debtors.

[28] Regarding the priority of claims going forward, the Applicants submit that because a deemed trust, such as the HWT, is not enforceable in bankruptcy, the Former and LTD Employees are by default *pari passu* with other unsecured creditors.

[29] In response to the Noteholders' concern that bankruptcy prior to October 2010 would create pension liabilities on the estate, the Applicants committed that they would not voluntarily enter into bankruptcy proceedings prior to October 2010. Further, counsel to the Applicants submits the court determines whether a bankruptcy order should be made if involuntary proceedings are commenced.

[30] Further, counsel to the Applicants submits that the court has the jurisdiction to release third parties under a Settlement Agreement where the releases (1) are connected to a resolution of the debtor's claims, (2) will benefit creditors generally and (3) are not overly broad or offensive to public policy. See *Re Metcalfe & Mansfield Alternative Investments II Corp.* (2008), 92 O.R. (3d) 513 (C.A.), [*Metcalfe*] at para. 71, leave to appeal refused, [2008] S.C.C.A. No. 337 and *Re Grace* [2008] O.J. No. 4208 (S.C.J.) [*Grace 2008*] at para. 40.

[31] The Applicants submit that a settlement of the type put forward should be approved if it is consistent with the spirit and purpose of the CCAA and is fair and reasonable in all the circumstances. Elements of fairness and reasonableness include balancing the interests of parties, including any objecting creditor or creditors, equitably (although not necessarily equally); and ensuring that the agreement is beneficial to the debtor and its stakeholders generally, as per *Re Air Canada*, [2003] O.J. No. 5319 (S.C.J.) [*Air Canada*]. The Applicants assert that this test is met.

The Monitor

[32] The Monitor supports the Settlement Agreement, submitting that it is necessary to allow the Applicants to wind down operations and to develop a plan of arrangement. The Monitor submits that the Settlement Agreement provides certainty, and does so with input from employee stakeholders. These stakeholders are represented by Employee Representatives as mandated by the court and these Employee Representatives were given the authority to approve such settlements on behalf of their constituents.

[33] The Monitor submits that Clause H.2 was bargained for, and that the employees did give up rights in order to have that clause in the Settlement Agreement; particularly, it asserts that Clause H.1 is the counterpoint to Clause H.2. In this regard, the Settlement Agreement is fair and reasonable.

[34] The Monitor asserts that the court may either (1) approve the Settlement Agreement, (2) not approve the Settlement Agreement, or (3) not approve the Settlement Agreement but provide practical comments on the applicability of Clause H.2.

Former and LTD Employees

[35] The Former Employees' Representatives' constituents number an estimated 19,458 people. The LTD Employees number an estimated 350 people between the LTD Employee's Representative and the CAW-Canada, less the 37 people in the Opposing LTD Employee group.

[36] Representative Counsel to the Former and LTD Employees acknowledges that Nortel is insolvent, and that much uncertainty and risk comes from insolvency. They urge that the Settlement Agreement be considered within the scope of this reality. The alternative to the Settlement Agreement is costly litigation and significant uncertainty.

[37] Representative Counsel submits that the Settlement Agreement is fair and reasonable for all creditors, but especially the represented employees. Counsel notes that employees under Nortel are unique creditors under these proceedings, as they are not sophisticated creditors and their personal welfare depends on receiving distributions from Nortel. The Former and LTD Employees assert that this is the best agreement they could have negotiated.

[38] Representative Counsel submits that bargaining away of the right to litigate against directors and officers of the corporation, as well as the trustee of the HWT, are examples of the concessions that have been made. They also point to the giving up of the right to make priority claims upon distribution of Nortel's estate and the HWT, although the claim itself is not extinguished. In exchange, the Former and LTD Employees will receive guaranteed coverage until the end of 2010. The Former and LTD Employees submit that having money in hand today is better than uncertainty going forward, and that, on balance, this Settlement Agreement is fair and reasonable.

[39] In response to allegations that third party releases unacceptably compromise employees' rights, Representative Counsel accepts that this was a concession, but submits that it was satisfactory because the claims given up are risky, costly and very uncertain. The releases do not go beyond s. 5.1(2) of the CCAA, which disallows releases relating to misrepresentations and wrongful or oppressive conduct by directors. Releases as to deemed trust claims are also very uncertain and were acceptably given up in exchange for other considerations.

[40] The Former and LTD Employees submit that the inclusion of Clause H.2 was essential to their approval of the Settlement Agreement. They characterize Clause H.2 as a no prejudice clause to protect the employees by not releasing any future potential benefit. Removing Clause H.2 from the Settlement Agreement would be not the approval of an agreement, but rather the creation of an entirely new Settlement Agreement. Counsel submits that without Clause H.2, the Former and LTD Employees would not be signatories.

CAW

[41] The CAW supports the Settlement Agreement. It characterizes the agreement as Nortel's recognition that it has a moral and legal obligation to its employees, whose rights are limited by the laws in this country. The Settlement Agreement temporarily alleviates the stress and uncertainty its constituents feel over the winding up of their benefits and is satisfied with this result.

[42] The CAW notes that some members feel they were not properly apprised of the facts, but all available information has been disclosed, and the concessions made by the employee groups were not made lightly.

Board of Directors

[43] The Board of Directors of Nortel supports the Settlement Agreement on the basis that it is a practical resolution with compromises on both sides.

Opposing LTD Employees

[44] Mr. Rochon appeared as counsel for the Opposing LTD Employees, notwithstanding that these individuals did not opt out of having Representative Counsel or were represented by the CAW. The submissions of the Opposing LTD Employees were compelling and the court extends its appreciation to Mr. Rochon and his team in co-ordinating the representatives of this group.

[45] The Opposing LTD Employees put forward the position that the cessation of their benefits will lead to extreme hardship. Counsel submits that the Settlement Agreement conflicts with the spirit and purpose of the CCAA because the LTD Employees are giving up legal rights in relation to a \$100 million shortfall of benefits. They urge the court to consider the unique circumstances of the LTD Employees as they are the people hardest hit by the cessation of benefits.

[46] The Opposing LTD Employees assert that the HWT is a true trust, and submit that breaches of that trust create liabilities and that the claim should not be released. Specifically, they point to a \$37 million shortfall in the HWT that they should be able to pursue.

[47] Regarding the third party releases, the Opposing LTD Employees assert that Nortel is attempting to avoid the distraction of third party litigation, rather than look out for the best interests of the Former and LTD Employees. The Opposing LTD Employees urge the court not to release the only individuals the Former and LTD Employees can hold accountable for any breaches of trust. Counsel submits that Nortel has a common law duty to fund the HWT, which the Former and LTD Employees should be allowed to pursue.

[48] Counsel asserts that allowing these releases (a) is not necessary and essential to the restructuring of the debtor, (b) does not relate to the insolvency process, (c) is not required for the success of the Settlement Agreement, (d) does not meet the requirement that each party contribute to the plan in a material way and (e) is overly broad and therefore not fair and reasonable.

[49] Finally, the Opposing LTD Employees oppose the *pari passu* treatment they will be subjected to under the Settlement Agreement, as they have a true trust which should grant them priority in the distribution process. Counsel was not able to provide legal authority for such a submission.

[50] A number of Opposing LTD Employees made in person submissions. They do not share the view that Nortel will act in their best interests, nor do they feel that the Employee Representatives or Representative Counsel have acted in their best interests. They shared feelings of uncertainty, helplessness and despair. There is affidavit evidence that certain individuals will be unable to support themselves once their benefits run out, and they will not have time to order their affairs. They expressed frustration and disappointment in the CCAA process.

UCC

[51] The UCC was appointed as the representative for creditors in the U.S. Chapter 11 proceedings. It represents creditors who have significant claims against the Applicants. The UCC opposes the motion, based on the inclusion of Clause H.2, but otherwise the UCC supports the Settlement Agreement.

[52] Clause H.2, the UCC submits, removes the essential element of finality that a settlement agreement is supposed to include. The UCC characterizes Clause H.2 as a take back provision; if activated, the Former and LTD Employees have compromised nothing, to the detriment of other unsecured creditors. A reservation of rights removes the finality of the Settlement Agreement.

[53] The UCC claims it, not Nortel, bears the risk of Clause H.2. As the largest unsecured creditor, counsel submits that a future change to the BIA could subsume the UCC's claim to the Former and LTD Employees and the UCC could end up with nothing at all, depending on Nortel's asset sales.

Noteholders

[54] The Noteholders are significant creditors of the Applicants. The Noteholders oppose the settlement because of Clause H.2, for substantially the same reasons as the UCC.

[55] Counsel to the Noteholders submits that the inclusion of H.2 is prejudicial to the non-employee unsecured creditors, including the Noteholders. Counsel submits that the effect of the Settlement Agreement is to elevate the Former and LTD Employees, providing them a payout of \$57 million over nine months while everyone else continues to wait, and preserves their rights in the event the laws are amended in future. Counsel to the Noteholders submits that the Noteholders forego millions of dollars while remaining exposed to future claims.

[56] The Noteholders assert that a proper settlement agreement must have two elements: a real compromise, and resolution of the matters in contention. In this case, counsel submits that there is no resolution because there is no finality in that Clause H.2 creates ambiguity about the future. The very object of a Settlement Agreement, assert the Noteholders, is to avoid litigation by withdrawing claims, which this agreement does not do.

Superintendent

[57] The Superintendent does not oppose the relief sought, but this position is based on the form of the Settlement Agreement that is before the Court.

Northern Trust

[58] Northern Trust, the trustee of the pension plans and HWT, takes no position on the Settlement Agreement as it takes instructions from Nortel. Northern Trust indicates that an oversight left its name off the third party release and asks for an amendment to include it as a party released by the Settlement Agreement.

LAW AND ANALYSIS

A. Representation and Notice Were Proper

[59] It is well settled that the Former Employees' Representatives and the LTD Representative (collectively, the "Settlement Employee Representatives") and Representative Counsel have the authority to represent the Former Employees and the LTD Beneficiaries for purposes of entering into the Settlement Agreement on their behalf: *see Grace 2008, supra* at para 32.

[60] The court appointed the Settlement Employee Representatives and the Representative Settlement Counsel. These appointment orders have not been varied or appealed. Unionized employees continue to be represented by the CAW. The Orders appointing the Settlement Employee Representatives expressly gave them authority to represent their constituencies "for the purpose of settling or compromising claims" in these Proceedings. Former Employees and LTD Employees were given the right to opt out of their representation by Representative Settlement Counsel. After provision of notice, only one former employee and one active employee exercised the opt-out right.

B. Effect of the Settlement Approval Order

[61] In addition to the binding effect of the Settlement Agreement, many additional parties will be bound and affected by the Settlement Approval Order. Counsel to the Applicants submits that the binding nature of the Settlement Approval Order on all affected parties is a crucial element to the Settlement itself. In order to ensure all Affected Parties had notice, the Applicants obtained court approval of their proposed notice program.

[62] Even absent such extensive noticing, virtually all employees of the Applicants are represented in these proceedings. In addition to the representative authority of the Settlement Employee Representatives and Representative Counsel as noted above, Orders were made authorizing a Nortel Canada Continuing Employees' Representative and Nortel Canada Continuing Employees' Representative Counsel to represent the interests of continuing employees on this motion.

[63] I previously indicated that "the overriding objective of appointing representative counsel for employees is to ensure that the employees have representation in the CCAA process": *Re*

Nortel Networks Corp., [2009] O.J. No. 2529 at para 16. I am satisfied that this objective has been achieved.

[64] The Record establishes that the Monitor has undertaken a comprehensive notice process which has included such notice to not only the Former Employees, the LTD Employees, the unionized employees and the continuing employees but also the provincial pension regulators and has given the opportunity for any affected person to file Notices of Appearance and appear before this court on this motion.

[65] I am satisfied that the notice process was properly implemented by the Monitor.

[66] I am satisfied that Representative Counsel has represented their constituents' interests in accordance with their mandate, specifically, in connection with the negotiation of the Settlement Agreement and the draft Settlement Approval Order and appearance on this Motion. There have been intense discussions, correspondence and negotiations among Representative Counsel, the Monitor, the Applicants, the Superintendent, counsel to the Board of the Applicants, the Noteholder Group and the Committee with a view to developing a comprehensive settlement. NCCE's Representative Counsel have been apprised of the settlement discussions and served with notice of this Motion. Representatives have held Webinar sessions and published press releases to inform their constituents about the Settlement Agreement and this Motion.

C. Jurisdiction to Approve the Settlement Agreement

[67] The CCAA is a flexible statute that is skeletal in nature. It has been described as a "sketch, an outline, a supporting framework for the resolution of corporate insolvencies in the public interest". *Re Nortel*, [2009] O.J. No. 3169 (S.C.J.) at paras. 28-29, citing *Metcalf*, *supra*, at paras. 44 and 61.

[68] Three sources for the court's authority to approve pre-plan agreements have been recognized:

- (a) the power of the court to impose terms and conditions on the granting of a stay under s. 11(4) of the CCAA;
- (b) the power of the court to make an order "on such terms as it may impose" pursuant to s. 11(4) of the CCAA; and
- (c) the inherent jurisdiction of the court to "fill in the gaps" of the CCAA in order to give effect to its objects: see *Re Nortel*, [2009] O.J. No. 3169 (S.C.J.) at para. 30, citing *Re Canadian Red Cross Society*, [1998] O.J. No. 3306 (Gen. Div.) [*Canadian Red Cross*] at para. 43; *Metcalf*, *supra* at para. 44.

[69] In *Re Stelco Inc.*, (2005), 78 O.R. (3d) 254 (C.A.), the Ontario Court of Appeal considered the court's jurisdiction under the CCAA to approve agreements, determining at para. 14 that it is not limited to preserving the *status quo*. Further, agreements made prior to the

finalization of a plan or compromise are valid orders for the court to approve: *Grace 2008, supra* at para. 34.

[70] In these proceedings, this court has confirmed its jurisdiction to approve major transactions, including settlement agreements, during the stay period defined in the Initial Order and prior to the proposal of any plan of compromise or arrangement: see, for example, *Re Nortel*, [2009] O.J. No. 5582 (S.C.J.); *Re Nortel* [2009] O.J. 5582 (S.C.J.) and *Re Nortel*, 2010 ONSC 1096 (S.C.J.).

[71] I am satisfied that this court has jurisdiction to approve transactions, including settlements, in the course of overseeing proceedings during a CCAA stay period and prior to any plan of arrangement being proposed to creditors: see *Re Calpine Canada Energy Ltd.*, [2007] A.J. No. 917 (C.A.) [*Calpine*] at para. 23, affirming [2007] A.J. No. 923 (Q.B.); *Canadian Red Cross, supra*; *Air Canada, supra*; *Grace 2008, supra*, and *Re Grace Canada* [2010] O.J. No. 62 (S.C.J.) [*Grace 2010*], leave to appeal to the C.A. refused February 19, 2010; *Re Nortel*, 2010 ONSC 1096 (S.C.J.).

D. Should the Settlement Agreement Be Approved?

[72] Having been satisfied that this court has the jurisdiction to approve the Settlement Agreement, I must consider whether the Settlement Agreement *should* be approved.

[73] A Settlement Agreement can be approved if it is consistent with the spirit and purpose of the CCAA and is fair and reasonable in all circumstances. What makes a settlement agreement fair and reasonable is its balancing of the interests of all parties; its equitable treatment of the parties, including creditors who are not signatories to a settlement agreement; and its benefit to the Applicant and its stakeholders generally.

i) Spirit and Purpose

[74] The CCAA is a flexible instrument; part of its purpose is to allow debtors to balance the conflicting interests of stakeholders. The Former and LTD Employees are significant creditors and have a unique interest in the settlement of their claims. This Settlement Agreement brings these creditors closer to ultimate settlement while accommodating their special circumstances. It is consistent with the spirit and purpose of the CCAA.

ii) Balancing of Parties' Interests

[75] There is no doubt that the Settlement Agreement is comprehensive and that it has support from a number of constituents when considered in its totality.

[76] There is, however, opposition from certain constituents on two aspects of the proposed Settlement Agreement: (1) the Opposing LTD Employees take exception to the inclusion of the third party releases; (2) the UCC and Notcholder Groups take exception to the inclusion of Clause H.2.

Third Party Releases

[77] Representative Counsel, after examining documentation pertaining to the Pension Plans and HWT, advised the Former Employees' Representatives and Disabled Employees' Representative that claims against directors of Nortel for failing to properly fund the Pension Plans were unlikely to succeed. Further, Representative Counsel advised that claims against directors or others named in the Third Party Releases to fund the Pension Plans were risky and could take years to resolve, perhaps unsuccessfully. This assisted the Former Employees' Representatives and the Disabled Employees' Representative in agreeing to the Third Party Releases.

[78] The conclusions reached and the recommendations made by both the Monitor and Representative Counsel are consistent. They have been arrived at after considerable study of the issues and, in my view, it is appropriate to give significant weight to their positions.

[79] In *Grace 2008, supra*, and *Grace 2010, supra*, I indicated that a Settlement Agreement entered into with Representative Counsel that contains third party releases is fair and reasonable where the releases are necessary and connected to a resolution of claims against the debtor, will benefit creditors generally and are not overly broad or offensive to public policy.

[80] In this particular case, I am satisfied that the releases are necessary and connected to a resolution of claims against the Applicants.

[81] The releases benefit creditors generally as they reduces the risk of litigation against the Applicants and their directors, protect the Applicants against potential contribution claims and indemnity claims by certain parties, including directors, officers and the HWT Trustee; and reduce the risk of delay caused by potentially complex litigation and associated depletion of assets to fund potentially significant litigation costs.

[82] Further, in my view, the releases are not overly broad or offensive to public policy. The claims being released specifically relate to the subject matter of the Settlement Agreement. The parties granting the release receive consideration in the form of both immediate compensation and the maintenance of their rights in respect to the distribution of claims.

Clause H.2

[83] The second aspect of the Settlement Agreement that is opposed is the provision known as Clause H.2. Clause H.2 provides that, in the event of a bankruptcy of the Applicants, and notwithstanding any provision of the Settlement Agreement, if there are any amendments to the BIA that change the current, relative priorities of the claims against the Applicants, no party is precluded from arguing the applicability or non-applicability of any such amendment in relation to any such claim.

[84] The Noteholders and UCC assert that Clause H.2 causes the Settlement Agreement to not be a "settlement" in the true and proper sense of that term due to a lack of certainty and finality. They emphasize that Clause H.2 has the effect of undercutting the essential compromises of the Settlement Agreement in imposing an unfair risk on the non-employee creditors of NNL, including NNI, after substantial consideration has been paid to the employees.

[85] This position is, in my view, well founded. The inclusion of the Clause H.2 creates, rather than eliminates, uncertainty. It creates the potential for a fundamental alteration of the Settlement Agreement.

[86] The effect of the Settlement Agreement is to give the Former and LTD Employees preferred treatment for certain claims, notwithstanding that priority is not provided for in the statute nor has it been recognized in case law. In exchange for this enhanced treatment, the Former Employees and LTD Beneficiaries have made certain concessions.

[87] The Former and LTD Employees recognize that substantially all of these concessions could be clawed back through Clause H.2. Specifically, they acknowledge that future Pension and HWT Claims will rank *pari passu* with the claims of other ordinary unsecured creditors, but then go on to say that should the BIA be amended, they may assert once again a priority claim.

[88] Clause H.2 results in an agreement that does not provide certainty and does not provide finality of a fundamental priority issue.

[89] The Settlement Parties, as well as the Noteholders and the UCC, recognize that there are benefits associated with resolving a number of employee-related issues, but the practical effect of Clause H.2 is that the issue is not fully resolved. In my view, Clause H.2 is somewhat inequitable from the standpoint of the other unsecured creditors of the Applicants. If the creditors are to be bound by the Settlement Agreement, they are entitled to know, with certainty and finality, the effect of the Settlement Agreement.

[90] It is not, in my view, reasonable to require creditors to, in effect, make concessions in favour of the Former and LTD Employees today, and be subject to the uncertainty of unknown legislation in the future.

[91] One of the fundamental purposes of the CCAA is to facilitate a process for a compromise of debt. A compromise needs certainty and finality. Clause H.2 does not accomplish this objective. The inclusion of Clause H.2 does not recognize that at some point settlement negotiations cease and parties bound by the settlement have to accept the outcome. A comprehensive settlement of claims in the magnitude and complexity contemplated by the Settlement Agreement should not provide an opportunity to re-trade the deal after the fact.

[92] The Settlement Agreement should be fair and reasonable in all the circumstances. It should balance the interests of the Settlement Parties and other affected constituencies equitably and should be beneficial to the Applicants and their stakeholders generally.

[93] It seems to me that Clause H.2 fails to recognize the interests of the other creditors of the Applicants. These creditors have claims that rank equally with the claims of the Former Employees and LTD Employees. Each have unsecured claims against the Applicants. The Settlement Agreement provides for a transfer of funds to the benefit of the Former Employees and LTD Employees at the expense of the remaining creditors. The establishment of the Payments Charge crystallized this agreed upon preference, but Clause H.2 has the effect of not providing any certainty of outcome to the remaining creditors.

[94] I do not consider Clause H.2 to be fair and reasonable in the circumstances.

[95] In light of this conclusion, the Settlement Agreement cannot be approved in its current form.

[96] Counsel to the Noteholder Group also made submissions that three other provisions of the Settlement Agreement were unreasonable and unfair, namely:

- (i) ongoing exposure to potential liability for pension claims if a bankruptcy order is made before October 1, 2010;
- (ii) provisions allowing payments made to employees to be credited against employees' claims made, rather than from future distributions or not to be credited at all; and
- (iii) lack of clarity as to whether the proposed order is binding on the Superintendent in all of his capacities under the *Pension Benefits Act* and other applicable law, and not merely in his capacity as Administrator on behalf of the Pension Benefits Guarantee Fund.

[97] The third concern was resolved at the hearing with the acknowledgement by counsel to the Superintendent that the proposed order would be binding on the Superintendent in all of his capacities.

[98] With respect to the concern regarding the potential liability for pension claims if a bankruptcy order is made prior to October 1, 2010, counsel for the Applicants undertook that the Applicants would not take any steps to file a voluntary assignment into bankruptcy prior to October 1, 2010. Although such acknowledgment does not bind creditors from commencing involuntary bankruptcy proceedings during this time period, the granting of any bankruptcy order is preceded by a court hearing. The Noteholders would be in a position to make submissions on this point, if so advised. This concern of the Noteholders is not one that would cause me to conclude that the Settlement Agreement was unreasonable and unfair.

[99] Finally, the Noteholder Group raised concerns with respect to the provision which would allow payments made to employees to be credited against employees' claims made, rather than from future distributions, or not to be credited at all. I do not view this provision as being unreasonable and unfair. Rather, it is a term of the Settlement Agreement that has been negotiated by the Settlement Parties. I do note that the proposed treatment with respect to any payments does provide certainty and finality and, in my view, represents a reasonable compromise in the circumstances.

DISPOSITION

[100] I recognize that the proposed Settlement Agreement was arrived at after hard-fought and lengthy negotiations. There are many positive aspects of the Settlement Agreement. I have no doubt that the parties to the Settlement Agreement consider that it represents the best agreement achievable under the circumstances. However, it is my conclusion that the inclusion of Clause H.2 results in a flawed agreement that cannot be approved.

[101] I am mindful of the submission of counsel to the Former and LTD Employees that if the Settlement Agreement were approved, with Clause H.2 excluded, this would substantively alter the Settlement Agreement and would, in effect, be a creation of a settlement and not the approval of one.

[102] In addition, counsel to the Superintendent indicated that the approval of the Superintendent was limited to the proposed Settlement Agreement and would not constitute approval of any altered agreement.

[103] In *Grace 2008, supra*, I commented that a line-by-line analysis was inappropriate and that approval of a settlement agreement was to be undertaken in its entirety or not at all, at para. 74. A similar position was taken by the New Brunswick Court of Queen's Bench in *Wandlyn Inns Limited (Re)* (1992) 15 C.B.R. (3d) 316. I see no reason or basis to deviate from this position.

[104] Accordingly, the motion is dismissed.

[105] In view of the timing of the release of this decision and the functional funding deadline of March 31, 2010, the court will make every effort to accommodate the parties if further directions are required.

[106] Finally, I would like to express my appreciation to all counsel and in person parties for the quality of written and oral submissions.


MORAWETZ J.

Date: March 26, 2010

