

Business**Bankruptcy pre-filing debt: Negotiating with suppliers**By **Wojtek Jaskiewicz**

Wojtek Jaskiewicz

(May 4, 2022, 11:33 AM EDT) -- Section 11.4 of the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act*, RSC 1985, c C-36 (CCAA), gives the court the power to order a supplier to continue to supply to an insolvent company. The *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act*, RSC 1985, c B-3 (BIA) does not have any similar provisions. The BIA has provisions that prevent a supplier from terminating an existing contract, but if there is no existing contract requiring the supplier to continue supplying, the court cannot force the supplier to do anything.

Does that mean there are no options left for a creditor that needs to keep its relationship with its supplier?

We were faced with this problem recently. A company approached us to assist with its restructuring. The client did not have claims totaling more than \$5 million, so the CCAA was not an option. The restructuring would have to be done under the BIA.

Our client's biggest problem was that its largest unsecured creditor was also its main supplier. Approximately 80 per cent of the client's business depended on the products supplied by this supplier. This would not be a problem if the client and the supplier had an ongoing agreement to continue to supply, but there was no such agreement. The supplier could cut our client off at any time and had no legal obligation to continue to accept our client's business.

To be successful after the restructuring, the client needed continued supply from the supplier, ideally on favourable credit terms.

We hoped to negotiate favourable payment terms with the supplier. Instead, the supplier told us that if its pre-filing debt was not paid in full, it would not supply, even on a cash on delivery basis.

Clearly the supplier was a critical supplier in every sense of the word. Without the supplier, there was no business.

We were faced with what seemed like an impossible task — negotiate favourable payment terms with a supplier demanding payment of all its pre-filing debt. And we delivered just that — an agreement with the supplier to provide payment terms together with a proposal, approved by the creditors and the court, which paid all the supplier's pre-filing debt.

But how could the supplier be paid all of its pre-filing debt?

A basic tenet of the BIA and insolvency legislation in general is that all unsecured creditors are supposed to be treated equally. Sections 95 and 96 of the BIA are designed to prevent unequal treatment of creditors and to unwind transactions that offend this principle.

However, two cases — one from the Ontario Court of Appeal and the other from the Supreme Court of British Columbia — say that treating unsecured creditors equally is the norm, but it is not always necessary or advisable.

In *Contech Enterprises Inc. (Re)*, 2015 BCSC 129, the court approved a proposal that provided for additional recovery for certain creditors that the debtor considered to be "key suppliers." The product

that the key supplier supplied accounted for approximately 25 per cent of the debtor's annual sales. If the key supplier refused to continue to supply products, it was unlikely that the debtor could continue to carry on business. The key suppliers would receive this additional amount if they first agreed to continue to supply product to the debtor on terms acceptable to the debtor.

In *1732427 Ontario Inc.(Re)*, 2019 ONCA 947, the Ontario Court of Appeal held that a debtor and a creditor could enter into an agreement for the payment of past debts in order to secure future supply. The court said that denying a debtor this ability would undermine attempts to successfully reorganize as a going concern. Creditors and debtors alike benefit from the debtor's continued operations. The goal of the stay and preference provisions of the BIA is to give the debtor some breathing room to reorganize. Legitimate agreements with key suppliers also form a vital part of that process.

With the legal framework in place, we prepared a proposal that would pay 100 per cent to the supplier and a much smaller dividend to the remaining unsecured creditors.

The creditors were placed into two separate classes — the supplier in its own class and the remaining unsecured creditors in their own class. This ensured that the remaining unsecured creditors would not be "swamped" by the much larger supplier and had the opportunity to independently approve the proposal.

The remaining unsecured creditors recognized that while there was a certain unfairness in the proposal, the supplier held all the cards. If the supplier stopped supplying, the distribution to all creditors would be even lower. While agreeing to a 100 per cent payment to the supplier must have been a hard pill to swallow, it was better than the alternative, and they accepted the proposal (which was ultimately approved).

The key takeaway is that in a proposal under the BIA, a debtor can pay more to one creditor if:

1. The creditor is a major supplier;
2. No one else can realistically supply to the debtor;
3. Without the supply the debtor is unlikely to succeed post proposal; and
4. The supplier agrees to continue to supply to the debtor on terms that are favourable to the debtor.

The court will approve a proposal where one creditor is paid more than others if paying that creditor more is the only way to create value for all other creditors.

Wojtek Jaskiewicz is a certified specialist in bankruptcy insolvency law and a partner with WeirFoulds LLP. He represents creditors, debtors, and insolvency professionals in insolvency proceedings under the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act and the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act.

Photo credit / Anomita ISTOCKPHOTO.COM

Interested in writing for us? To learn more about how you can add your voice to The Lawyer's Daily, contact Analysis Editor Richard Skinulis at Richard.Skinulis@lexisnexis.ca or call 437- 828-6772.