

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

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 SPROUTLY, INC. and TORONTO
HERBAL REMEDIES INC.

(each an “**Applicant**” and collectively, the “**Applicants**”)

FACTUM OF THE APPLICANTS

June 30, 2022

Thornton Grout Finnigan LLP
3200 – 100 Wellington Street West
TD West Tower, Toronto-Dominion Centre
Toronto, ON M5K 1K7

Rebecca L. Kennedy (LSO# 61146S)
Email: rkennedy@tgf.ca

Leanne M. Williams (LSO# 41877E)
Email: lwilliams@tgf.ca

Adrienne Ho (LSO# 68439N)
Email: aho@tgf.ca

Tel: 416-304-1616
Fax: 416-304-1313

Lawyers for the Applicants

TO: THIS HONOURABLE COURT
AND TO: THE SERVICE LIST

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I - OVERVIEW	- 2 -
PART II - FACTS	- 3 -
PART III - THE LAW AND ANALYSIS.....	- 8 -
A. Extension of the Stay.....	- 9 -
B. The DIP Lender’s Charge should be increased.....	- 10 -
C. Approval of the SISP.....	- 11 -
D. Sealing Order.....	- 13 -
PART IV - RELIEF REQUESTED	- 15 -
SCHEDULE “A” – LIST OF AUTHORITIES.....	- 16 -
SCHEDULE “B” – RELEVANT STATUTES.....	- 17 -

PART I - OVERVIEW

1. On June 24, 2022, the Court granted an initial order in these proceedings (the “**Initial Order**”) that, among other things:
 - (a) appointed BDO Canada Limited (“**BDO**”) as monitor (the “**Monitor**”) of Toronto Herbal Remedies Inc. (“**THR**”) and Sproutly, Inc. (jointly with THR, the “**Applicants**”) in these *Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act* (the “**CCAA**”) proceedings;
 - (b) approved a stay of proceedings for the initial 10-day period (the “**Stay Period**”);
 - (c) approved certain Court-ordered charges; and
 - (d) approved the interim financing facility (the “**DIP Loan**”) to be provided by 0982244 B.C. Ltd. operating as the Isle of Mann Property Group (the “**DIP Lender**”) pursuant to a DIP facility agreement (the “**DIP Facility Agreement**”).

2. This factum is filed in connection with a motion by the Applicants on July 4, 2022 (the “**Comeback Hearing**”) in these CCAA proceedings for, among other things:
 - (a) The granting of an amended and restated initial order (the “**ARIO**”) which amends and restates the Initial Order to provide certain additional relief including:
 - (i) The extension of the Stay Period until October 3, 2022 (the “**Extended Stay Period**”);
 - (ii) Authorizing the Applicants to file with the Court a plan of compromise or arrangement (the “**Plan**”);
 - (iii) Increasing the DIP Lenders’ Charge to \$750,000;
 - (iv) Permitting the Applicants to pursue restructuring options, including the termination of employees; and

- (b) The granting of an order (the “**Sale Process Approval Order**”), which seeks the following relief, among other things:
- (i) approving a sales and investment solicitation process (the “**SISP**”) in connection with the marketing and sale in respect of all or part of the assets, property and undertakings (collectively the “**Assets**”) of the Applicants;
 - (ii) approving the activities described in the First Report of the Monitor; and
 - (iii) sealing the confidential appendices of the First Report of the Monitor.

PART II - FACTS

3. The facts with respect to this motion are briefly recited herein and are more fully set out in the affidavit of Craig Loverock sworn June 22, 2022 (the “**Loverock Affidavit**”) ¹ and the First Report of the Monitor dated June 29, 2022 (the “**First Report of the Monitor**”).
4. Capitalized terms not otherwise defined herein are defined in Loverock Affidavit.
5. Unless otherwise stated herein, monetary amounts are stated in Canadian dollars.
6. THR is engaged in the production, processing and sale of cannabis products. It holds the Applicants’ primary assets, which include the Real Property (as defined below), various equipment and inventory, and the Health Canada license permitting the processing, cultivation, and sale of cannabis in accordance with the Cannabis Act and the Cannabis Regulations (the “**Cannabis License**”). ²

¹ Affidavit of Craig Loverock sworn June 22, 2022 (excluding exhibits), Applicants’ Application Record dated June 29, 2022 at Tab 2 [“**Loverock Affidavit**”].

² Loverock Affidavit at para. 5.

7. THR owns a 15,913 square foot production facility (the “**THR Facility**”) located at 64-70 Raleigh Avenue, Toronto, Ontario (the “**Real Property**”). The THR Facility was built to cultivate pharmaceutical grade cannabis. It has 12 grow rooms, and approximately 10,528 square feet dedication to production support.³

Granting of Initial Order and Activities Since the Initial Order was Granted

8. On June 24, 2022, the Court granted the Initial Order in these proceedings. Pursuant to the Initial Order, BDO was appointed the Monitor.⁴
9. Since the granting of the Initial Order, the Monitor has prepared and sent a notice to the Applicant’s known creditors with claims of more than \$1,000.⁵
10. Furthermore, the Applicants, in consultation with the Monitor, have developed the SISP in order to solicit interest in a sale or liquidation of one or the other of:
 - (a) the Applicants’ business and assets, including its Cannabis License and Real Property core to its license and operations; or
 - (b) the Applicants’ Real Property.⁶

The Proposed Sales Process

11. On June 29, 2022, the Applicants, with the assistance of the Monitor entered into two separate agreements, pending Court approval, to engage:

³ Loverock Affidavit at para. 13.

⁴ Initial Order dated June 24, 2022 in these proceedings (“**Initial Order**”) at para 20.

⁵ First Report of the Monitor at para 24.

⁶ First Report of the Monitor, Appendix D, paras. 4-6.

- (a) Hyde Advisory & Investments Inc. (“**Hyde**”) to market the Real Property without the Cannabis License and business (“**Realtor Sale**”); and
 - (b) Avison Young (“**Avison**”) to act as broker and market the Real Property for sale.⁷
12. THR had previously entered into advisory and success fee agreements with Hyde in 2020 and 2021 to source qualified leads in order to sell THR. Although a letter of intent resulted from the second engagement with Hyde, the transaction was not ultimately pursued by the purchaser.⁸
13. THR intends to re-engage Hyde, given Hyde’s experience in marketing cannabis assets. Hyde has assisted in over 21 mergers or acquisitions of cannabis companies and their licences.⁹
14. With the assistance of the Monitor, the Applicants also reached out to 3 realtors to present listing proposals in relation to the sale of the Real Property. From among the 2 realtors to submit proposals, Avison’s proposal was selected. Not only did Avison have prior knowledge of the Real Property and had previously provided an appraisal, Avison presented a competitive commission rate, a detailed marketing plan, and indicated it could adhere to the strict timelines in these proceedings.¹⁰

⁷ First Report of the Monitor at paras. 33-39.

⁸ First Report of the Monitor at paras. 33-35.

⁹ First Report of the Monitor at paras. 33-36.

¹⁰ First Report of the Monitor at para. 37.

15. The Applicants seek court-approval of the proposed SISP. All capitalized terms not otherwise defined in this section of the factum have the meaning prescribed to them in the proposed SISP.¹¹
16. The Monitor will be responsible for conducting the SISP in consultation with the Applicants. The Applicants or the Monitor will be providing weekly updates on the status of the SISP to the DIP Lender.¹²
17. The SISP contemplates the following timeline:¹³

Event	Date (each by 5:00 p.m. EST)
Sales Agents to create list of Known Potential Bidders and distribute Teaser Letter and Confidentiality Agreements to Known Potential Bidders	As soon as practical and no later than July 6, 2022
Sales Agents to prepare and have available for Potential Bidders the CIM	As soon as practical and no later than July 6, 2022
Advertisement in the national edition of the Globe and Mail and/or another national news publication	July 6, 2022
Initial (non-binding) Offer Deadline	August 5, 2022

¹¹ First Report of the Monitor, Appendix D.

¹² First Report of the Monitor, Appendix D, para. 11.

¹³ First Report of the Monitor, Appendix D, para. 10.

Event	Date (each by 5:00 p.m. EST)
Binding Offer Deadline	By August 19, 2022
Selection of Winning Bid and Final Agreement	By August 22, 2022
Final Agreement	By August 26, 2022
Application to the Court for Approval Order(s)	As soon as reasonably practicable after the Final Agreement
Closing of the Transaction (the “Closing Date”)	September 23, 2022

18. The SISP contemplates that the DIP Lender will be included in the list of potential bidders, such that the DIP Lender reserves its right to credit bid the amounts extended to the Applicants on the DIP Facility, in addition to their previous secured debt facilities extended to THR to purchase the Real Property.¹⁴

Sealing Order

19. The Applicants also seek an order sealing the unredacted version of the engagement letter entered into between Hyde and THR, a copy of which is attached is to the First Report of the Monitor (“**Hyde Agreement**”).¹⁵

¹⁴ First Report of the Monitor at para. 41.

¹⁵ First Report of the Monitor, Appendix B.

Extension of the Stay Period

20. The Applicants are seeking an extension of the Stay Period until the end of the Extended Stay Period (being October 3, 2022).
21. Under a revised Cash Flow Forecast, as appended to the First Report (“**Cash Flow Forecast**”), the Applicants are forecasted to have sufficient liquidity to fund its obligations and costs through the end of the Extended Stay Period.¹⁶

Increase to the DIP Lender’s Charge

22. The Applicants were granted a DIP Lender’s Charge pursuant to the Initial Order.¹⁷ The amount secured by the DIP Lender’s Charge was intended to only secure the maximum amount of the draw during of \$160,000 during the Stay Period.¹⁸
23. The Applicants seek to increase the maximum amount of the DIP Lender’s Charge to secure the anticipated amounts that will be required during the Extended Stay Period, being \$750,000.¹⁹

PART III - THE LAW AND ANALYSIS

24. The issues to be determined by the Court with respect to this motion, are whether:
 - (a) This Court should extend the Stay Period until the Extended Stay Period:

¹⁶ First Report of the Monitor at para. 27 and Appendix A.

¹⁷ Initial Order at paras. 32 and 35.

¹⁸ Initial Order at paras. 32 and 35.

¹⁹ First Report of the Monitor at paras. 29-31.

- (b) This Court should increase the maximum amount of borrowings under the DIP Facility;
- (c) This Court should approve the SISP; and
- (d) This Court should grant the sealing order.

A. Extension of the Stay

25. Pursuant to section 11.02(2) of the CCAA, the Court may grant an extension of the Stay Period if the Court is satisfied that the (i) the circumstances exist that make the order appropriate; and (ii) the applicant has acted, and is acting, in good faith and due diligence.²⁰
26. The Stay Period is set to expire on July 4, 2022. The Applicants submit that the extension of the Stay Period to October 3, 2022 should be granted, as they continue to act in good faith and with due diligence.²¹
27. The Monitor's Cash Flow Forecast demonstrates that the Applicants will have sufficient funds to continue their operations and fund these CCAA proceedings until October 2, 2022.²² The Monitor further recommends that the Stay Period be extended until October 3, 2022.²³

²⁰ *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* ("CCAA"), R.S.C., 1985, c. C-26, s. [11.02\(2\)-\(3\)](#).

²¹ First Report of the Monitor at para. 45.

²² First Report of the Monitor at para. 31.

²³ First Report of the Monitor at para. 44.

B. The DIP Lender's Charge should be increased

28. The Applicants seek to increase the DIP Lender's Charge to the maximum amount of the DIP Facility, being \$750,000, under the ARIO.
29. In seeking this relief, the Applicants adopt and rely on their prior submissions regarding the appropriateness of the DIP Facility as set out in the Applicants' initial factum dated as of June 23, 2022.²⁴
30. The quantum of the DIP Lender's Charge granted pursuant to the Initial Order was informed by section 11.001 and subsection 11.2(5) of the CCAA, such that it was limited to what was reasonably necessary for the Applicants' continued operations in the ordinary course of business during the initial 10-day stay period. The Applicants are now seeking to increase the DIP Lender's Charge to \$750,000.
31. As specified in the Cash Flow Forecast, the Applicants seek to increase the maximum amount they can borrow under the DIP Facility from the principal amount of \$160,000 to \$750,000 to enable them to pay specified amounts that are known to be due during the Extended Stay Period.²⁵ The Monitor believes the Applicants will have sufficient liquidity, with the benefit of the DIP Facility, to complete the SISP.²⁶

²⁴ Factum of the Applicants, dated June 23, 2022, at paras. 45-55.

²⁵ First Report of the Monitor, Appendix A.

²⁶ First Report of the Monitor at para. 31.

32. This Court has already approved the terms of the DIP Facility. The only question before this Court in respect of the increased quantum of the DIP Lender's Charge is whether the benefits of financing to all stakeholders outweigh the potential prejudice to some creditors.
33. The DIP Lender's Charge is intended to secure draws under the DIP Facility. The DIP Lender is not only a secured creditor but also the first-ranking mortgagee on the Applicants' Real Property.²⁷ The DIP Lender and the second ranking mortgagee have entered into a subordination agreement.²⁸ As a result, there is no prejudice.
34. The benefits of granting the increase to the DIP Facility are evident: the Applicants cannot conduct the SISP without increased draws under the DIP Facility.
35. The Monitor is also in support of the increase in the DIP Charge.²⁹
36. As a result, in taking into account the factors under section 11.2(4) of the CCAA, there should be a corresponding increase in the DIP Lender's Charge.³⁰

C. Approval of the SISP

37. In the absence of the plan, this Court has previously considered the following factors of whether to authorize a sale process under the CCAA (the "*Nortel criteria*"):
- (a) Is a sale warranted at this time?
 - (b) Will the sale be of benefit to the whole "economic community"?

²⁷ Loverock Affidavit at paras. 31 and 35.

²⁸ Loverock Affidavit at para. 28.

²⁹ First Report of the Monitor at para. 29-31 and 44.

³⁰ [CCAA, s. 11.2\(4\)](#).

(c) Do any of the debtors' creditors have a *bona fide* reason to object to a sale of the business?

(d) Is there a better viable alternative?³¹

38. Section 36(3) of the CCAA sets out factors the Court considers in determining whether to approve the sale transaction itself. Though an approval of sales process and an approval of sale are distinct, this court has recognized that these factors can be considered indirectly in considering the approval of a sales process:³²

(a) whether the process leading to the proposed sale or disposition was reasonable in the circumstances;

(b) whether the monitor approved the process leading to the proposed sale or disposition;

(c) whether the monitor filed with the court a report stating that in their opinion the sale or disposition would be more beneficial to the creditors than a sale or disposition under a bankruptcy;

(d) the extent to which the creditors were consulted;

(e) the effects of the proposed sale or disposition on the creditors and other interested parties; and

(f) whether the consideration to be received for the assets is reasonable and fair, taking into account their market value.

³¹ *Nortel Networks Corporation (Re)*, 2009 CanLII 39492 at [para 49](#).

³² *Brainhunter Inc., Re*, 2009 CanLII 72333 at [paras 15-17](#) and *U.S. Steel Canada Inc. (Re)*, 2015 ONSC 2523 at para 8.

39. In considering the factors set out above, the SISP proposed should be approved by the Court:
- (a) the SISP will fairly canvass the market to identify potential purchasers of the Applicant's Real Property, given that bids will be sent to bidders who may have an interest and an advertisement will be placed in *The Globe and Mail*;
 - (b) The SISP is the most effective and efficient method to allow for the potential sale and continuation of the Applicant's business operations and/or maximize the realization on the Applicants' assets; and
 - (c) The Monitor and the DIP Lender are supportive of the SISP, with the latter being included in the list of potential bidders.³³

D. Sealing Order

40. The applicable legal test for granting a sealing order, as set out by the Supreme Court of Canada in *Sherman Estate v. Donovan* ("**Sherman**"), is that the person asking a court to exercise discretion in a way that limits the open court presumption must establish that:
- (a) court openness poses a serious risk to an important public interest;
 - (b) the order sought is necessary to prevent this serious risk to the identified interest because reasonably alternative measures will not prevent this risk; and
 - (c) as a matter of proportionality, the benefits of the order outweigh its negative effects.³⁴

³³ First Report of the Monitor at paras 41 and 44 and Appendix D, at paras 11 and 14-15.

³⁴ *Sherman Estate v. Donovan*, 2021 SCC 25 at [para 38](#).

41. The Applicants request a sealing order in respect of the unredacted version of the Hyde Report, which is appended as Appendix B of the Monitor’s First Report.³⁵ The Hyde Report contains an estimation of the liquidation value of the Applicants’ assets.
42. Courts have recognized that there is a public interest in maximizing recoveries in a restructuring proceeding, which transcends each individual case.³⁶
43. Since the *Sherman* decision, this Court has granted a sealing order in respect of information pertaining to realization estimates in *Ontario Securities Commission v. Bridging Finance Inc* (“**Bridging Finance**”).³⁷ The Court held that disclosure would have a negative impact on future realizations and be detrimental to efforts to maximize value for shareholders. The Court also observed that there was no reasonable alternative to a sealing order; that there would be no material prejudice to stakeholders; and any deleterious effects were outweighed by the benefits of granting such relief.³⁸
44. In another related decision in the same proceedings as *Bridging Finance*, this Court also granted a sealing order in respect of documents containing hurdle rates and business assessment reports, on the basis that disclosing such sensitive commercial information would be detrimental to stakeholders.³⁹

³⁵ See *Court of Justice Act*, [s. 137\(2\)](#).

³⁶ *Danier Leather Inc., Re*, 2016 ONSC 1044 at [para 84](#).

³⁷ *Ontario Securities Commission v. Bridging Finance*, 2022 [ONSC 1857](#) (“**Bridging Finance**”).

³⁸ *Bridging Finance*, 2022 ONSC 1857 at [paras 50-53](#).

³⁹ *PricewaterhouseCoopers Inc. v. MJardin Group, Inc.*, 2022 ONSC 3603 at para 20.

45. This case is analogous to the decisions in the *Bridging Finance* proceedings cited above. Disclosing Hyde's valuation of the Applicants' assets at this stage would negatively impact future realizations and potentially set a "ceiling" in any future sales process, to the detriment of the Applicants' stakeholders. There is no reasonable alternative to any sealing order here, and the Applicants' stakeholders would not be materially prejudiced by this sealing order. The benefits of maximizing value for shareholders outweigh any deleterious effects of the relief sought.
46. As such, the Applicants submit that the test for a sealing order has been met and should be granted.

PART IV - RELIEF REQUESTED

47. For all of the foregoing reasons, the Applicants request the ARIO and Sales Process Order substantially in the form of the draft orders requested.

ALL OF WHICH IS RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 30th day of June, 2022.



Thornton Grout Finnigan LLP
3200 – 100 Wellington Street West
TD West Tower, Toronto-Dominion Centre
Toronto, ON M5K 1K7

Rebecca L. Kennedy (LSO# 61146S)
Email: rkennedy@tgf.ca

Leanne M. Williams (LSO# 41877E)
Email: lwilliams@tgf.ca

Adrienne Ho (LSO# 68439N)
Email: aho@tgf.ca
Tel: 416-304-1616
Fax: 416-304-1313
Lawyers for the Applicants

SCHEDULE “A” – LIST OF AUTHORITIES

1. [*Nortel Networks Corporation \(Re\)*, 2009 CanLII 39492](#)
2. [*Brainhunter Inc., Re*, 2009 CanLII 72333](#)
3. *U.S. Steel Canada Inc. (Re)*, 2015 ONSC 2523
4. [*Sherman Estate v. Donovan*, 2021 SCC 25](#)
5. [*Danier Leather Inc., Re*, 2016 ONSC 1044](#)
6. [*Bridging Finance*, 2022 ONSC 1857](#)
7. *PricewaterhouseCoopers Inc. v. MJardin Group, Inc.*, 2022 ONSC 3603

SCHEDULE “B” – RELEVANT STATUTES

Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act, R.S.C., 1985, c. C-26

Stays, etc. — initial application

11.02 (1) A court may, on an initial application in respect of a debtor company, make an order on any terms that it may impose, effective for the period that the court considers necessary, which period may not be more than 10 days,

- (a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under the *Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act* or the *Winding-up and Restructuring Act*;
- (b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and
- (c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of any action, suit or proceeding against the company.

Marginal note: Stays, etc. — other than initial application

(2) A court may, on an application in respect of a debtor company other than an initial application, make an order, on any terms that it may impose,

- (a) staying, until otherwise ordered by the court, for any period that the court considers necessary, all proceedings taken or that might be taken in respect of the company under an Act referred to in paragraph (1)(a);
- (b) restraining, until otherwise ordered by the court, further proceedings in any action, suit or proceeding against the company; and
- (c) prohibiting, until otherwise ordered by the court, the commencement of any action, suit or proceeding against the company.

Marginal note: Burden of proof on application

(3) The court shall not make the order unless

- (a) the applicant satisfies the court that circumstances exist that make the order appropriate; and
- (b) in the case of an order under subsection (2), the applicant also satisfies the court that the applicant has acted, and is acting, in good faith and with due diligence.

Marginal note: Restriction

(4) Orders doing anything referred to in subsection (1) or (2) may only be made under this section.

Interim financing

11.2 (1) On application by a debtor company and on notice to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the security or charge, a court may make an order declaring that all or part of the company's property is subject to a security or charge — in an amount that the court considers appropriate — in favour of a person specified in the order who agrees to lend to the company an amount approved by the court as being required by the company, having regard to its cash-flow statement. The security or charge may not secure an obligation that exists before the order is made.

Marginal note: Priority — secured creditors

(2) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over the claim of any secured creditor of the company.

Marginal note: Priority — other orders

(3) The court may order that the security or charge rank in priority over any security or charge arising from a previous order made under subsection (1) only with the consent of the person in whose favour the previous order was made.

Marginal note: Factors to be considered

- (4)** In deciding whether to make an order, the court is to consider, among other things,
- (a)** the period during which the company is expected to be subject to proceedings under this Act;
 - (b)** how the company's business and financial affairs are to be managed during the proceedings;
 - (c)** whether the company's management has the confidence of its major creditors;
 - (d)** whether the loan would enhance the prospects of a viable compromise or arrangement being made in respect of the company;
 - (e)** the nature and value of the company's property;
 - (f)** whether any creditor would be materially prejudiced as a result of the security or charge; and
 - (g)** the monitor's report referred to in paragraph 23(1)(b), if any.

Marginal note: Additional factor — initial application

(5) When an application is made under subsection (1) at the same time as an initial application referred to in subsection 11.02(1) or during the period referred to in an order made under that subsection, no order shall be made under subsection (1) unless the court is also satisfied that the terms of the loan are limited to what is reasonably necessary for the continued operations of the debtor company in the ordinary course of business during that period.

Restriction on disposition of business assets

36 (1) A debtor company in respect of which an order has been made under this Act may not sell or otherwise dispose of assets outside the ordinary course of business unless authorized to do so by a court. Despite any requirement for shareholder approval, including one under federal or provincial law, the court may authorize the sale or disposition even if shareholder approval was not obtained.

Marginal note: Notice to creditors

(2) A company that applies to the court for an authorization is to give notice of the application to the secured creditors who are likely to be affected by the proposed sale or disposition.

Marginal note: Factors to be considered

- (3)** In deciding whether to grant the authorization, the court is to consider, among other things,
- (a)** whether the process leading to the proposed sale or disposition was reasonable in the circumstances;
 - (b)** whether the monitor approved the process leading to the proposed sale or disposition;
 - (c)** whether the monitor filed with the court a report stating that in their opinion the sale or disposition would be more beneficial to the creditors than a sale or disposition under a bankruptcy;
 - (d)** the extent to which the creditors were consulted;
 - (e)** the effects of the proposed sale or disposition on the creditors and other interested parties; and
 - (f)** whether the consideration to be received for the assets is reasonable and fair, taking into account their market value.

Marginal note: Additional factors — related persons

- (4)** If the proposed sale or disposition is to a person who is related to the company, the court may, after considering the factors referred to in subsection (3), grant the authorization only if it is satisfied that
- (a)** good faith efforts were made to sell or otherwise dispose of the assets to persons who are not related to the company; and
 - (b)** the consideration to be received is superior to the consideration that would be received under any other offer made in accordance with the process leading to the proposed sale or disposition.

Marginal note: Related persons

- (5)** For the purpose of subsection (4), a person who is related to the company includes
- (a)** a director or officer of the company;

(b) a person who has or has had, directly or indirectly, control in fact of the company;
and

(c) a person who is related to a person described in paragraph (a) or (b).

Marginal note: Assets may be disposed of free and clear

(6) The court may authorize a sale or disposition free and clear of any security, charge or other restriction and, if it does, it shall also order that other assets of the company or the proceeds of the sale or disposition be subject to a security, charge or other restriction in favour of the creditor whose security, charge or other restriction is to be affected by the order.

Marginal note: Restriction — employers

(7) The court may grant the authorization only if the court is satisfied that the company can and will make the payments that would have been required under paragraphs 6(5)(a) and (6)(a) if the court had sanctioned the compromise or arrangement.

Marginal note: Restriction — intellectual property

(8) If, on the day on which an order is made under this Act in respect of the company, the company is a party to an agreement that grants to another party a right to use intellectual property that is included in a sale or disposition authorized under subsection (6), that sale or disposition does not affect that other party's right to use the intellectual property — including the other party's right to enforce an exclusive use — during the term of the agreement, including any period for which the other party extends the agreement as of right, as long as the other party continues to perform its obligations under the agreement in relation to the use of the intellectual property.

Courts of Justice Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. C.43

Documents public

137 (1) On payment of the prescribed fee, a person is entitled to see any document filed in a civil proceeding in a court, unless an Act or an order of the court provides otherwise.

Sealing documents

(2) A court may order that any document filed in a civil proceeding before it be treated as confidential, sealed and not form part of the public record.

Court lists public

(3) On payment of the prescribed fee, a person is entitled to see any list maintained by a court of civil proceedings commenced or judgments entered.

Copies

(4) On payment of the prescribed fee, a person is entitled to a copy of any document the person is entitled to see. R.S.O. 1990, c. C.43, s. 137.

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 SPROUTLY, INC. and TORONTO HERBAL REMEDIES INC. (each an “**Applicant**” and collectively, the “**Applicants**”)

Court File No. CV-22-00683056-00CL

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
(COMMERCIAL LIST)

Proceedings commenced at Toronto, Ontario

FACTUM OF THE APPLICANTS

Thornton Grout Finnigan LLP
3200 – 100 Wellington Street West
TD West Tower, Toronto-Dominion Centre
Toronto, ON M5K 1K7

Rebecca L. Kennedy (LSO# 61146S)
Email: rkennedy@tgf.ca

Leanne M. Williams (LSO# 41877E)
Email: lwilliams@tgf.ca

Adrienne Ho (LSO# 68439N)
Email: aho@tgf.ca

Tel: 416-304-1616

Fax: 416-304-1313

Lawyers for the Applicants