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--- Upon commencing at 10:05 a.m.
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. BORG-OLIVIER:
1
Q. Good morning, Mr. Riley.
A. Good morning.

2
Q. You're here today, Mr. Riley, in connection with the action Catalyst versus Brandon Moyse and West Face Capital. Do you understand that?
A. Yes.

3
Q. And you have sworn, if I have
counted correctly -- sworn or affirmed -- five affidavits in this proceeding? I can walk you through the dates, if you would like.
A. Could you -- if you could, could just show me the first page?

4 Q. Absolutely.
A. Please.

5 Q. And maybe for the record, I will point out that, in the motion record dated February 18, 2015, there's an affidavit of yours sworn February 18, 2015, which is at tab 3. And your counsel will take you to the first page.
A. Thank you.

Yes.

6
Q. Then attached to that affidavit is exhibits you have at tab A, an affidavit that you swore
in this proceeding dated June 26, 2014, and if I have it correct, that was the first affidavit that you swore?
A. Yes. I don't know if it's the first, but I do recognize the affidavit.
7 Q. Behind tab B, there's what's called
a reply affidavit of yours sworn July 14, 2014?
A. Yes.

8
Q. This one was -- if you look at paragraph 2 there, this one was sworn primarily in response to affidavits that were put in by our client Mr. Moyse and by West Face?
A. Yes.

9
Q. And behind tab C, there's a further reply affidavit sworn July 28, 2014.
A. Yes.

10
Q. And, finally, if you pull up the supplementary motion record dated May 1st, 2015, there's an affidavit of yours, supplementary affidavit, sworn May 1st, 2015?
A. Yes.

11
Q. Okay. And have you had a chance before appearing here today to review the affidavits that you swore in this proceeding?
A. I have reviewed them.

12 Q. And is there anything in those affidavits that you would like to take the opportunity to correct?
A. Not at this time, no.

13 Q. Okay. For your purposes and your counsel's purposes, I will let you know that my examination will be quite brief, and then $I$ will be turning it over to Mr. Milne-Smith, and I expect most of my questions will pertain to the affidavit of February 18, 2015.
A. May I do one thing before we start?

MR. BORG-OLIVIER: Yes.
-- OFF THE RECORD --
BY MR, BORG-OLIVIER:
14 Q. So if I could have you turn, please, Mr. Riley, to the affidavit of February 18, 2015, which is at tab 3 of the motion record. And I would ask you to pull up paragraph 31, please.
A. Can I read it for one moment?

15
Q. Please do.
A. Yes, I have read it.

16
Q. And in this paragraph, you are describing the parties' appearance before Justice Himel on June 30th to schedule Catalyst's motion for urgent interim relief. Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.

17 Q. And Catalyst, I believe, was represented by Mr. Winton on that appearance; is that right?
A. I don't know. I don't remember whether it was Mr. DiPucchio or Mr. Winton, but if you tell me it's Mr. Winton, $I$ will take that as given. 18 Q. Were you in court that day?
A. No.

19
Q. And what your counsel, whether it be Mr. Winton or Mr. DiPucchio, was seeking that day, as you know, was an urgent motion for an interim injunction, correct?
A. Correct.

20
Q. And if you turn up Exhibit F to this affidavit. We'll all struggle with this a little bit.
A. Is there a typed version of this endorsement?

21 Q. There isn't, but I don't think there is going to be anything controversial about it.

So what this is, I will tell you, Mr. Riley, is Justice Himel's endorsement, and one thing that you can see there, at the top, is that the approved date for the hearing of the motion was

July 16, 2014. Do you see that?
A. Yes, I see that.

22 Q. Okay. And the endorsement reads --
about three lines down, you will see it says:
"Counsel seeks urgent motion interim injunction."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. MMoving party to serve and file materials by July 2, 2014, and responding party by July 7, 2014."

Do you see that?
A. Yes, I see it.

23
Q. And, finally, it says:
"On consent, counsel agree to preserve status quo re documents."

Et cetera. Do you see all that?
A. Yes, I do.

24 Q. Okay. And if you turn two pages beyond that to page --
A. Sorry, there is a -- there's a -there's a little bit of writing to the right.

25 Q. There is. Yes. I think that's Justice Himel's description of the type of case it is, so it says "Employment departure employee case
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```
non-compete clause".
```

A. Okay. Thank you.

26
Q. I think it's typical in those cases so that the next judge would understand basically what kind of case they are dealing with.
A. Okay.

27
Q. So if you turn two pages beyond that to 129 in the motion record, what you see there is the consent that was entered into between the parties. Do you see that?
A. Yes.

28
Q. And it's signed by Mr. Pushalik for the defendants and by Mr. Winton for the plaintiffs. Do you see that?
A. Yes.

29 Q. And that reads:
"Defendants' counsel agree to preserve the status quo with respect to relevant documents in the defendants' power, possession, or control."

Do you see that?
A. Yes, I see that.
Q. And I take it that that was the only undertaking that the -- that Catalyst obtained at the time?
A. As far as $I$ know, yes, as far as $I$
know.
31
Q. And Catalyst accepted and
understood that those terms would stay in place from that date, June 30th, until the July 16th hearing?
A. And I'm not quibbling in any way. Just having reread the endorsement and looking at the undertaking, it's a little broader than the judge's order. I'm just -- just looking at the language.

32 Q. Yes. So we are focussing right now on the undertaking that was provided by -- on consent.
A. Yes.

33 Q. So Catalyst understood and accepted that those terms would stay in place from June 30th to July 16 th, to the date of the hearing?
A. Yes.

34
Q. And, of course, it was open to Catalyst, as it was to any of the other parties, to seek that different terms be included in that undertaking?
A. Yes.

35
Q. And the undertaking didn't say, for example, that counsel would agree to preserve the status quo with respect to irrelevant documents?
A. No.
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36 Q. That wasn't a concern for Catalyst?
The focus was on relevant documents?
A. Yes.

37
Q. Yes. And nor did it require, for example, that Mr. Moyse hand over his computer immediately on that date?
A. I don't recall why there was a hiatus between the date of the order and the date of the turnover.

38 Q. Okay. But that wasn't something that Catalyst sought or obtained on that date?
A. No. Never turned our minds to it, as far as I recall.

39 Q. Okay. Then if we can go to paragraph 32 of your affidavit, please.
A. Sorry. I will leave him to find it, because otherwise I will --

MR. BORG-OLIVIER: It's page 65 of the record, if that helps.
-- OFF THE RECORD --
BY MR. BORG-OLIVIER:
40
Q. So, Mr. Riley, in paragraph 32, you describe the motion for interim relief which took place on July 16, 2014?
A. Yes.
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41 Q. Were you in court that day?
A. As far as I recall, no.

42
Q. You understand, I take it, that the parties appeared before Justice Firestone?
A. Yes.

43
Q. And you understand, in fact, you have stated here, that the parties consented to interim terms which were incorporated into an order of Justice Firestone?
A. Yes.

44
Q. All the parties consented to the interim terms that day, I understand?
A. Yes.

45
Q. And those terms were acceptable to Catalyst?
A. They were, although, to my best recollection, they were read to me over the telephone. I was not given a hard copy.

46
Q. Understood. Was it you who was providing instruction to counsel that day?
A. I was, and as I recall, we were under a lot of time pressure.
Q. No doubt. And you were providing instructions on behalf of Catalyst?
A. I was.

48 Q. And, ultimately, the instructions
that you provided were that the terms of what became the order of Justice Firestone were acceptable to you and to Catalyst?
A. That is correct.

49
Q. And if we go to Exhibit $G$, this, Mr. Riley, is the interim relief order signed that day by Justice Firestone?

MR. WINTON: I don't want to interfere unduly, Counsel, but it wasn't signed that day by Justice Firestone.

MR. BORG-OLIVIER: Okay.
MR. WINTON: But it is the interim order.

MR. BORG-OLIVIER: Okay. Fair enough. BY MR. BORG-OLIVIER:

50
Q. And I take it, Mr. Riley, that this order appropriately captured what you understood to be the terms that Catalyst had consented to at that time?
A. May I just read it?

51
Q. Please do.
A. I think that's correct, but I just want to read it. May I take a moment?

I've read it.
52
Q. Okay. And I will repeat my
question. I take it that this order appropriately captured the relief that Catalyst sought and obtained on that date?
A. Yes.

53 Q. Okay.
A. Yes, it does.

54 Q. And Catalyst did not seek or obtain any broader relief than that captured within this order, I take it?

MR. WINTON: Can you just clarify when you say -- what do you mean by "sought" or "seek"?

BY MR. BORG-OLIVIER:
55 Q. Well, fair point. Maybe the point that should be made in the question is, ultimately, Catalyst didn't obtain any further relief beyond this? Beyond what was in this order at that time?
A. To the best of my knowledge, no.

56 Q. Okay. Nor did it seek to by bringing a motion for further relief at that time?
A. No.

57
Q. Okay. If we can go to paragraph 36, please, of your affidavit, and this is at page 68 of the record.

So, Mr. Riley, subsequent to the interim relief order being signed on July 16 or soon
thereafter, I take it counsel were in regular communication regarding the process that would lead to the creation of the images of Mr. Moyse's computer devices? Do you recall that?
A. I don't recall. That would have been communication between counsel, which I would only be on the periphery of.

58 Q. Okay. But I take it you were generally kept informed of the fact that the parties were working together in furtherance of the order?
A. I have no recollection either way. I mean, I assume -- when I say -- "assume" is always a bad word. I would take it that they were working towards fulfilling the order of Justice Firestone.

59 Q. Okay. So in these paragraphs where you are describing the process by which the image was ultimately created on July 21, 2014, I take it this is information that you received from counsel or otherwise?

So if I start you at paragraph 33, for example. And maybe it makes sense, Mr. Riley, that you take a moment to read through these paragraphs, but what you are describing here is the process leading up to Mr . Moyse turning over his computer and the image being created. So why don't you have a look at that.
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A. Do I need to look at the exhibits?
Q. If you'd like. I'm going to take you to Exhibit $K$, but you are welcome to look at any exhibits you need.
A. Okay. I think.

61
Q. So you've told us in paragraph 1 of the affidavit -- and I acknowledge this is standard language in these affidavits -- that you have knowledge of the matters set out in the affidavit and that, where it's based on information and belief, you identify the source of the information and belief to be true?
A. Yes.

62
Q. So I don't see any language suggesting that this is on information and belief, so is it a fair conclusion to draw that this is information that you are now aware of or were aware of at the time?
A. Yes.

63
Q. Okay. So I'll ask again. This is a description, then, of the process by which Mr. Moyse's computer came to be turned over for forensic imaging on July 21st?
A. Yes.

64
Q. And as described in those paragraphs, counsel were in regular communication
regarding that process?
A. Yes.

65 Q. Okay. And as you note in paragraph 33, it was agreed that -- Harold Burt-Gerrans?
A. I don't know how to pronounce that.

MR. WINTON: We have been using the hard G internally, but I don't think --

BY MR. BORG-OLIVIER:
66. Q. Harold Burt-Gerrans of --
A. Why don't you call him "H\&A"?

67
Q. Yes. H\&A eDiscovery was retained to create the images. Do you see that?
A. Yes.

68
Q. Okay. And in paragraph 36, you refer to an e-mail which is reproduced in full at tab K.
A. Yes.

69
Q. From Mr. Hopkins, who is then Mr. Moyse's counsel to Mr. Burt-Gerrans?
A. Yes, I see it.

70
Q. Okay. And that e-mail was copied to your counsel, Mr. Winton and Mr. DiPucchio, and to West Face's counsel, Mr. Pushalik. Do you see that?
A. I do.

71 Q. Okay. And this e-mail is dated
July 18 at 8:54. Do you see that?
A. Yes.

72 Q. Okay. And it sets out some
proposed changes to the engagement letter. Do you see that?
A. Yes.

73
Q. And it requests consultation with Mr. Musters regarding how to image Mr. Moyse's iPad, in the paragraph beneath the numbered paragraphs?
A. I see that.

74 Q. Okay. And, finally, it advises in the last standalone paragraph that Mr. Moyse has confirmed he will be at the Grossman offices by 10 a.m. on Monday with his three computer devices. Do you see that?
A. Yes.

75
Q. And I can tell you, Mr. Riley -you won't necessarily know this by looking at it -that the Monday he's referring to, the following Monday, is July 21, 2014.
A. I will take that as given.

76
Q. Yes. So there was, you'll agree with me, no attempt on behalf of Mr. Moyse's counsel to hide the fact that he would only be producing the
computer for forensic imaging some days later?
A. No.

77
Q. And I haven't seen any evidence
that your counsel or anybody else objected in any way to that plan?
A. Not to my knowledge.

BY MR. BORG-OLIVIER:
78
Q. Okay. And I can ask this to you or to Mr. Winton, but if there are any communications from you, Mr. Winton, or Mr. DiPucchio, or anyone else to Mr. Moyse's former counsel objecting to the plan or suggesting that the computer, in fact, had to be turned over immediately, I take it you will provide them to me? We haven't seen anything like that?

MR. WINTON: In response to this e-mail, no.

MR. BORG-OLIVIER: Okay. And you can certainly do it by way of undertaking, if that's easier.

MR. WINTON: What I am just reviewing right now is the correspondence, because there was one fact I wanted to check, but -- in response to that question.

MR. BORG-OLIVIER: Should we go off for

```
a second?
```


## TRAN000397/23
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MR. WINTON: If we can. That would be great. Thanks.

MR. BORG-OLIVIER: Sure.
-- OFF THE RECORD --
MR. WINTON: That's fine.
BY MR. BORG-OLIVIER:
79
Q. Okay. Can we go, Mr. Riley, to paragraph 61, please, of your affidavit, which is at page 74 of the record.

Just so I'm clear on the record, Mr. Winton, when you said "That's fine", that means you gave the undertaking asked before we went off the record?

MR. WINTON: No, it means there is no such correspondence. There's nothing to undertake to produce.

MR. BORG-OLIVIER: Okay. So you have provided the answer?

MR. WINTON: Correct.
MR. BORG-OLIVIER: Okay.
THE WITNESS: I'm on paragraph 61.
BY MR. BORG-OLIVIER:
80 Q. Sorry, actually, go to paragraph 60, if you wouldn't mind, and I would ask if you would just read from paragraph 60 to paragraph 63.
A. Just to 63?

81
Q. Yes. Please. So you are
describing here, Mr. Riley, your reaction or views to the draft report from the ISS that was circulated?
A. Yes.

82
Q. And one of the concerns that you have that you express in paragraph 63 is that you or Catalyst were concerned that Catalyst's confidential information was potentially mistakenly omitted from the draft report?
A. Yes.

83 Q. And at paragraph 62, you suggest that the ISS might have misunderstood the relationship between Catalyst and Callidus and that may have been a reason why certain confidential information was mistakenly omitted from the draft report?
A. Yes.

84
Q. And you'll recall that there was a series of what you describe as additional search terms that had been provided to the ISS that you make reference to at paragraph 62?
A. Yes, I recall that.

85 Q. Yes. And you take the position at the end of paragraph 62 that any document in Mr. Moyse's possession or potentially any document in

Moyse's possession that was responsive to the additional search terms, by its nature, very likely contained Catalyst's confidential information?
A. Yes. That was my belief at the time.

86
Q. Okay. And I take it that you had reviewed the additional search terms before swearing this affidavit?
A. Yes. Is it attached here? I can't remember. Did we redact this?

87 Q. They are not.
A. Sorry. I apologize. I think we redacted them.
Q. Yes.
A. Yes. Okay. And I do recall the search -- I don't recall each one of them, but I do recall the additional search terms.

89 Q. Okay. And I take it that you at least turned your mind to what those search terms were when providing the evidence that --
A. Yes.

90
Q. -- any document containing those search terms, by their nature, very likely contained Catalyst's confidential information?

## A. Yes.

91 Q. Okay. And in making that statement, did you consider whether it might be possible that some of the terms would show up on Mr. Moyse's computer for benign reasons, that is, in contexts unrelated to Catalyst's confidential information?
A. I did not, but I'm not a computer -- a computer -- I'm relying on others for that expertise.

92 Q. Okay. You understood this much, surely, that, to the extent a document on Mr. Moyse's computer contained one of those search terms, it would register as a hit?
A. Yes, I do understand that.

93
Q. Okay. And you expressed the view that, when there would be such a hit, it very likely was a document containing Catalyst's confidential information? That's what you have said here, isn't it?
A. Yes.

94
Q. Okay. And the conclusion that you reached, I take it, is that it was very unlikely that there would be documents on there that would register hits but not contain Catalyst's confidential information?
A. I'm not sure -- could you repeat
the question.
95 Q. Sure. I'm just really stating the converse of what you have stated here. I think you are saying that if a document contains one of those search terms, by its nature, that very likely contained Catalyst's confidential information?
A. Yes.

96
Q. You have said that?
A. Yes.

97
Q. So I'm suggesting that the necessary converse of that is that it's very unlikely that documents containing those search terms would be benign: Not containing Catalyst's confidential information?
A. I think that's correct. I have trouble with --

98 Q. I think I'm stating that fairly.
A. And I'm not quibbling. I'm just saying I think that is correct, but I'm not sure I -I'm not sure I understand the construct.

99 Q. Fair enough. I will move forward on that basis.
A. Okay.

100 Q. As you mentioned, the search terms have been redacted on the record and, in fact, we
included the supplementary ISS report in Mr. Moyse's motion record, but we redacted those terms, and I have a copy of the unredacted one for these purposes. I don't propose to enter it as an exhibit, nor do I propose to share it with West Face's counsel, but I do want to have a list of the search terms available to us, and I won't read any of them into the record, but the purpose of the questions, I need to have reference to those search terms. So they start at paragraph 3 .

MR. WINTON: Can we go off the record?
-- OFF THE RECORD --
THE WITNESS: May I look at this for a
moment?
BY MR. BORG-OLIVIER:
101 Q. For sure, absolutely.
A. Yes.

102
Q. So am I right, Mr. Riley, that the additional search terms to which you make reference at paragraph 62 of your affidavit are those listed here at paragraph 8 of the unredacted supplementary ISS report?
A. I'm sorry, I don't see the
reference to it in here. What paragraph, 62?
103 Q. Paragraph 62.
A. Yes.

104
Q. In the last line.
A. Oh, I apologize. I see it now.

105
Q. That's okay. So there's a reference at paragraph 62 to additional search terms?
A. Yes.

106
Q. And I'm just seeking your confirmation that the terms listed here at paragraph 8 of the supplementary ISS report are those additional search terms to which you've referred.
A. What date is this document?

107
Q. This document is dated --
A. March, okay.

108
Q. -- March 30, 2015.
A. Yes, these are -- to the best of my recollection, these are the additional search terms. 109
Q. Okay. And if you turn to page 4 and look at the third term down on that list, it's one that registered 541 hits. Do you see that?
A. Yes, I see it.

110 Q. Okay. You'll agree with me, I take it, that that's a common man's name?
A. I would actually disagree with
that.
111
Q. Okay.
A. I don't know any [redacted]. I'm not an expert on names.

MR. WINTON: Let's go off the record for a second.
-- OFF THE RECORD --

BY MR. BORG-OLIVIER:
112
Q. So we are back on. So without saying the name in question, and perhaps without getting into too much of an argument about how common that name is, would you at least go this far with me, Mr. Riley: That's a recognized man's name?
A. Yes.

113 Q. In other words, you look at that and you would acknowledge that certainly it's a word and a name that might appear in contexts other than in respect of Catalyst confidential information?
A. Yes.
$114 \quad$ Q. And did you consider at the time you swore the affidavit that that term might show up on Mr. Moyse's computer because he might have had reference to or discussions with a person with that name in an unrelated context to Catalyst?
A. We did, but we looked at the totality of all of the hits and found it -- in context, that it seemed unusual to us.

115 Q. What do you mean by that?
A. That it was not something I would
have expected to come up as frequently as that, and when I tied it in with the other -- the other hits, it seemed unusual to me.

116 Q. Okay. And the second term that I want to take you to, which I think we have agreement from you and your counsel that we can read into the record, notwithstanding that it was previously redacted, is the term "leader". Do you see that?
A. Yes.

117
Q. $\mathrm{L}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{D}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{R}$.
A. I do.

118 Q. Okay. Can you agree with me that that is a common word?
A. Yes.

119 Q. Used in normal conversation outside of Catalyst context?
A. Yes.

120 Q. And, in fact, in numerous contexts that would have nothing to do with finance?
A. Yes.

121
Q. Sports, politics, others?
A. Yes.

122
Q. Okay. And you didn't disclose to the Court, I take it, that this was a common term that was among the redacted search terms?
A. Not to my knowledge, but I wasn't present in any of those hearings, I don't think.
123
Q. Okay. In your affidavit?
A. Yeah. Not in my affidavit, no.

124
Q. Okay. And I take it, again, did you give any consideration to the fact that that term could show up in benign contexts on Mr. Moyse's computer?
A. I'm prepared to answer that question, but I think when I looked at these search terms, I looked at them in the context of the likelihood of the number of times that all of them would show up. In other words, I -- from my view, I didn't isolate one term and say, wow, that showed up a lot; I looked at it in the context of why would these names have shown up and what was the likelihood of all of them showing up in any significant way.

125 Q. Okay. I see. As I look at the hit counts, it looks to me like there's a pretty broad range, from zero all the way up to 15,000 , on the different hits, right?
A. Yes.

126
Q. Okay.
A. What I'm saying and what I'm trying to say is I don't think you can isolate just one set of
hit counts and dismiss them because of the likelihood that they could be a common term. I'm expressing this in my own way. You have to look at all of the ones that show up. What is the likelihood with those search terms of all of them showing up in any significant way? Sorry, a number of them showing up in any significant way? So without going through the names again -127 Q. Right.
A. -- I was surprised to see these names showing up in any way. I would have expected zeros or low numbers.
128 Q. Okay. I think I understand the point. But I take it, Mr. Riley, you are not quarreling with the idea that the word "leader", for example, could quite easily show up in contexts unrelated to Catalyst?
A. I'm not quarreling with that. I didn't think $I$ was quarreling with anything you were saying.

129 Q. No, no. I think it was going swimmingly.

In paragraph 65, if I can take you there.

> A. May I look at 64?

130 Q. Of course.
A. Okay.

131 Q. So at paragraph 64 of your affidavit, Mr. Riley, you set out there four questions that your counsel, Mr. Winton, on behalf of Catalyst, asked the ISS arising out of their draft report. Do you see that?
A. Yes.

132 Q. And those were questions intended to address the concerns that you have set out in the preceding paragraphs about potentially the ISS misinterpreting the relationship between Catalyst and Callidus, among other issues?
A. Yes.

133
Q. And at paragraph 65, you note that Mr. Moyse's counsel objected to letting the ISS answer the questions?
A. Yes.

134
Q. You are aware, I take it,

Mr. Riley, that Mr. Moyse's new counsel subsequently agreed to have the ISS answer those questions?
A. Can I just -- I never know the rule on this. Can I confirm? I do not recall -- I do believe that that is correct, but I can't recall precisely when $I$ saw it or when $I$ was informed of it.
135 Q. That's perfectly fair. You
understand, I take it, that the ISS subsequently delivered a supplementary report?
A. Yes.

136 Q. Which is the document that $I$ have handed to you --
A. Yes.

137 Q. -- that maybe you can have reference to if your counsel has it handy.
A. Yes.

138
Q. And you understood then or, at a minimum, I take it you understand now that the purpose of that ISS supplementary report was, in fact, to specifically answer the four questions that you have set out there at paragraph 64?

MR. WINTON: Just -- I note that I think paragraph 3 of the supplementary report, which is not redacted from the record, may help address this question.

MR. BORG-OLIVIER: Perfect.
MR. WINTON: And maybe if I pull out a copy of the appendix $C$, which might be in -- is the appendix to that report in the record somewhere, because that might also help.

MR. BORG-OLIVIER: It is. Do you have our responding motion record?

MR. WINTON: I will.
MR. BORG-OLIVIER: Let's go off for a second.
-- OFF THE RECORD --
BY MR. BORG-OLIVIER:
139
Q. So, Mr. Riley, your counsel is showing you the complete supplementary ISS report, including its appendices, which is at tab $K$ of Mr. Moyse's affidavit in our responding motion record. And if you go to tab $C$ of the complete supplementary ISS report at page 129 of the responding motion record of Moyse, you will see there an e-mail from Mr. Winton to the ISS, and others. Can you have a look at that e-mail.
A. Yes, I've looked at it.

140 Q. And you see there confirmation that, in fact, Mr. Moyse's new counsel agreed that the issues of concern that had been raised previously could, in fact, be responded to and addressed by the ISS?
A. Yes.

141
Q. And that subsequently led to the creation of the supplementary report that we have been looking at?
A. Yes. Thank you.

142 Q. So I take it that the concerns, then, that you had raised in those preceding paragraphs have now been addressed by virtue of the ISS preparing its supplementary report?
A. I still have some residual concern. 143
Q. Okay. But I take it the concern that the issues had not been addressed by the ISS certainly have been dealt with?
A. I'm not trying to be argumentative. I still have residual concerns.

144 Q. I understand that. You may disagree with the conclusions of the ISS, but -- let me ask the question -- but you no longer have the concern that you have expressed in here that Catalyst had raised certain concerns which the ISS was precluded from dealing with?
A. Again, I'm not trying to be argumentative. I think this was part of the response, but I do believe I've still got residual concerns, so I want that expressed that way.

145
Q. Okay. And neither you nor your counsel, I take it, asked any further questions of the ISS coming out of this supplementary report?
A. We did resolve that we would have to probe deeper into the ISS and we might need a
broader process.
146 Q. I take it neither you nor your counsel asked any further questions of the ISS in the aftermath of this report?
A. I only asked questions of my counsel. Whether they pursued them at that time, I don't know or I don't recall.

147 Q. Okay. Maybe we can get that answer from your counsel or by way of undertaking, but $I$ certainly haven't seen any further issues or questions raised with the ISS in the aftermath of the supplementary report, and I'd appreciate getting that confirmation.

MR. WINTON: That's correct, we did not pursue this further with the ISS in relation to Mr. Moyse's -- the images in Mr. Moyse's devices.

BY MR. BORG-OLIVIER:
148 Q. Thank you. And, finally, I'm going to ask you to turn up your July 14 th affidavit, which is at tab $B$ of your motion record at page 109.

MR. WINTON: Tab 3B.
MR. BORG-OLIVIER: Sorry, tab 3B. There are several B's.

THE WITNESS: May I look at this for a moment just to put it in context?

BY MR. BORG-OLIVIER:
149
Q. Yes. You can look at it to place yourself at the right moment in time, and $I$ will let you know that the only questions I'm going to be asking pertain to paragraph 14.
A. Yes.

150
Q. Okay. So at this paragraph 14, Mr. Riley, you're discussing the fact that Mr. Moyse wiped his company-issued BlackBerry before returning it to Catalyst?
A. Yes.

151
Q. And in the last line of that paragraph, you raise concern that, by doing so, Mr. Moyse may have destroyed evidence of, among other things, Moyse's communications with West Face?
A. Yes.

152
Q. And I take it, Mr. Riley, that it's speculation on your part that Mr. Moyse had any communications with West Face from his work-issued BlackBerry?
A. I can't tell one way or the other, because it's wiped.

153 Q. Therefore, it's speculation, correct? You don't know that Mr. Moyse had any communications with West Face -- let me ask the
question.
A. I don't know that, because his BlackBerry was wiped. 154 Q. Yes.
A. If I was able to look at his

BlackBerry, unwiped or unaltered, I would be able to answer that question.

155 Q. Well, you are still able to answer
that question. The question is it's speculation on your part that Mr. Moyse had any communications with West Face from his work-issued BlackBerry?
A. Yes, that is correct.

156
Q. Okay. And I take it that e-mails sent to or from a Catalyst work e-mail address are maintained on a server at Catalyst; is that correct?
A. Yes.

157 Q. And my understanding -- and you can correct me if I'm wrong -- would be that wiping a BlackBerry would not remove e-mails on that BlackBerry from the Catalyst server; is that correct?
A. That is correct.

158 Q. Okay. So e-mails that Mr. Moyse may have sent or received on that BlackBerry wouldn't have been destroyed by virtue of the wiping of the BlackBerry?
A. I'm not -- again, I'm not a
technical expert, but $I$ think what I'm about to say is correct. If you deleted the e-mail on our -- in our system, double delete, it's most likely it would have been taken out of -- our server would be removed, but it would still be retained on his BlackBerry.

159
Q. okay.
A. If I delete -- let me say it simply. If $I$ delete an e-mail from my -- if I double delete an e-mail --

160 Q. What do you mean by "double delete"?
A. You delete it once and then you go and you delete it --

161 Q. You empty the deleted folder.
A. -- you empty the deleted bucket, it will still be on my BlackBerry, because I don't sync the two from the deletion point of view. Similarly, if I delete a message on my BlackBerry, it is not deleted from my computer.

$$
162
$$

Q. Okay. Does --
A. The other thing $I$ will say is that I believe in the BlackBerry system that if you use BlackBerry Messenger or text messages, those are not -those are not touched.
163 Q. Understood. I imagine Catalyst has some sort of e-mail backing-up system?
A. I would have to -- I would have to confirm that with our tech people, how it's backed up. Again, there is a backup system.

164 Q. Yes.
A. But I believe that when you delete it, it's deleted from the system.

165 Q. Okay. You have access to your IT people, right?
A. Yes.

166 Q. I mean, you have made reference in one of your affidavits to the fact that you spoke to one of your internal IT people?
A. Yes.

167 Q. But I take it you didn't raise this issue with them before swearing the affidavit?
A. I do not recall.

168 Q. Okay. So when you provided this evidence that, by virtue of the BlackBerry being wiped Mr. Moyse's communications would be destroyed, I take it you didn't confirm that fact with anybody in the IT department as to whether, in fact, e-mails might be preserved?
A. We discussed at the time how we
could access different messages; in particular, what was on his BlackBerry, and it was confirmed to me we could not trace what was on his BlackBerry through any system we had.

$$
169 \quad \text { Q. By whom? }
$$

A. What date was that? It was -- I can't remember the name of the -- I can undertake to give you the name.

MR. WINTON: I will do undertakings.
THE WITNESS: Yes. I just can't recall the name, because we have switched providers.

BY MR. BORG-OLIVIER:
170 Q. Okay. Well, what I would like to know is what Catalyst's backup data retention policies are, and if the evidence is that e-mails wiped from a BlackBerry would not be maintained, I'd like to understand why that is with respect to its data retention policies.

MR. WINTON: First of all, I'm going to restrict any response to whatever policies may have existed in July, 2000 -- or June-July, 2014.

MR. BORG-OLIVIER: Yes.
$\mathrm{U} / \mathrm{A}, \mathrm{U} / \mathrm{T}$ MR. WINTON: I'm going to take it under advisement in any event as far as production of a data retention policy.

As for the second, I will confirm whether or not on a factual basis it's Catalyst's position that e-mails wiped from a BlackBerry would not otherwise be maintained on Catalyst's servers, but I just want to make it clear we are referring to e-mails sent or received from a Catalyst e-mail address --

MR. BORG-OLIVIER: Absolutely.
MR. WINTON: -- and account, not
referring to Mr. Moyse's personal e-mails.
MR. BORG-OLIVIER: No, my only interest, in fact, is on the work-issued BlackBerry account.

THE WITNESS: The other thing, I don't know how he set up his BlackBerry, but you can set it up as a feature that if you delete it on your BlackBerry, it's deleted on the system. That's a feature that BlackBerry has. I don't do it that way for a particular reason, which is I like to -- I like to keep the two systems somewhat separate.

BY MR. BORG-OLIVIER:
171 Q. Okay. And do you have any information as to how Mr. Moyse would have set up his BlackBerry at the time?
A. No. As I said, I don't know.

BY MR. BORG-OLIVIER:
172 Q. And perhaps that's something that
could be determined by your IT folks, in which case I'd ask that we get that information by way of undertaking.

MR. WINTON: I don't agree with the suggestion that that can be determined, so we will make inquiries as to whether it can be determined, and if it can be determined, we will make inquiries as to whether -- to what evidence they have on that point.

MR. BORG-OLIVIER: Yes. That's fair.
$\mathrm{U} / \mathrm{T}$
MR. WINTON: Okay. And just to be clear, the determination is whether it is possible now to determine whether Mr. Moyse's BlackBerry was synchronized with his -- the catalyst server such that e-mails that were deleted from one would be deleted from the other.

MR. BORG-OLIVIER: I think that's what I understand Mr. Riley's evidence to suggest, so that's the information --

MR. WINTON: That may be a setting that's turned on or off, and we will see if we can determine what the setting was on Mr. Moyse's BlackBerry and, if we can make that determination, we will share that information with you.

BY MR. BORG-OLIVIER:
173 Q. Thank you. And I take it the BlackBerry that would have been work-issued would have
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```
included a phone component?
```

A. Yes.

174 Q. It would have been usable as a phone?
A. Yes.

175 Q. When you refer to Mr. Moyse's hypothetical communications with West Face in this paragraph 14, I take it you are not suggesting that records of any phone calls Mr. Moyse might have made to or from West Face would also be destroyed by virtue of the BlackBerry being wiped?
A. I don't know the answer to that question.

176 Q. I take it that catalyst receives --
A. Actually, I apologize -- I
apologize. It would wipe it from his phone, because there is a phone record, but as to -- as to -- I have not examined our phone records.

177 Q. Okay. Do you see the bills that Catalyst receives in respect to, for example, your BlackBerry?
A. I don't, personally. They go directly -- no, they go directly to our accounting group.

BY MR. BORG-OLIVIER:
178 Q. Okay. Then I would ask for an undertaking seeking confirmation that, in fact, Catalyst would receive bills in respect of work-issued BlackBerrys that would, around this time, have included records of phone calls made and received from that work-issued BlackBerry.

MR. WINTON: Well, I think I just want to get clarification, Counsel, as to what you mean by "records of phone calls". What data points you say would be recorded in the invoices.

MR. BORG-OLIVIER: The numbers of the calls of the sender or recipient of the phone calls. U/T MR. WINTON: Okay. Yes, we will give you that undertaking.

MR. BORG-OLIVIER: Okay. And subject to the answers to the undertakings that come back, those are the questions that I have for you, Mr. Riley. Thank you for your time.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.
MR. BORG-OLIVIER: I'll turn you over to Mr. Milne-Smith.
-- RECESS AT 10:58 --
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
179
Q. Good morning, Mr. Riley. I'm going
to skip over the preliminaries that Mr. Borg-Olivier covered.

I take it you assume or that you will understand that you are still under oath and the same ground rules that Mr. Borg-olivier set up this morning still apply.
A. Good morning, and I do.
Q. Okay. Good. Now, Catalyst alleges in this motion and in this action that Mr. Moyse has misappropriated and given to West Face confidential information belonging to Catalyst; is that right?
A. Yes.

181
Q. And you have put in your affidavits -- and Mr. Borg-Olivier went through the five of them -- all relevant information of which you are aware in support of that allegation, correct?
A. Yes.

182
Q. And Catalyst has also filed two affidavits of Mark Musters; is that right?

MR. WINTON: Martin Musters.
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
183 Q. Sorry, Martin Musters.
A. Yes. Is it two?

MR. WINTON: It's two, yes.
THE WITNESS: Yes.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
184
Q. Okay. And, Mr. Riley, you are the Chief Operating Officer of Catalyst?
A. I am.

185
Q. And that makes you one of the most senior executives at the firm?
A. Yes.

186
Q. One of three, correct?
A. One of three. I think that's a better way to express it.

187 Q. Okay. I take it there's no formal general counsel role at Catalyst?
A. No.

188
Q. But you are the closest thing to an in-house counsel?
A. I am.

189
Q. You were a banking lawyer for several decades before joining Catalyst?
A. I also did insolvency work, but I was a banking and insolvency lawyer for --

190 Q. Okay. So you certainly --
A. For some years.

191
Q. Okay. So you certainly have an extensive legal background?
A. I do.

192 Q. And do I also understand it -- or, sorry, just to finish off that point. Is it fair to say you are the closest thing to an in-house counsel that Catalyst would have?
A. Yes. I'm the only lawyer.

193 Q. Okay. And you've taken an active role in managing this litigation?
A. Yes, I have.

194
Q. You're the company's principal, indeed, only affiant from the company itself?
A. Yes.

195 Q. And without disclosing the content of any communications, is it fair to say that you are the principal person at Catalyst involved in instructing counsel?
A. Yes. I should step back from that. I think instruction was also provided by Newton Glassman from time to time. Newton Glassman, $G-I-A-S-S-M-A-N$.

196 Q. And I take it you would be aware of any material instructions that Mr. Glassman gave, you would become aware of any --
A. Yes, I would be aware of any.

197
Q. Okay. That Mr. Glassman gave to your counsel?
A. Yes.

198 Q. Okay. And to the best of your knowledge, Catalyst's various affidavits have put before the Court all evidence of which it is aware supporting the allegation that Mr. Moyse disclosed confidential Catalyst information to West Face?
A. Sorry, ask the question again, please.

199
Q. Sure. To the best of your
knowledge, Catalyst's various affidavits have put before the Court all evidence of which Catalyst is aware that support the allegation that Mr. Moyse disclosed confidential Catalyst information to West Face?
A. Yes.

200 Q. Okay. So we briefly touched on -I just want to make sure the Court has a little bit of information on your background and qualifications. So your background is as a banking and insolvency lawyer?
A. Yes.

201
Q. You practiced at Stikemans, Ogilvy Renault, and Goodmans?
A. Yes.

202 Q. You left the private practice of law in 2011 to join Catalyst; is that correct?
A. Yes.

203 Q. You obviously have a law degree.
Do you have any other degrees or professional
qualifications beyond undergraduate?
A. I have a Masters of Law from

Harvard.
204 Q. Could you briefly describe for me your responsibilities as COO of Catalyst.
A. They are fairly broad. I do the day-to-day operations, including management of the office. I interface with the finance group. When we're fundraising, I handle the mechanics of fundraising as well as participate in those fundraising meetings. I do the -- our financial banking arrangements. I interface with, in particular -- some of the portfolio companies and, in particular, Callidus on a daily basis. And anything that falls between the cracks usually falls into my remit. 205 Q. Okay.
A. Including paying attention to things like Nortel. That's why I was asking the questions.

206 Q. Okay. I take it, as COO, you do not make any final investment decisions at Catalyst?
A. No. Let me qualify that.

Investment decisions are made by all three partners, but ultimately, the final say would be Newton Glassman's as the chief investment officer. 207 Q. That's correct. So I think you have anticipated where I --
A. Sure, and I wasn't trying to anticipate. I was just -- you asked me the question and I wanted to be able to say.

208 Q. No, that's fine. So you referred to Mr. Glassman as the chief investment officer, correct?
A. Yes. I'm not sure he has that official title, but that's certainly functionally. 209 Q. Okay. That's fine. And you would be aware that Mr. Glassman is the only person at Catalyst registered with the Canadian Securities Administrators as a dealing representative?
A. That is correct.

210
Q. Under national instrument 31-103?
A. I'm not sure what the instrument number is, but $I$ will take it. If that's the right instrument, I will accept that.

211 Q. Okay. And just for the sake of the record, you are aware that the Canadian Securities Administrators have a national instrument that deals
with the qualifications for people entitled to make various levels of investment decisions?
A. Yes.

212
Q. And Mr. Glassman is the only person
at Catalyst with such a designation?
A. That is correct.

213
Q. Okay. Because your background is in law, not in investment, correct?
A. That is correct.

214
Q. Okay. And I take it you would agree with me that analyzing investments is an inexact science if it's a science at all?
A. I'm not -- I am not sure I can agree with that. I think there are nuances.

215 Q. Okay. So let's put it another way.
You would agree with me that two analysts could look at the same facts and draw different conclusions about a company's prospects?
A. Yes.

216 Q. And sometimes analysts agree and sometimes they do not?
A. Again, I mean, I understand where you -- I understand what you are asking for in the question. The only things in the back of my mind is that, to the extent that they're applying the same
principles to the same set of facts --
217 Q. Yes.
A. -- I would expect them to come
close to the same answer.
218 Q. Okay.
A. I think it's -- that's why --
again, I'm not trying to be argumentative. I think
it's a nuanced question, and I do think that a certain
set of facts run through the same model or the same
analysis -- I don't mean model in the technical
sense -- should result, more or less, in the same
answer.
219 Q. But the fact of the matter is that
people do, in fact, reach different conclusions on the
prospects of a company or an investment all the time?
A. Yes.
220
Q. Okay. And when they do not agree
like that, it's not necessarily a matter of bad faith;
it could just be a matter of a difference of opinion or
a difference of approach?
A. Maybe. I don't --
221
Q. It depends on the facts?
A. You're asking a question that has a
lot of nuances. That's what I'm -- that's why I'm
hesitating.

222 Q. That's fine. Mr. Moyse gave notice of his intention to resign from Catalyst on May 24, 2014, correct?
A. Is that a Sunday?

223
Q. I can check for you.
A. Could you check for me? I think if the 24 th is a Sunday, I believe he gave it on Sunday. Around that date.

224
Q. I will confirm for you.
A. Do we have that e-mail?

225
Q. May 24 was a Saturday.
A. Saturday. Then it was on that weekend.

226
Q. Okay. That, obviously, was almost
a year ago?
A. Yes.

227
Q. And you would agree with me that after six months Mr. Moyse's knowledge of Catalyst's plans would be stale and of little use to West Face?
A. Depends on what the facts were. I think some things might be stale, not all things.

228 Q. Okay. Well, let me take you to --
A. In other words, what I'm saying is I think it's still subject to the confidentiality wrap that's in his employment agreement.

229 Q. Let me take you -- well, the confidentiality wrap was a six-month ...
A. No, I think confidential is
forever.
230
Q. Okay.
A. That's why I say there are two provisions in the employment agreement, and maybe we should go to that. One is the non-compete and the other is confidentiality.

231 Q. Let me take you to paragraph 33 of your June 26, 2014, affidavit.
A. Yes. Is that a clean copy?

MR. WINTON: Yes. Paragraph 33?
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
232
Q. Paragraph 33, correct.
A. What page was that?

233
Q. That's on page 19 of the record, page -- I'm going to flip you over to the subparagraphs (a), (b), and (c), but feel free to read the entire paragraph.

MR. WINTON: We are actually at page 94 of our most recent motion record, which attached the affidavit.

MR. MILNE-SMITH: Oh, that's fine.
MR. WINTON: It's the same text.

THE WITNESS: Here?
MR. WINTON: Yes.
THE WITNESS: May I look at his
employment agreement first for a moment before $I$ answer this question?

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
234
Q. By all means.
A. Okay.
Q. That was at tab A, tab 2A, of your original motion record from last summer.

MR. WINTON: At hand, I have tab 1E of Mr. Moyse's responding record.

MR. MILNE-SMITH: If it's there too, that's fine.

MR. WINTON: It's at page 92 of Mr. Moyse's responding record.

MR. MILNE-SMITH: Okay.
THE WITNESS: I still agree with generally what I said there. I think the nuance that is missing in there is that $I$ don't read the confidentiality agreement as being limited as to time. I.e., if the information is confidential or if there is a limitation of one year for any opportunities belonging to the fund.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
236
Q. I don't want to debate nor I think
is the role for either of us to debate the meaning and impact of the confidentiality provision in the employment agreement.
A. Okay.

237
Q. The only thing I want to confirm is
a factual point, which is, at paragraph 33 of your June 26, 2014, affidavit, you are discussing the non-compete clause, correct?
A. Correct.

238
Q. And in that context, you say, at paragraph $33(\mathrm{~b}):$
"After six months, the analyst's knowledge of Catalyst's plans would be 'stale' and of little use to a competitor."

You stand by those words?
A. I do, but if I were rewriting this, given the question you are asking, I would say "should be stale".

239 Q. Okay. But you said "would be stale"?
A. I did.

240
Q. Okay. And the analyst here would
be Mr. Moyse?
A. Yes.

241 Q. And the reference to a competitor, that's what you are alleging in this case that West Face is?
A. Yes.

242
Q. So we established earlier that

May 24 was when Mr. Moyse gave notice that he was leaving. I take it you would also agree with me that two days later, on May 26, was when he told Catalyst that he was going to West Face?
A. Yes.

243
Q. Okay. So it's safe to say that, from that day forward, you knew he was planning to work for someone that Catalyst, at least, considered to be a competitor?
A. Yes.
Q. And he was on vacation at the time?
A. No, the 26 th ...

245 Q. Sorry, the 26th was when he returned?
A. He returned to the office, yes.

246
Q. Right. And he was sent home at that time?
A. I asked him to go home, yes.

247 Q. Okay. And he stayed home for the reminder of his notice period?
A. Yes.

248
Q. And he wasn't given any additional assignments?
A. I don't know that for sure, but I think we were reluctant to engage him in anything that was active.
249
Q. You certainly don't recall --
A. No, no.

250
Q. Let me just make sure it's clear for the record. You didn't recall giving him or anyone else at Catalyst giving him any additional assignments?
A. That is correct.

251 Q. And you kept him away from any further discussions regarding investment opportunities at Catalyst?
A. Yes.

252
Q. So six months from late May would have been late November, 2014, correct?
A. It depends -- his notice period was 30 days, so I think he would count the non-compete six-month period starting after 30 days.

253
Q. So either late November or late

```
December?
```

A. Yes.

254 Q. In your February 18, 2015,
affidavit, paragraph 8, you refer to the danger of a competitor scooping an opportunity that Catalyst was considering?
A. Yes.

255 Q. I take it you'd agree with me, because I think you gave this evidence in your last cross-examination, that, in the last six months of Mr. Moyse's employment, his work was focussed almost entirely on performing operating reviews of Catalyst-owned companies?
A. He was also involved in the -- in the telecom files.

256 Q. I understand that, but his work was focussed -- outside of the telecom opportunity, his work was focussed almost entirely on performing operating reviews of Catalyst-owned companies?
A. Yes, yes.

257
Q. And so if they were Catalyst-owned companies, they were no longer an opportunity someone else could scoop; that was something that Catalyst already owned?
A. But there might be bolt-on acquisitions that would be new opportunities.

258 Q. Okay. The only opportunity that, in your affidavits, you say West Face has scooped relates to Wind Mobile, correct?
A. That is correct. Excuse me. That is what I said in my affidavits at the time. I think there's some issue around Arcan, which was part of the information that was conveyed by Moyse to West Face.

259 Q. Okay. Catalyst alleges that Mr. Moyse disclosed confidential information to West Face in the March 27, 2014, e-mail which attached the writing samples?
A. Yes.

260
Q. And Catalyst has, in fact, consented to unsealing the court record that contained those documents, correct?
A. Yes.

261 Q. So it no longer treats that information as confidential?
A. Yes.

262 Q. Meaning I was correct? I'm correct that Catalyst no longer treats them as confidential?
A. That is correct.

263
Q. Okay. Good. Sometimes a "yes" can mean --
A. No, no, sorry, I wasn't trying
to -- I was trying to agree with you. 264 Q. I understand.
A. Ask simpler questions.

265
Q. Yes. Did anyone at Catalyst advise
any members of the media that the court file was unsealed and they could find materials there?
A. Not to my knowledge.

266
Q. Did anyone at Catalyst speak to Theresa Tedesco of the National Post?
A. We would have spoken to Theresa from time to time.

267 Q. Do you know if anyone spoke to Ms. Tedesco about these proceedings?
A. I don't know if it's possible that

Newton would have spoken to her or one of our -- I think -- I can't remember when -- when we hired -we've hired a new communications officer, Shawn Lepin.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
268 Q. I would like to know if your communication officer or Mr. Glassman spoke to Ms. Tedesco at any time after the unsealing of the court record about this case.

MR. WINTON: Perhaps you can explain how it's relevant before we respond to that.

MR. MILNE-SMITH: Catalyst has made
allegations about West Face making -- entering evidence about Callidus in an effort to publicize its position, effectively. So I would like to test whether Catalyst has, in fact, been doing exactly the same thing.
$\mathrm{U} / \mathrm{A}$
MR. WINTON: Okay. Well, I will take that under advisement.

MR. MILNE-SMITH: I would ask the same questions for Tim Kiladze at the Globe and Mail.

MR. WINTON: Kiladze.
MR. MILNE-SMITH: And just for your reference, those are the authors of two articles about the case that we have included at Volume 2, tab 50 of the responding motion record.

THE WITNESS: Sorry, tab 2?
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
269
Q. Sorry, Volume 2, tab 50.
A. Do I have that? May I see that for a minute?

MR. WINTON: I'm just getting down the question that was asked so I make sure I have it. I just want to make sure $I$ have this right. You want to know if Mr. Lepin or Mr. Glassman spoke at any time after the unsealing of the court order with Ms. Tedesco or Mr. Kiladze about this case?

MR. MILNE-SMITH: Yes.
$\mathrm{U} / \mathrm{A}$ advisement.

MR. WINTON: And I will take that under

MR. MILNE-SMITH: Okay. And just to be clear, $I$ would like to know if anyone at Catalyst spoke to anyone at the Globe and Mail or National Post, but I have named those four individuals as the most likely participants in such communication.

MR. WINTON: So the question is actually broader than the names you gave?

MR. MILNE-SMITH: Yes.
U/A MR. WINTON: Still under advisement.
THE WITNESS: Was this an online piece
or was it also in FP?
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
270 Q. I don't know.
A. Okay.

MR. WINTON: So that's the -- Mr. Riley
is looking at the --
THE WITNESS: That's Tedesco.
MR. WINTON: -- Financial Post article, and slip-sheeted behind that is a Globe and Mail article.

MR. MILNE-SMITH: That's correct.
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
271 Q. I'm ready to move on from that
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whenever you are, Mr. Riley.
A. Okay.

272
Q. So going back to the four writing samples, I take it there's no dispute here that West Face has not made an investment into Homburg?
A. Not to my knowledge.

273
Q. Homburg was one of the four writing samples?
A. Yes.

274
Q. And another one of the writing samples was a company called NSINV?
A. Yes.

275 Q. And West Face hasn't made any investment in that company?
A. I don't know if West Face has made an investment or not.
276 Q. Not to your knowledge?
A. You have asked me that question. I don't know.

277 Q. You have no information that West Face has made an investment in that company?
A. No, no.

278
Q. And another one of the companies -another one of the companies addressed by a writing sample was Rona?
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MR. WINTON: Don't get into that habit. THE WITNESS: Sorry, no, no. You know what I mean. Without having to go back to the document.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
287
Q. So Mr. Griffin explained in his
affidavit that he concluded that debentures were being treated unfairly by the Aspen Leaf plan of arrangement compared to the shareholders. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.

288
Q. And you'd agree with me, of course,
that the Aspen Leaf transaction hadn't even happened when Mr. Moyse wrote his memo for Catalyst, correct?
A. I would have to go back and -- I would have to go back and look at the time sequence. 289 Q. Okay. Do you have any familiarity with the Aspen Leaf plan of arrangement yourself?
A. I do not.

290 Q. And I take it, then, you are not aware of Catalyst taking any position with respect to that transaction?
A. It's the best of my recollection we did not.

291 Q. Okay. You weren't aware of
Catalyst considering any investment?


297 Q. You are not aware of any overlap from any source between the two?
A. No, but, again, I have not done the review to compare what he did and what we did.

MR. MILNE-SMITH: I understand. Why don't we -- I'm moving on to a new subject, so why don't we take the morning break now.
-- RECESS AT 11:30 --
-- RESUMING AT 11:41 --
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
298 Q. So, Mr. Riley, just a few follow-up points or clarification points from this morning before I move on to our next subject.

In respect of the examination conducted by Mr. Borg-Olivier, I take it that Catalyst, as a factual matter, has not conducted or instructed to be conducted any search of Mr. Moyse's text message or e-mail or phone history in respect of his company BlackBerry, correct?
A. That is correct as to phone, but we would not be able to trace BlackBerry text.

299 Q. Okay. Well, I think there may be a technical dispute about that down the road, but I just want to make sure, as a factual matter, whether it's because they couldn't or, for whatever reason, they did
not instruct such a search be taken.
A. At the time, I believe I talked to Jonathan -- and I can't remember Jonathan's last name -- as to whether we would be able to retrieve text or BBM messages.

300 Q. Okay. Again, I'm not looking for the why at this point. I think that has to be left to the technical experts. I just want to figure out the what. So, as a matter of fact, no search has been directed or conducted of SMS, meaning text messages?
A. Yes.

301 Q. Or e-mail or phone records, correct?
A. There's been no search of phone records, and I don't believe -- sorry, and I'm not trying to quibble or quarrel, but $I$ don't believe -based on my understanding is, we would not be able to trace BBM or SMS messages.

302 Q. And so you didn't try to?
A. No, didn't try to do the
impossible.
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
303
Q. Okay. I'm going to have to
apologize to Mr . Winton here, because I have already expanded the scope of his advisement once. I'm going

```
to ask to do it once more.
    When I was asking this morning about
    communications with the Globe and Mail or National
    Post, I would also like that to encompass any indirect
    communications. So if Catalyst advised an external
    press agent or anyone else on its behalf to communicate
    with the press, I would also like to know about that.
    U/A MR. WINTON: Okay. Well, still, I'll
    take it under advisement.
    MR. MIINE-SMITH: Of course.
    MR. WINTON: I understand.
    BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
    304 Q. Okay. But it's unclear on the
    record here whether I got my answer about e-mail
    records. You said there was no search of phone
    records, and you weren't trying to quibble or quarrel.
    Based on your understanding, you would not be able to
    trace BBM.
                            A. Or text, SMS.
    3 0 5
                            Q. But how about e-mail? Was a search
done of Brandon's e-mails?
                            A. Not from his BlackBerry device.
        306
                            Q. From his Catalyst -- from
        Catalyst's records, did you search?
                            A. Yeah, we did -- we did do some
```

searches.
307 Q. Okay. And I assume anything relevant would have been produced?
A. Yes.

308
Q. I take it you'd agree with me that, to the best of your knowledge, the position that West Face took in Arcan was a passive one?
A. I don't know.

309
Q. You are not aware of West Face taking any control position in Arcan?
A. No, I am not.

310
Q. Mr. Griffin's evidence was that they bought some debentures, correct?
A. Yes. I mean, I would have to go back and look, but I believe that is correct.

31 Q. And you are not aware of anything further?
A. No.

312
Q. So I take it you would agree with me that West Face buying some debentures would not interfere with Catalyst's ability to make a similar or an opposing investment in Arcan?
A. It could.

313 Q. Are you saying that West Face's purchase of debentures interfered with the market price
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of those debentures?
A. No. It could, in certain
circumstances, represent a blocking position, i.e., it might be a critical piece of the control piece.
314 Q. But you are not aware of West Face acquiring a position large enough to constitute a blocking position?
A. I don't know. I don't know what they acquired.

315 Q. Okay. And if Catalyst had wanted to make an investment in Arcan, presumably, you would have done the deal just to find out whether or not West Face had a blocking position?
A. We would continue diligence before
investing.
316
Q. Okay. But you haven't --
A. But we would not know -- the fact you just presented to me, we would not necessarily know.

317 Q. Okay. You haven't made that

```
effort?
```

A. No.

318
Q. In other words, to find out that West Face had a blocking position, you would have to try to invest?
A. Correct.

319
Q. And because West -- because you don't know or are aware of West Face having a blocking position, you haven't made the effort to invest?
A. I think that is correct, but I
would have to go -- I would have to go back and double-check some of these things.

320 Q. Well, if you have any information to the contrary, you will let me know?
A. Yes.

321
Q. Okay.

MR. WINTON: And just to be clear, let's not treat that as an undertaking. If there is a need to correct --

MR. MILNE-SMITH: Absolutely.
MR. WINTON: -- what was said, it will be corrected, but, otherwise, if you don't hear from us, it's going to just stand as is.

MR. MILNE-SMITH: I agree.
MR. WINTON: Thanks.
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
322 Q. Mr. Moyse was only assigned to work on Wind roughly two weeks before he submitted his resignation; is that correct?
A. I believe he may have been working

```
on it earlier than that.
```

323 Q. Mr. Riley, you were cross-examined on your first three affidavits on July 29, 2014?
A. Yes.

324
Q. Do you recall that?
A. I do.

325
Q. Okay. And you were asked the
question -- now, Brandon's evidence at paragraph 11 of his affidavit is that he was only assigned to work on Wind Mobile two weeks before he left on vacation.
A. Yes.

326
Q. That's at paragraph 11, halfway down the paragraph, and now, in quotes, from Mr. Moyse's affidavit:
"'I was only assigned to work on Wind Mobile the week before $I$ left on
vacation two weeks before my resignation
and, as such, did not have extensive
knowledge of the transaction.'
"Would you agree with that statement?
"Answer: I would have to double-check the timing, but I'm willing to accept it
for now."
And then you move on to a different point.

I take it you stand by that evidence?
A. I would like to go back and, again, double-check, because I don't -- my recollection is that there may be some documents from earlier time -like, a March date where his name appeared. So I would -- I would, once again, like to go back and affirm my recollection.

327 Q. okay. So is that --
A. That is --

328
Q. -- an undertaking to advise of any documents showing Brandon on -- involved in Wind before April -- before May of 2014?

MR. WINTON: Here's what I will suggest. We will undertake to inform you whether the evidence given at Mr. Riley's July 29th cross-examination is correct.

MR. MILNE-SMITH: Yes.
MR. WINTON: Because he referred to a need to double-check.

MR. MILNE-SMITH: Yes.
U/A MR. WINTON: And if there is any document that supports his suggestion that his involvement predates the two-week period referred to in the question, we'll -- I'll take under advisement whether we will produce it, but we will definitely
discuss it with you and come up with a solution with regards to that document.

MR. MILNE-SMITH: Okay. And I take it before this matter was argued to Mr. Justice Lederer last year, no update to that evidence was given?

MR. WINTON: That's correct.
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
329
Q. Okay. And we're going to come this
later, but $I$ think it might be relevant now. I understand there has been some reference to a PowerPoint presentation to Industry Canada on which Mr. Moyse worked?
A. Yes.

330 Q. Might that have been what you were thinking of, of something that took place earlier in the year on which Mr. Moyse worked?
A. I would have to check my dates. If you are asking me the question right now, I do not recall the actual date when that was presented.

331 Q. Okay.
A. Or prepared -- excuse me.

332 Q. I will just wait to see the answers that come on the previous question, then.

Am I correct in understanding that this PowerPoint presentation was not specifically in respect
of Wind but was with respect to the telecom industry more broadly?
A. At that -- at this time or at that time? You cannot talk about the telecom industry without talking about at least Mobilicity and Wind. 333 Q. Okay. But, again, so the presentation would have applied to Wind but wasn't solely in respect of Wind?
A. That is correct.

334
Q. Okay. And I understand from e-mail received from your counsel last night that the PowerPoint presentation in question has been -- was destroyed shortly after it was given?
A. Yes.

335 Q. And no records of it have been maintained?
A. That is correct.

336 Q. Mr. Riley, I take it you would agree with me that the fact that VimpelCom was considering selling its investment in Wind in early 2014 was not a piece of information that was confidential to Catalyst?
A. That is correct.

337
Q. There's no dispute that the price demanded by VimpelCom was well known to all potential
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```
bidders?
```

A. I don't know that.
Q. If you want to look at

Mr. Griffin's affidavit, Exhibit 5. So that's in
Volume 1, tab 5.
MR. WINTON: It's clean.
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:

339
Q. So this is an article in the Globe
and Mail --
A. Sorry.

340
Q. This is an article in the Globe and

Mail dated July 31, 2014?
A. Yes.

341
Q. And you will see the first line of
the article states "Wind Mobile's foreign owner ..."
Let me just pause there. I take it we agree that's reference to VimpelCom?
A. Yes.
Q. "... has put a $\$ 300$ million price
tag on the start-up wireless
carrier."
Do you see that?
A. Yes, I see that, yeah.

342
Q. So based on that, you would agree with me, then, that the $\$ 300$ million price tag set by

VimpelCom was known to the market at least as of July, 2014?
A. Again, I'm not quibbling, but certainly Christine Dobby believed it. I don't know whether -- I don't know what her source was for that. 343 Q. Okay.
A. And I don't -- she is -- I have only met her once.

344 Q. And I take it there's no dispute also that by May, 2014, VimpelCom had expressed any interest in bidders that it was interested in a complete sale of its interest? In other words, it wasn't trying to refinance, it was trying to get out?
A. Yes, I believe that is correct.

345
Q. Okay. And, finally, it was also well known to all interested parties that regulatory risk was a significant issue from the perspective of VimpelCom, correct?
A. I'm not sure I can -- I'm not sure I can say that -- what you are asking me, I'm not sure I can affirm yes or no.

346 Q. Okay. So let's talk a little bit more about what regulatory risk means and maybe we can come back to that.

Is it fair to say that Wind Mobile was
considered a strategic asset by Industry Canada?
A. Yes.

347
Q. And a company called AAL controlled
by Anthony Lacavera and others held two-thirds of the voting shares in Wind Mobile?
A. That sounds correct.

348
Q. And VimpelCom held debt non-voting equity and some of the remaining voting shares, correct?
A. Yes.

349
Q. Industry Canada, by virtue of Wind Mobile being a strategic asset, held the right to approve any transfer of voting shares?
A. Yes.

350 Q. And this was well known to anybody in the marketplace?
A. Yes.

351 Q. So if VimpelCom wanted to get paid for its share --
A. Can I go back for a second?
Q. Please.
A. What I would understand from the questions you are asking is if you wanted to have a controlling interest, a share ownership controlling interest, and you were -- you would need Industry

Canada approval. That's what I would understand from that question. If you want control of VimpelCom, you needed IC approval.

353 Q. And control --
A. Or, sorry, excuse me, of wind.

354
Q. Right. And "control" means voting shares?
A. Yes.

355
Q. So if you wanted to get the voting shares, you had to get Industry Canada approval?
A. Yes.

356
Q. And so if a party wanted to acquire all of the equity in Wind -- meaning both the voting shares held by AAL and the other shares held by VimpelCom -- in one transaction, Industry Canada had the right to approve that or not?
A. That is correct.

357
Q. So there was a risk to Vimpelcom or any potential purchaser that industry Canada could deny such approval?
A. Say that -- sorry, ask -- sorry, I'm not -- again, I'm not trying to quibble. I just want to make sure I understand the question.

358 Q. There was a risk to VimpelCom that Industry Canada could deny approval of a transaction
that included a transfer of the voting shares?
A. I'm going to say maybe, because I think you can pre-socialize with Industry Canada where they are going to come out on that decision, because I think that Industry Canada -- this is -- I don't want to over-answer, but I think you have to put it in the context of what is it that the Government of Canada wanted to see, which is the development of a fourth carrier and, to a certain extent, the reduction of foreign ownership in the space at that time.
359 Q. And the socialization of Industry Canada, until you had done that, you wouldn't know what their reaction was going to be?
A. Yes.

360
Q. And that was a risk that any potential bidder faced until they had undergone that socialization?
A. We had spent a fair amount of time in discussions with Industry Canada and with other members -- other aspects of the government, so we had a sense of what they would be willing to agree to in terms of approvals.

361 Q. Is it your position that Catalyst had Industry Canada's pre-approval for the acquisition of the voting shares in Wind?
A. You never have pre-approval from the government, in my experience.

362 Q. So there was a risk there?
A. Yes.

363
Q. And that risk was equally borne by Vimpelcom in that it could see a transaction into which it wanted to participate be blocked?
A. Yes.

364
Q. So that's the regulatory risk I was talking about for VimpelCom.
A. Yes.

365
Q. So you would agree that it was well known that regulatory risk was an issue for Vimpelcom?
A. Yes.

366
Q. Okay. So let's see if we can agree on one more thing. If VimpelCom wanted to get out, to sell its entire interest in Wind as part of a transaction in which the acquiring party or parties would also be acquiring the voting shares, all right? So are we clear on the hypothetical? It's a transaction where VimpelCom is selling everything and the purchaser is acquiring the voting shares. Right?
A. And everything else.

367
Q. Yes.
A. Okay. Yes.

368 Q. So if VimpelCom wanted to do that without getting Industry Canada approval, one way they could do that is if the owner of the voting shares was one of the purchasers, because then there would be no transfer of the voting shares, right?
A. I'm sorry, I just -- again, could you please repeat the question.

369 Q. Yes. So VimpelCom wants to get paid for transfer of their interest, correct?
A. Yes, yes.

370
Q. And they want to do it without incurring the risk of Industry Canada saying no?
A. Yes.

371
Q. One way they could do that is if no transfer of the voting shares was required, correct?
A. Yes.

372
Q. And they could do that, for example, if the purchaser already holds the voting shares, because then there is no transfer of voting shares.
A. Keep going, because I'm not sure -I can't -- are you saying if Mr. X owns two-thirds -373
Q. Mr. Lacavera.
A. -- and Mr. Lacavera acquires the third, would that require approval? I don't know the
answer to that question. I think the answer is probably not, but $I$ don't know the answer. I'm not -I am not a regulatory -- I am not a regulatory guru in that space.

374
Q. Fair enough. Another way you could do it without Industry Canada approval is if the voting shares are being transferred, if they just stayed --
A. Yes.

375
Q. Okay. And that was never something that Catalyst was considering, correct?
A. To the best of my knowledge, no. Although we may have considered many hypotheticals at that time.

376 Q. Okay. But never something that was seriously pursued?
A. To the best of my knowledge, no. 377 Q. Okay. If I have read your affidavit correctly, your position is that the information that Mr. Moyse disclosed to West Face thereby blocking Catalyst's efforts to acquire Wind related to Catalyst's confidential regulatory concerns; is that right?
A. Yes.

378
Q. So how Catalyst planned to deal with the regulatory risk was the confidential

```
information?
```

A. Yes. Attitude. I will call it attitude towards the government and risk.
379
Q. What was Catalyst's attitude towards the government?
A. We believed that you needed -you -- it would be a smarter approach to get approval from the government for any transaction you did. A broader concern -- broader expression than you have. You wanted the government to be on side.

380 Q. So your position is that it's -the confidential information is that it would be better to have the government on side?
A. Yes.

381 Q. Okay. And I take it you are not aware of any efforts by West Face to get the government on side in advance?
A. Don't know.

382
Q. I want to come back to that

PowerPoint presentation we have spoken about earlier. What was in the presentation?
A. It was -- can we go off the record for a moment?

> MR. MILNE-SMITH: Yes.
-- OFF THE RECORD --

THE WITNESS: Yes. I have read
paragraph 36.
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
383
Q. Okay. Before we get to that, I
just want to go back and make sure I have covered off one point completely.

You told me earlier that the
confidential information you are concerned Mr. Moyse conveyed to West Face related to the need or the desire to have government on side before entering into a transaction, correct?
A. Correct.

384 Q. Was there anything else? Is there anything else? Any other confidential information that you say Mr. Moyse passed to West Face? Relating to Wind?
A. There would also be in that context the ability to transfer spectrum. Which is an ongoing issue in the telecom space.

385 Q. So Industry Canada's approval for whether or not you can transfer spectrum?
A. It would be their consideration of future transfers of spectrum.

386 Q. Industry Canada's consideration?
A. Yes, and the government indirectly.

387 Q. And, again, are you aware of any efforts by West Face to determine the government's willingness to transfer spectrum in the future?
A. I do not know that.

388
Q. Have we, then, now completely covered the landscape of what confidential information you are concerned about passing from Mr. Moyse to West Face? Relating to Wind?
A. Yes.

389
Q. Okay. so back to paragraph 36 of your reply affidavit.
A. This one?

MR. WINTON: Yes.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
390
Q. And that's May 1, 2015. You state that:
"The PowerPoint presentation primarily concerned Catalyst's plans for Wind and outlined regulatory concessions Catalyst needed in order to carry out a Wind
transaction."
A. Correct.

391 Q. So the regulatory concessions that you are talking about there, are we talking about, for
example, wholesale roaming rates?
A. Yes. Oh, no, excuse me. No, that was not -- to the best of my recollection, that was not a consideration.

392 Q. Okay. Tower sharing or tower
leases?
A. It may have been in there, because that was an ongoing issue at the time.

393 Q. Okay. Spectrum transfer?
A. Spectrum transfer, for sure, and use of spectrum, alternative uses of spectrum. Wholesale versus retail.

394 Q. Any other regulatory concessions that you can recall being a part of that presentation?
A. Considerations of consolidation in the industry.

395
Q. Okay. And you are not aware of West Face raising any of those concerns with Industry Canada?
A. You are asking me -- you are asking me questions that $I$ have no basis to answer one way or the other.

396
Q. Okay. So you have -- you have no basis to conclude that West Face implemented any of Catalyst's strategy with respect to these regulatory

```
issues?
```

A. I have a concern that West Face took a position, knowing what our regulatory attitude was, that was more aggressive than they might otherwise have taken.

397 Q. Okay. So the concern is not that West Face copied Catalyst; it's that West Face took a different approach?
A. That knowing our strategy, they were willing to be more aggressive, but they only were willing to be more aggressive if they knew what our strategy was.

398 Q. Okay. Mr. Griffin has sworn in his affidavit that West Face first explored investment in Wind in 2009. Do you recall that?
A. If you -- if you can tell me that that's what it says, I will agree with you --

399
Q. Okay. You have no reason --
A. -- without having to go back to
that.
400
Q. You have no reason to dispute that?
A. I have no reason to dispute that.

Sorry, what was the date, in 2009?
401 Q. I don't recall precisely when in 2009.
A. It doesn't matter the month. Just
the year was 2009?
402 Q. The year was 2009.
A. Thank you.

403 Q. So I take it there is no issue here
that West Face was aware of and, indeed, was pursuing in late 2013 and early 2014 the wind opportunity before Moyse ever appeared on the landscape of West Face?
A. Is that what -- is that what Mr. Griffin's affidavit --
404
Q. Yes.
A. I have no reason to disagree with
that.
405
Q. Okay. So Mr. Griffin, in his affidavit, states that West Face entered into a confidentiality agreement on December 7, 2013, with VimpelCom. I take it you have no reason to dispute that?
A. No reason to dispute that.

406 Q. Okay. And are you aware that West Face told your counsel at the time they delivered Mr. Griffin's affidavit that West Face could not produce the confidentiality agreement and other negotiating documents with Vimpelcom because of the obligations in the CA but invited Catalyst to seek an
exception and said that West Face wouldn't oppose it?
Were you aware of that?
A. I'm not recalling that.

407 Q. Okay.
A. Is there something you can point me to?

408
Q. Sure. So I'm handing you a copy of a March 13, 2015, letter from me to Mr. DiPucchio.

And you'll see in the first paragraph this refers to serving the responding motion record of West Face?
A. I do.

409 Q. And you will see in the second paragraph it refers to the nondisclosure agreement with VimpelCom?
A. I do.

410 Q. And you'll see the last sentence, it says:
"West Face undertakes not to oppose a motion to relieve it of its nondisclosure obligations to VimpelCom under the 2013 NDA."
A. I'm sorry, where is that, please?

411
Q. The last sentence of paragraph 2 of the letter.
A. Got it.

412 Q. Reads:
"West Face undertakes not to oppose a motion to relieve it of its nondisclosure obligations to VimpelCom under the 2013 NDA."
A. I do see that.

413
Q. And I take it we are agreed that

Catalyst took no steps in that regard?
A. Do you have any response from Rocco on this one?

414
Q. No. But you are not aware of anything?
A. No, but I would want to confer -- I would want to confer with Rocco.

MR. MILNE-SMITH: Okay. I would like to mark that as the first exhibit on this examination.

MR. WINTON: Okay.
EXHIBIT NO. 1: Letter from
Mr. Milne-Smith to Mr. DiPucchio dated
March 13, 2015
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
415
Q. Now, Mr. Riley, as the instructing principal at Catalyst, I take it you are also aware or you'd also agree that, after delivery of your affidavit
on this motion on February 18, 2015, West Face's counsel asked Catalyst to produce copies of any documentation relating to your allegation that Catalyst and VimpelCom had negotiated everything but a term relating to regulatory approval? Do you recall that? A. Yes.

416 Q. So I'm handing you a copy of a letter dated February 20, 2015. This one was from Jeff Mitchell at Denton's sent, again, to Mr. DiPucchio?
A. Uhm-hmm.

417
Q. And you'll see the third paragraph. A. Yes.

418
Q. Makes the request for production of documentation relating to that assertion in your affidavit?
A. Yes.

MR. MILNE-SMITH: So let's mark that as
Exhibit 2.
EXHIBIT NO. 2: Request for production of documentation relating to letter from

Mr. Mitchell to Mr. DiPucchio dated
February 20, 2015
THE WITNESS: Yes.
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
419
Q. And then the response comes from
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Mr. Winton on February 26 to Mr. Mitchell. I'm handing you a copy of that.
A. Thank you.

420 Q. You are aware of that communication?
A. Yes.

MR. MILNE-SMITH: So we will mark that as Exhibit 3.

EXHIBIT NO. 3: Letter dated February 26
to Mr. Mitchell
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
421
Q. I take it you'd agree with me --
feel free to review the letter, but I take it you would agree with me that Mr. Winton, on behalf of Catalyst, refused to produce the requested communications?
A. Yes.

422 Q. And counsel advised last night that this refusal was based on an agreement from last July between counsel to Mr. Moyse and counsel to Catalyst that Catalyst didn't have to produce e-mails on which Mr. Moyşe was copied concerning negotiations with VimpelCom; is that correct?
A. Sorry, where is that referenced in
the letter?
423
Q. No, I'm moving on to a
communication I had last night. Perhaps you should let Mr. Winton answer this.

Counsel, you'd agree with me, of course, that last night you advised that the refusal to produce the communications with VimpelCom -- and that refusal is set out in Exhibit 3-- was based on an agreement from last July between counsel to Mr. Moyse and counsel to Catalyst that you didn't have to produce e-mails Mr. Moyse was copied on?

MR. WINTON: Well, the e-mail correspondence last night was not in reference to communications with Vimpelcom; it was, as I understood it, a request for copies of the e-mails referenced in affidavits that said Mr. Moyse had been copied on e-mails at Catalyst relating to Wind.

MR. MILNE-SMITH: Okay.
MR. WINTON: There's an allegation or it's -- in Mr. Riley's affidavit, there's a statement that Mr. Moyse was copied on numerous e-mails, dozens of e-mails. You may not use the term "dozens", but several e-mails, let's say, relating to Wind. Those e-mails were present at Mr. Moyse's cross-examination on July 31st, 2014, and at the time, rather than introduce them into the record under some form of seal or confidentiality undertaking between the parties, it
was agreed that Mr. Moyse would admit to having received the e-mails and, on that basis, there was no need to introduce them into the record.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
424 Q. And at the time of that agreement, Wind was still in play, correct? So this is in July of 2014, Mr. Riley, Wind was still in play?
A. I believe that that's correct. I can't remember what the date of the West Face transaction was.

425 Q. That was in September 16, I believe.
A. Thank you.

426 Q. And, in fact, Catalyst had exclusivity from I believe July $23 r d$ until August 18 ? Does that sound correct?
A. That sounds correct.

427 Q. Okay. So at the time of this agreement, the negotiations between Catalyst and VimpelCom were very much confidential?
A. Yes.

428 Q. Those negotiations are no longer confidential, would you agree?
A. There may still be some vestige of confidentiality vis-a-vis us and VimpelCom. I would
have to look at that arrangement.
429 Q. Certainly concerns about
confidentiality are greatly attenuated? Greatly reduced?
A. I think that's correct, although there may be still some sensitive information in there. 430 Q. Okay. But you haven"t checked to see if there is anything still, have you?
A. I have not, I have not.

431 Q. So the reason, then, that documents relating to Catalyst's negotiation with VimpelCom have not been produced is because of what is set out in paragraph 3 of Exhibit 3, which is that they simply aren't relevant? On the first page, paragraph 3.

MR. WINTON: Well, to be fair, I think the letter says "are relevant and/or should be produced". So I think there's suggestion there that it's not just about concerns about relevancy or about whether it's proper to produce them to West Face in the context of what is complained of.

MR. MILNE-SMITH: So is it relevance and confidentiality?

MR. WINTON: Correct.
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
432
Q. Okay. I will repeat for the record
my request that Catalyst produce any evidence concerning its negotiations with Vimpelcom that support Mr. Riley's assertion in his February 18 affidavit that Catalyst and VimpelCom had negotiated everything except for a term relating to regulatory approval.

U/A MR. WINTON: I will take that under advisement.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
433
Q. And, Mr. Riley, you are aware, I take it, that West Face has produced to your counsel all e-mails it was able to retrieve from the West Face computer servers either from, to, or about Mr. Moyse?
A. To the best of my knowledge, yes.

434 Q. Okay. And you are also aware that West Face made an offer to let the independent supervising solicitor review any documents that were able to be retrieved from the West Face computer system that were created, edited, or accessed by Mr. Moyse? Were you aware of that?
A. I -- I think your question is more precise than I can answer. I think it's more -- I turn to Andrew and ask him to answer that.

435 Q. That's fine.
MR. WINTON: I believe it's in Exhibit 1 the offer is made.

Counsel, I think we need to distinguish between what West Face -- or what you and West Face say has been done versus whether or not it has actually been done. And so in saying you provided a USB drive that contains all the e-mails relating -- to/from relating to Mr. Moyse versus whether in fact that's the case, that's, of course, a matter that is at issue in this motion.

MR. MILNE-SMITH: I understand.
MR. WINTON: Okay.
MR. MILNE-SMITH: The fact I'm trying to establish is if the offer has been made. I'm asking specifically about the ISS proposal now.

MR. WINTON: Right. But I'm going back to two questions ago where you asked Mr. Riley that ...

MR. MILNE-SMITH: All e-mails were produced.

MR. WINTON: All e-mails were produced, and that's the position you are taking.

MR. MILNE-SMITH: Right.
MR. WINTON: But whether or not that is, in fact, the case is what is really at the heart of this motion.

MR. MILNE-SMITH: I understand.
MR. WINTON: Okay.
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MR. MILNE-SMITH: At least one of the issues that your client has raised.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
436
Q. But going back to my -- my question now is just a predicate to what is going to be the real question.

So the predicate is an offer was made to let the ISS review and then produce to Catalyst, under appropriate confidentiality terms, any document created, edited, or accessed by Mr. Moyse. That offer was made, correct?
A. In this letter? Is that in this
letter?
437
Q. In this letter and, in fact, also in Mr. Griffin's affidavit.
A. Yes.

438
Q. And there was no response to that offer, correct? That's the real question.
A. To the best of my knowledge, no.

439
Q. Mr. Riley, were you aware that VimpelCom, during the course of its negotiations with Catalyst, sent a draft share purchase agreement to Catalyst?
A. Yes.

440 Q. And we're going to have to do a
little bit of compare and contrast here, so bear with me. I'd like you to have your reply affidavit, specifically Exhibit $E$, and Mr. Griffin's supplementary motion record.
A. Okay.
Q. Tab 1A.
A. So what is this? What is this one?

MR. WINTON: This one is Mr. Griffin's.
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
442
Q. Right. So just to give you the context, sir, and be fair to you. Tab 1A of Mr. Griffin's affidavit.
A. This one? This one?

443 Q. Yes, correct. Is what he describes as a May 9, 2014, draft share purchase agreement sent by VimpelCom to West Face.
A. Okay.

444
Q. Okay. Now, the proposition I'm going to put to you, sir, is that -- sorry, let me get the other side of the equation clear on the record as well.

So Exhibit E to your reply affidavit is a clean and a blackline copy of a share purchase agreement sent by Catalyst to VimpelCom, correct?
A. Yes, it is. That's this one,

```
right? This one?
```

    445 Q. Correct. You are at page -- Bates
        stamp page 51.
    A. 51, yes. Yes.
    446
    Q. So the simple proposition I want to
        put to you is that -- sorry, if you want to go to
        page 165 of the record. So what you are looking at now
        is the clean copy; page 165 is the blackline.
    A. Okay.
        447
    Q. So the simple proposition I would
        put to you, sir, is that the blackline here that we are
        looking at on page 165 is a blackline against the very
        same VimpelCom draft that's at tab 1A of Mr. Griffin's
        supplementary affidavit.
    A. I can't answer that. I mean,
    that's -- I can't -- the reason I can't answer that
        question is that when you have documents that are
        some -- have, whatever, ten -- ten articles.
        \(448 \quad\) Q. Okay.
            A. In other words --
            449 Q. I understand.
            A. -- you would have to do a fairly
        thorough cross-reference between the documents.
            450 Q. I understand. So we have done
        that.
    A. Okay. Can I rely on your
diligence?
451
Q. Well, Mr. Griffin says, at
paragraph 4 of his supplementary affidavit, that:
"Exhibit E includes clean and
blackline copies of what appear to be a
Catalyst markup of a draft share
purchase agreement provided by
VimpelCom."
A. So can I -- sorry.

452
Q. So what I would ask is for --
A. Hang on. Sorry, now I'm confused, and you have got to help me.

453 Q. Yes.
A. This is a draft of May 9 th.

454
Q. Yes.
A. The blackline, which is Faskens' comments, is marked May 23 rd.

455 Q. Correct.
A. Okay. So, I'm sorry, can you ask the question again, because I may be misunderstanding your question.
$456 \quad$ Q. Okay. So let me restate it so it's hopefully clear on the record.

> I'm going to put a proposition to you.

What I'm going to ask for at the end is if you have any information or evidence to the contrary.

So the proposition is this. What's at tab 1A of Mr. Griffin's supplementary affidavit is a draft share purchase agreement sent by VimpelCom to West Face. My first proposition to you is that that very same draft was sent by VimpelCom to Catalyst.
A. I don't know. I can't -- I mean, I can't answer that question, because you are asking -you are asking me to confirm things that $I$ may not be able to prove.

457 Q. I understand.
A. Or establish, say.

458 Q. The basis on which I assert that is that Exhibit $E$ to your reply affidavit --
A. Yes.

459
Q. -- is a blackline against the very
same document that is at tab 1A of Mr. Griffin's affidavit. In other words, if you take out all the Changes shown in the blackline, what you're left with is Exhibit 1A of Mr. Griffin's affidavit.
A. And, again, I'm not trying to
argue. You would have do a line-by-line comparison.
MR. MILNE-SMITH: So if you are going to
take a contrary position at the return of the motion, I
would like to know on what basis.
MR. WINTON: Well, without getting into the nuts and bolts, $I$ just notice right away that on page 165 of the Catalyst supplementary record.

MR. MILNE-SMITH: Yes.
MR. WINTON: The red struck-out text suggests this was a draft dated May 16 th.

MR. MILNE-SMITH: As opposed to May 9.
MR. WINTON: As opposed to May 9.
MR. MILNE-SMITH: So there's one difference. If you have any others, please let me know.

THE WITNESS: The others -- that was provided during the confidentiality period, the exclusive negotiation period, I believe.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
460 Q. No. That came later.
A. No. Oh, sorry, later. Okay.
$\mathrm{U} / \mathrm{T}$
MR. WINTON: I just was bringing that to the attention. We do not -- if we intend to take that position, we will let you know.

THE WITNESS: And I'm not trying to be difficult, I'm just saying you are asking a person who -- this is what I do for a living.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
461
Q. Yes.
A. Or used to do for a living for many decades, so $I$ have learned my lesson.

462
Q. Mr. Riley, I'm not faulting you for not being able to answer this question on the spot, and I didn't mean to imply that you should. All I want to know is whether a contrary position to the proposition I have stated is going to be taken at the return of the motion, and, if so, on what basis.
A. May I ask a question?

463
Q. Yes.
A. Just for my own edification. The only thing that I'm confused by -- it's a different issue than Andrew raised. In what $I$ appended, a party to the agreement is VimpelCom.
$464 \quad$ Q. Yes.
A. In this draft of May 9th, which precedes this draft, I think, if I'm correct.
465
Q. Yes.
A. In other words, I'm looking at the ribbon at the top of the Faskens document. 466 Q. Yes.
A. VimpelCom is not a party to this agreement.

467 Q. Yes. That's one of the changes that you made. If you go to the blackline at page 165, you will see --
A. Okay. So that was an add by us.

468 Q. Right. You'll see that "and VimpelCom" has been added by Catalyst.
A. Okay. Sorry, and that's why I say I don't want to -- I don't want to -- without -without going through them and also asking some questions, I can't answer your question.

469 Q. Okay.
A. In the way you want it answered.

470
Q. That's fine. I think I've got the commitment clear on the record that if you are going to take a contrary position to the proposition I've put, you're going to let me know ahead of time and on what basis, correct?

MR. WINTON: Yes. Just to be clear, the proposition that is at tab 1 A of Mr . Griffin's affidavit is the same draft that was marked up in the blackline attached to tab 1 E of Mr. Riley's supplementary affidavit.

MR. MILNE-SMITH: Right. With the only apparent difference being the date.

MR. WINTON: Right.

The Catalyst Capital Group Inc. v. Brandon Moyse et al RILEY; JAMES on May 13, 2015

Page 111

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
471 Q. Right. So let's look at the VimpelCom form at tab 1 A of Mr . Riley's -- of Mr. Griffin's supplementary affidavit, and I want to take you to section 7.3B, as in Bravo.

Let's go off the record.
-- OFF THE RECORD --
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
472
Q. Just one thing I wanted to make clear, and I don't think I did before. We were looking at Exhibit $E$ to your affidavit, and that includes a covering e-mail dated May 24, which is copied to a number of people including Mr. Moyse?

MR. WINTON: Yes.
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
473
Q. So I take it we are in agreement that --

MR. WINTON: Tab E is May 23.
MR. MILNE-SMITH: No, no. Sorry,
Mr. Riley's reply affidavit, not Mr. Griffin.
MR. WINTON: Yes. Let's go to it.
MR. MILNE-SMITH: Okay.
MR. WINTON: Are you referring to an
e-mail from Mr. Batista?
MR. MILNE-SMITH: I am referring to --
oh, yes, May 23, not 24. I apologize.
MR. WINTON: Right.
MR. MILNE-SMITH: Yes.
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
474
Q. So I take it that was the latest draft that Mr. Moyse would have seen? That's why you included it, right?
A. I think that's correct.
Q. The day before he gave notice?
A. Yes. That's a -- I want to keep, I just want to remember, that would be a Friday, correct? 476 Q. Correct.
A. Okay. Thank you.

477
Q. That's correct. So if we go to tab 1A of Mr. Griffin's supplementary affidavit, page 36 of the record.
A. So let me just understand. This is -- you're asking me to look at an agreement dated May 9 th that was presented to West Face or it was a document that we were not in the circle on? 478
Q. Correct.
A. Okay.

479
Q. All we are doing is looking, compare and contrast here to make sure I'm not missing anything.
A. I'm more worried about me missing
something.
480
Q. So you will see section 7.3 (b)
there is a clause referring to Industry Canada approval?
A. Yes.

481
Q. So without limiting the purchaser's
obligations herein, including in section 6.5 -- sorry, I'm going to read the preamble so it makes sense. It says:
"The obligation of the parties to
complete the transaction is subject to
the following conditions which are the
benefit of all of the parties."
And then A deals with Competition Act
approval and $B$ deals with Industry Canada approval.
A. Yes.

482
Q. So what this is saying is that the transaction doesn't go ahead unless Industry Canada approves?
A. Yes. Do you mind if I look at the
definition?
483
Q. Sure. You are looking at the definition of Industry Canada approval?
A. Yes, because it was a defined term.

484 Q. For the record that's on page 12.
A. Okay. Thank you.

485
Q. Maybe you can leave that in front of you. And then if you want to pull up Exhibit E to your affidavit, it's at page 209 of the Bates stamp.
A. So this is -- this -- can I refer to this as the west Face document?

486
Q. Sure. So the West Face document means tab 1 A of Mr . Griffin's supplementary affidavit.
A. Thank you.

487
Q. So you will see Catalyst has made a few changes to the preamble of clause 7.3 substituting purchaser and the seller for parties?
A. Can I just, again, can I look at this?

488
Q. Sure.
A. So the only parties to this agreement -- just -- were the purchasers, so whoever the purchasers, and Globalive.

489 Q. Yes.
A. So here who was defined as the seller? We're presumably the purchaser.

490
Q. The seller is Globalive. VimpelCom is a separate defined term.
A. Okay. So this was --

MR. WINTON: Page 177 of the Catalyst supplementary record, the defined term "seller" is the meaning specified in the recitals to this agreement, and if we -- recitals are where? Are on page --

THE WITNESS: Sorry.
MR. WINTON: -- 169 --
MR. MILNE-SMITH: Correct.
MR. WINTON: -- of the agreement. And the seller is defined as Globalive Investment Holdings Corp.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
491
Q. Correct. Sir, my simple question is the Industry Canada approval clause doesn't change, correct?
A. I'd have to go back and understand why VimpelCom was not involved in that ability to waive the condition. I just -- just don't know.

492 Q. VimpelCom is not included, not
included on either -- in either of the drafts. Because it's not a party to the West Face document and it's not a purchaser or seller in the Catalyst draft.
A. I agree with -- I just can't -mine is an intellectual point, not anything more than $I$ can't understand why VimpelCom wouldn't have been in that circle. That's -- it's a question.

493 Q. My simple point is that there's no change made to the Industry Canada approval clause?
A. Correct.

Although you are asking -- and I only say this, you are asking me a question about a document that if $I$ ever read it, I haven't looked at it in a long time.

494 Q. Okay. That's fine.
A. So there may be a nuance in there.

495
Q. Here's my simple point, and I'm happy to take this by way of undertaking. On my review of Exhibit E, I don't see Catalyst adding anything novel about Industry Canada approval or regulatory risk to the draft agreement that it sends back to VimpelCom. And if I'm wrong, I would like you to tell me where it is.
A. No. On the wording of this agreement $I$ don't see that.

496 Q. Okay. So just to take stock then, as of May 24 when Mr. Moyse announces his departure, VimpelCom had proposed a regulatory approval condition?
A. Hmm-hmm.

497
Q. You have to say yes. Okay?
A. Sorry, yes.

498
Q. And Catalyst have not demanded any
additional regulatory conditions in its black line it sent back on May 23?
A. Not in the blackline draft.

499 Q. And you are not aware of it sending such a condition anywhere else?
A. There were conversations at the time which I was not a party to, but I know it was a subject of discussion internally as to whether we had to expand what -- what the aspects of that consent, that consent should be.
500
Q. Okay.
A. Which would not be unusual, when you are at that early stage, to see where you end up in the negotiations.
$501 \quad Q$. But certainly nothing had been communicated to VimpelCom?
A. Not to my knowledge.

502
Q. And you're not aware of Mr. Moyse being involved in high-level discussions like that?
A. Oh, that -- he would be involved in -- he would be aware of our concern about, as I say, going back to the presentation that he was a party to. 503 Q. Right.
A. That would be part of that whole

504 Q. Okay. But nothing communicated to
Vimpelcom on that front?
A. To my knowledge, no.

505 Q. Okay. Mr. Moyse stopped working at
West Face on July 16, 2014, as part of a consent order. You saw that in the discussions with Mr. Borg-Olivier this morning?
A. Yes.

506 Q. And as of that date, I take it you have and Catalyst has no evidence that West Face was willing to drop a condition of regulatory approval?
A. Not to my knowledge.

507 Q. Okay. And on July 23rd catalyst earned the exclusive right to negotiate with Vimpelcom for the sale of its interest in Wind; is that right?
A. I --

508
Q. You will take my word for it?
A. I will take your word for it.

509
Q. Okay.
A. Because otherwise I have to go back and double-check the date.

510 Q. That's fine. I take it I'm right that Catalyst has not commenced proceedings against VimpelCom for breach of that exclusivity obligation?
A. No, we have not.

511 Q. There is no suggestion here that
VimpelCom breached exclusivity?
A. I wouldn't say that.

512
Q. You haven't sent a demand letter to VimpelCom?
A. We have not at this time.

513
Q. You haven't made any allegation to VimpelCom in that regard?
A. Not to my knowledge.

However, when a contract is breached, as
I recall, there's two -- you can -- under the theory of Lumly and Guy, and I'm not trying to play lawyer, you can go after one of two parties, the party breaching or the party inducing a breach.

514
Q. There's been no pleading of inducing breach of contract?
A. There's been no pleading.

515
Q. If we go back to your original -- I shouldn't say original, because that's 2014. We go to your February 8, 2015, affidavit.
A. Sorry, 2015? You said 2008 and I was nervous.
516
Q. Sorry, 2015. I apologize.
A. That's okay.
517
Q. February 8, 2015.

MR. WINTON: Can I put the others away?
MR. MILNE-SMITH: For now, yes.
THE WITNESS: There are a lot of dates that float around.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
518 Q. Yes, it's good to be clear.
So if you go to your affidavit at tab 3,
paragraph 45, and we've touched on this before but I want to make sure I have covered it off. A. Sorry, this is my affidavit,
correct?
519 Q. Your affidavit, correct,
February 18, 2015.
A. Yes.
$520 \quad$ Q. You say:
"During the exclusivity period,
Catalyst and VimpelCom were able to negotiate almost all of the terms of the potential sale of Wind Mobile to Catalyst. The only point over which the parties could not agree was regulatory approval risk. Catalyst wanted to ensure that its purchase was conditional on receiving certain regulatory concessions from Industry Canada, but

Vimpelcom would not agree to the conditions Catalyst sought."

So I take it we are talking here about regulatory concessions that were not in the draft on which Mr. Moyse was copied on May 23rd appearing at Exhibit E to your reply affidavit?
A. It's not in that agreement, no. We have touched on that before.

521 Q. Okay. What were the conditions that Catalyst demanded?
A. We have touched on them before and I don't want to be and I'm not trying to be a hundred percent these are the only ones, but it had to do with transferability of Spectrum --

522 Q. Okay.
A. -- in certain events. It also had to do with the ability to create a wholesale as opposed to a retail --

523

524 2014, and call it August 18 when exclusivity ended in 2014, nobody at Catalyst communicated with Mr. Moyse and told him that Catalyst was demanding those conditions?
A. That is correct.

525
Q. In your reply affidavit at
paragraph 41.
A. Is that the same affidavit I'm
looking at here?
526 Q. No. That's the May 1 affidavit.
They have the same subject covered in two affidavits so we have to flip back and forth.
A. Okay. That's fine.

MR. WINTON: Which paragraph?
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
527
Q. Paragraph 41.
A. This is the reply affidavit to Moyse? Or what is the affidavit I'm applying to?

528
Q. You are replying to Moyse and Griffin.
A. Okay. Thank you.

MR. WINTON: I just want to show you
those pages.
MR. MILNE-SMITH: That's fine.
529
Q. So you see paragraph 41 you are referring to information and belief --
A. Yes.

530
Q. -- you obtained from Mr. DeAlba?
A. Yes.

531 Q. I take it this is something you
were not aware of at the time you swore your February 18 affidavit? It's not referred to.
A. No. I mean, I can't recall why it would have been omitted from there. I ...

532 Q. Okay. So this refers to final but unsigned paper work for a transaction to acquire Wind.
A. Yes.

533 Q. I'd like production of that final but unsigned paper work?

U/A MR. WINTON: Take that under advisement.
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
$534 \quad$ Q. And would that final but unsigned paper work have included the regulatory conditions that we've been referring to?
A. I would have to say, subject to seeing it, yes.

535 Q. Okay. And paragraph 41 also refers to a conference calls with representatives of Industry Canada?
A. We is this now?

536 Q. Paragraph 41.
A. Paragraph 41, yes.

537
Q. So this is in August of 2014, a conference call with representatives of Industry

```
Canada?
```

A. Yes.

538 Q. And obviously Mr. Moyse would have no way of knowing the contents of that conversation?
A. He would not.

Unless he bugged --sorry, strike that.
I don't want to --
539 Q. That's fine. I understand what was said in jest and you are not making an allegation.
A. Exactly.

540
Q. I would like any -- in addition to the final but unsigned paper work referred to, I'd like any documentary evidence demonstrating that Vimpelcom was prepared to accept those terms. U/A MR. WINTON: Take that under advisement.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
541
Q. Okay. When did this call with -are there any records that reflect when exactly the call with Industry Canada took place?
A. Not, not -- I would have to -- I would have to confirm with Mr. DeAlba to figure out the date.

542 Q. If you could consult either diaries or maybe long-distance phone records --
A. Yes.

not given approval?
MR. WINTON: You are asking for
Catalyst's understanding?
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
548 Q. Correct. And if any VimpelCom approval had been communicated, I'd like to see evidence of it.

So take that under advisement?
$\mathrm{U} / \mathrm{T}$
MR. WINTON: No. I will give you that undertaking.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
549 Q. Wonderful. Paragraph 42 you go on to say that the anticipated deal with VimpelCom was conditional on Industry Canada approval and the granting of certain regulatory concessions to a Catalyst-owned Wind, and in Catalyst's mind would make it easier for a fourth national carrier to succeed. I take it those are the same regulatory concessions we've been discussing?
A. Yes.

550
Q. And those weren't in the May 23
draft that Mr. Moyse saw?
A. No, but, again, it would have been -- I think it was in the context of the PowerPoint that I have raised it.

551 Q. I understand. And to your
knowledge, West Face has never asked -- never asked for any such concessions?
A. I don't know what concessions they
asked for.
552
Q. You're not aware of them ever asking for those kinds of concession?
A. No. But just to be clear, I have no way of knowing that. Industry Canada would never share that under kind of information. Counsel would never share that kind of information and West Face would not share that information to my knowledge.

553 Q. I understand.
A. So there is no source for that.

554 Q. Did VimpelCom ever ask for a break fee?
A. I don't know.

555 Q. Could you --
A. Is it in the draft?

556 Q. Could you please make inquiries and advise?
$\mathrm{U} / \mathrm{T}$
MR. WINTON: Yes.
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
557
Q. I would also like to know that if VimpelCom did ask for a break fee, I'd like to know
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obviously its precise terms and whether Catalyst agreed to it?

U/T MR. WINTON: That I will take under advisements.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
558
Q. Mr. Riley, do you know if Catalyst ever had committed financing for its proposed transaction to acquire VimpelCom's interest in Wind?
A. Can I defer for a minute just to explain the fund structure? We would call for capital. 559 Q. Yes.
A. And we do have a line of credit that we could use in the interim. so our access, our -- our ability to access funds is under our limited partnership agreements. 560
Q. Did your line of credit -- was the available balance --
A. I don't know.

561 Q. You don't know whether it would have covered --
A. I -- you know, I don't know.

562
Q. Okay. So it would have then been subject to a capital call that would have to be approved by the various investors in Catalyst?
A. No, there's no approval rights. If
we call Capital, they are required under the LPA to
provide that capital.
563 Q. The limited partners?
A. Correct.
564
Q. You'd never made that call though,
call for capital?
A. To my knowledge, no. I mean, I
would have to look back at the calls at that period.
565 Q. Right.
A. In other words, I don't know
because we call capital on a fairly frequent basis.
566 Q. Okay.
A. And what we were calling capital
for at that time, we may or may not have made any
capital calls at that time. I just -- I can't answer
that question.
567 Q. And you hadn't gotten far enough
along in that transaction to actually make that capital
call with respect to Wind?
A. No. We would make that capital call when we were ready to close. And I suspect, given the availability -- if we had our capital call facility, which is a line of credit, available we would use that first, just to manage cash flows.

568 Q. Okay. West Face ultimately made an

The Catalyst Capital Group Inc v. Brandon Moyse et al RILEY, JAMES on May 13, 2015
offer to close without any condition related to
transfer of ownership of voting shares held by AAL.
Are you aware of that?
A. Yes.

569 Q. And that offer went in on
August 7th, 2014, according to Mr. Griffin?
A. Yes. Well, I'm going based on what he said in his affidavit.

570 Q. Correct. And you're not aware of any evidence to the contrary?
A. No.

571 Q. And I take it we are agreed that Mr. Moyse obviously had been gone from West Face for three weeks by then?
A. He left on July 16th.

572
Q. Yes.
A. And it sounds like three weeks to me.

573 Q. July 16 to August 7 is roughly three weeks, right?
A. Yes. I had to do the math.

574
Q. And Catalyst never agreed to drop all regulatory conditions, correct?
A. Not that I can recall.

575 Q. And it was never part of Catalyst's

```
strategy to engage in a two-part structure to the
transaction whereby VimpelCom only transferred
nonvoting shares at the first stage of the transaction?
That was never contemplated by --
    A. I was not -- that's a very
technical point in a deal, so I can't answer that
question.
    5 7 6
                            Q. Okay. If you can advise by way of
undertaking whether Catalyst ever engaged or considered
that structure and, if so, produce evidence of having
done so?
    A. Yes.
U/T MR. WINTON: Yes.
    BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
    577
    Q. I also take it it was never part of
Catalyst's strategy to waive any and all conditions for
regulatory approval or regulatory concessions?
    A. Not to my knowledge.
    5 7 8 ~ Q . ~ O k a y . ~ A n d ~ i t ~ w a s ~ a l s o ~ n e v e r ~ p a r t
of Catalyst's strategy to give VimpelCom a
representation backed by an indemnity that no
regulatory approval was required for the transfer of
its shares?
                    A. Sorry, I would -- not to my
knowledge.
```

579
there.
-- LUNCHEON RECESS AT 12:54 --
-- RESUMING AT 2:03 --
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
580
Q. Mr. Riley, just a few points to close off from this morning. We talked about your role at Catalyst. I just want to understand the scope of Catalyst.

I believe in a previous cross-examination -- sorry, take a step back. So we know there are three partners?
A. Correct.

581
Q. We have heard of that already. I believe in a previous cross-examination, you refer to there being one or two vice-presidents?
A. There are currently three vice-presidents.

582
Q. Three vice-presidents. And how many analysts or associates?
A. There are two right now, and I can't remember whether they're associates. There are at least one analyst, one associate. I think one is an associate, one is an analyst.

583 Q. Okay. And I read an article that

```
appeared shortly after you started Catalyst in 2011,
and it said that, at the time, there were over 25
professionals. What do you recall as being the -- sort
of the comparable head count at the time in 2011?
    A. Three.
    584
    Q. Okay.
    A. I don't know where that number -- I
        would have to see the article. I don't know where that
        number came from.
    585
    Q. That's fine.
                            A. That might include -- I'd have to
go back.
    586
    Q. That might include support staff?
    A. Yeah.
    587
                            Q. Right. What are the current assets
        under management for Catalyst?
            A. It would be in the order of
```

        4 billion, 4.5.
        588
                            Q. And how is that comprised? I know
        there are sort of the five funds and they're in various
        stages. How is that number calculated?
            A. By assets under administration.
        I'm sorry, I don't know what -- what are trying to get
        to, maybe?
            589
            Q. So which of the five funds would be
    comprised in that?
A. In that number?

590 Q. Yes.
A. Fund 2, fund 3, fund 4 -- oh, I'm sorry, there's a parallel fund to fund 2, and then fund 3, and then fund 4, and fund 4 parallel.

591 Q. Okay. But not fund 5?
A. No. Fund 5 is in just the course of raising funds.

592 Q. Okay. Thank you.
You talked this morning about a capital
call. What is the notice period for a capital call?
A. Ten days.

593 Q. Ten days. And you never sought outside financing?
A. Separate, no.

594 Q. Okay. Just the line of credit availability that you referred to, which was never drawn on?
A. Correct.

595
Q. Now, at the time that negotiations broke down or at least that exclusivity expired with VimpelCom.
A. Yes.

596 Q. I take it that you didn!t

```
disclose -- Catalyst didn't disclose to anybody outside
Catalyst why those negotiations had broken down?
A. Not to my knowledge.
597
Q. And you are not aware of VimpelCom disclosing or anybody on behalf of VimpelCom disclosing?
A. No, not to my knowledge.
598
Q. Okay. And so at that time --
A. Sorry, and, again, when you say
"outside", do you mean outside of professionals that might have been involved in the matter?
599 Q. That's what I meant, yes, and thank you for clarifying. So obviously, for example, VimpelCom had UBS working for them?
A. Correct.
600
Q. And they had lawyers working for them?
A. Yes.
601
Q. So outside of VimpelCom, nobody at
VimpelCom or their professional advisors, to your knowledge, disclosed to any third party?
A. To my knowledge.
602
Q. Okay. And so when exclusivity expired, all of a sudden, anybody could bid for Wind, correct?
```

A. Yes.

603 Q. And I think we discussed this
before. It had been known throughout 2014 that getting to the finish line, as it were, was an important thing for VimpelCom?
A. Yes.

604 Q. And so it would have been a sensible thing for any interested bidder to drop as many conditions as possible to get to that finish line, correct?
A. I disagree with that. I think you have to always look at what conditions make sense in the context of what you are prepared to do.

605
Q. That's a fair point. So you don't want to drop so many conditions that it's no longer a good deal for you?
A. Correct.
606. Q. Because Catalyst determined that dropping conditions wasn't a good deal?
A. I think it was our conditions were important to us. Whether we would have dropped them in certain circumstances, I can't -- it's a hypothetical. 607 Q. Okay. But you certainly weren't willing to drop them at the time?
A. Yes.

608 Q. And presumably, if presented with the same choice today, you wouldn't drop them again?
A. Don't know that.

609
Q. All other things being equal, you are not aware of anything that would have changed?
A. Well, actually, there's a lot of things have changed in telecom, so I can't answer. 610 Q. In telecom. I see.
A. I'm not trying to be argumentative as much as I'm saying your question asks too much. 611
Q. The landscape just changed?
A. The landscape has changed
dramatically.
612
Q. Did you know back in August, on

August 18, when exclusivity expired, did you know that West Face was interested in Wind?
A. I don't know the answer to that.

613 Q. Okay. Let's talk about Callidus.
You note in your reply affidavit -- so this is the May 1, 2015, affidavit. At paragraph 7.

MR. WINTON: Counsel, that's fine.
MR. MILNE-SMITH: That's fine.
THE WITNESS: Sorry, where am I, please?
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
614 Q. Paragraph 7.
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that Callidus released its 2014 year-end financials on March 31st, correct?
A. Correct.

622 Q. So reducing the short position also occurred after Callidus' -- release of Callidus' financials?
A. Correct.

623
Q. And I think it's fair to say that Callidus did not meet analysts' predicted earnings?
A. I can't remember. I just -- I don't recall.

$$
624
$$

Q. You'd agree that --
A. I just -- I can't recall whether we had met their expectations or not.
625
Q. Okay. You'd agree that the coverage of Callidus that is referred to in paragraph 7 only came after West Face filed materials at court relating to Callidus, correct?
A. What was the date of that? Was it March 15th? The date of the affidavit?

$$
626
$$

Q. Mr. Griffin's affidavit was sworn March 7, 2015?
A. Okay.

MR. WINTON: But I seem to recall,
counsel, there was a bit of a brief lull before --
between the time he was sworn and a copy of the affidavit sent to us and the date that you actually filed it. If you recall, there was some e-mails that may even be in the record or we discussed some e-mails relate -- there was some e-mail traffic between us about the filing of the record.

MR. MILNE-SMITH: Yes, but the BNN article comes out on March 30th.

MR. WINTON: Correct. And I believe that the date is March 13 th, roughly, is when the record was filed, just to make sure we are accurate in the record.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
627
Q. So either way, the coverage only comes out after the West Face materials are filed with the court?
A. Yes, yup, yes.

628
Q. And it's true, isn't it, that the first time the word "Callidus" appeared in this litigation was when the funds filed their amended notice of motion on February 6th, 2015, correct?
A. Hmm, I have no --

MR. WINTON: Why don't I show the
amended notice of motion to --
THE WITNESS: Okay.

MR. MILNE-SMITH: Okay.
THE WITNESS: This is February?
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
629
Q. This is February?

MR. WINTON: I mean, if we're going to be -- I don't want the witness to be put to a memory test if I can --

MR. MILNE-SMITH: No, I'm happy for you to answer.

MR. WINTON: Fine. Then the issue -- or at least the mention of Callidus did come up in the record with respect to -- during the cross-examination of Mr. Dea and Mr. Moyse back in July in -- based on the March 27 th e-mail or March 26-27th e-mail exchange between Mr. Dea and Mr. Moyse. There was a question from Mr. Dea about Callidus that was the subject of some discussion.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
630 Q. Right. There was a -- there was a question -- I think Mr. Dea asked Mr. Moyse what was the name of that entity that had been modelled after a Cerberus entity or something like that, right?
A. I think it would be Callidus modelled after -- sorry, what would be the Cerberus entity that Catalyst was modelled after.

631 Q. okay.
A. I suspect is the question.

MR. WINTON: Right. And just because your question asked the first time the word "Callidus" appeared in this litigation, ellipses.

I'm trying to make sure -- just to respond accurately that, if he agrees with that, that's not technically what --

MR. MILNE-SMITH: Okay. No, that's very fair. So to the best of both of our recollections as of right now, the only time "Callidus" appeared was in the context of that e-mail where they were asking about the Cerberus connection?

MR. WINTON: And questions in the transcripts relating to that e-mail.

MR. MILNE-SMITH: Right. That's
correct.
MR. WINTON: Okay.
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
632 Q. So I take it it's fair to say that there was no allegation made by West Face in respect of Callidus before February 6th? It's not something that West Face was raising?
A. Callidus?

633 Q. Yes.
A. Not to my knowledge.

634
Q. Okay. Now, your affidavit dated

February 18 elaborated on the callidus accusation made in the notice of motion dated February 6th, correct?

MR. WINTON: Can you take him to where in the affidavit you are referring to.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
635
Q. Sure. So that's in tab 3 of the motion record.

MR. WINTON: Yes.
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
636
Q. And starting at paragraph 70. So feel free to review it, but you can review it with this context. My question is that the basic accusation here is that Mr . Moyse took confidential information about Callidus and gave it to West Face, correct?
A. Yes.

637
Q. And West Face hadn't made any effort to introduce evidence in this proceeding about Callidus, its strengths or weaknesses, until after you had filed your affidavit on February 18, 2015, correct?
A. I'm not sure I'm following you, Counsel. I just -- if you could walk me through it a little bit.

638 Q. Sure. So the February 18 affidavit
that you filed said that Callidus confidential information was given by Mr. Moyse to West Face, correct?
A. Yes.

639
Q. And West Face, in its responding materials, included evidence about what information it had about Callidus and where it came from, correct?
A. That is correct.

640
Q. And West Face had never tried to lead evidence like that before your February 18 affidavit, correct?
A. No, but we had -- I think it was -we had requested of West Face several times to provide the information we refer to as the November, 2014, whisper campaign.

641 Q. But that was entirely outside the context of the litigation, correct?
A. Of this litigation?

642
Q. Yes.
A. Yes, because at that time, we hadn't seen anything that would suggest where you could imply the source of that information was.

643 Q. Right. So we now know that starting in -- we know this based on Mr. Griffin's testimony, that starting in mid-October, West Face
was -- started to accumulate a short position on Callidus, correct?
A. Yes, without having undertaken research at that time.

644
Q. Well, we have a disagreement about that, but it will be for a judge to interpret Mr. Griffin's evidence.
A. Yes.

645
Q. The original injunction motion, $I$ believe, the -- not the interim but the interlocutory, was argued on October 27, 2014, before Justice Lederer?
A. Yes, that's -- yes.

646
Q. And there was no effort made at
that time by West Face to introduce any information about Callidus or the strengths of Callidus' financial condition?
A. In that motion?

647
Q. Correct.
A. No.

648
Q. And there was no effort thereafter to introduce information about Callidus until after you swore your February 18 affidavit, correct?

MR. WINTON: I think he already answered that.

THE WITNESS: I think I have answered
that, haven't I?
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
649 Q. And the answer is "yes", correct?
A. Yes.

650 Q. Okay. And I take it Callidus wasn't raising money in the public markets at any time since October, 2014, was it?
A. No.

651
Q. I believe we are agreed, but let me be sure. Mr. Moyse never worked for Callidus?
A. No, but at the time he was -- at the time he was with Catalyst, callidus and the funds occupied the same space, and there was no partition. 652 Q. I understand. They had different computer systems?
A. Yes, they had different computer systems.

653
Q. And you conducted your -- people on behalf of Catalyst, the funds, conducted forensic reviews of his computer both at Catalyst and his home computer?
A. We didn't conduct a forensic on his home computer. That was through the ISS.

654
Q. Through the ISS.
A. We did review his computer, and
that's when we started our action.
655 Q. Okay. And in your reply affidavit,
that's the May 1 affidavit, you point to various pieces
of information that you say West Face got wrong about Callidus.
A. Yes.

656
Q. You say it's inaccurate?
A. Yes. Could I look at the -- sorry, can you flip to the page, just if we could, please.

657
Q. Sure. I'm not talking about
anything in particular right now --
A. Okay.

658
Q. -- but I'm just summarizing generally.
A. I think I set out three possible examples.

659
Q. Correct. But the allegation you made is one of inaccuracy, correct?
A. Yes. Can I just see what I --

660
Q. Sure.
A. May I just take a moment to read these paragraphs?

661 Q. By all means.
A. Thank you.

Yes.

662 Q. So in your reply affidavit, you don't point to anything about callidus that you say was based on confidential information, correct?
A. My concern is that, in order to conduct the type of research that West Face purported to undertake, he would be guided by confidential information. That's my -- that's my allegation, I guess.

663
Q. Okay. But you haven't, in your affidavit, pointed to one fact that West Face has put forward that you say was based on confidential information?
A. Well, I do, because I say that the names of the companies involved would be I think based on confidential information.

664 Q. Well, West Face has put in an affidavit of Mr . Griffin that specifies for every single borrower, it has identified from Callidus the source of that information. You are aware of that from Mr. Griffin's affidavit?
A. Yes.

665 Q. And I take it you are not able to point to one fact in Mr. Griffin's affidavit with respect to Callidus that came from a nonpublic source?
A. I would have to look back through
his affidavit. I have not looked at the report on that basis.

666 Q. Okay. Well, you understood that the issue in this proceeding --
A. Yes, correct.

667
Q. -- was whether or not West Face had confidential information about Callidus?
A. Yes, and I'm starting with the names.

668
Q. Okay. And you read Mr. Griffin's affidavit with that purpose in mind?
A. Yes.

669
Q. And in reading that affidavit, you don't recall coming across a single piece of information that could be traced to a nonpublic source?
A. I would have to go back and look at his whole affidavit again, because there were extensive materials.

670 Q. But in reading it for that purpose and in that context, you don't recall coming across anything?
A. I tried to replicate his searches, and I wasn't able to replicate them to the degree of specificity that he was able to do so.

671 Q. But you saw that he produced
exhibits documenting every single fact, correct?
A. After the fact.

672
Q. Okay. And all of the exhibits that are in Mr. Griffin's affidavit are from public sources, correct? We are agreed on that much?
A. I think that's probably correct.

673
Q. Okay. And if someone were to have confidential information from Catalyst, then --
A. From Catalyst or Callidus? Sorry,
that's why $I$ just --
674 Q. Sorry, no, you are right.
A. Sorry, I want to -- I will keep
doing that, because you are better off using "the funds" or "Callidus".

675 Q. Let's say Callidus.
A. Yes.

676
Q. So if someone had confidential
information from Callidus --
A. Or about Callidus.

677 Q. -- or about Callidus, then it would
be correct, right? You don't maintain inaccurate information about Callidus?
A. No. No, we do not.

678 Q. Right. Okay. So to the extent, then, that you are pointing to inaccuracies in

Mr. Griffin's information, that can't have come from a confidential source?
A. I think that's correct.

679
Q. Okay. I'd like to look at

Exhibit A to your May 1 reply affidavit.
MR. WINTON: It's the short chart?
MR. MILNE-SMITH: Yes.
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
680
Q. So this shows that in October and November of 2014 the share price was above $\$ 20$ ?
A. Yes. Let me just check the bar graph. Yes, yeah, okay, thank you, yup.

681 Q. And I think it's fair to say that the vast majority of the short interest came during this period when the share price was above $\$ 20$ ?
A. Yes.

682
Q. And once the share price came down in the $\$ 16$ range in early December, the short interest, it's fair to say, petered out? At least the short interest you were able to track?
A. This is taken off a Bloomberg
screen. This is not -- it's nothing --
683 Q. I understand.
A. No rocket science involved.

MR. WINTON: What do you mean by
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```
"petered out"?
                            BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
6 8 4
    Q. It means it --
    A. And nobody increased their short
    position.
    6 8 5
    Q. Correct.
    A. There's little blips in March.
    6 8 6 ~ Q . ~ R i g h t . ~ B u t ~ b e t w e e n ~ e a r l y ~ D e c e m b e r ~
    and March, the short interest stays not completely but
    relatively flat?
    MR. WINTON: I'm just pointing out the
        dots on the chart to assist Mr. Riley.
                            BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
        6 8 7
            Q. Correct.
                            A. Sorry, and I'm just trying to pick
        the dates off the bottom. There's too much information
        on this chart.
            Yes, I agree with that statement.
        6 8 8
                            Q. Okay. And then in -- I think you
        said in April, between March 30 and April 14, you see
        some reducing of the short position?
            A. Yes.
        6 8 9
                            Q. Some reduction in the short
        position?
```

            A. Yes. No, you can see -- you can
    see it over on the right-hand side of that chart.
690 Q. Right. And this stock price chart
starts in October, because that's when the short interest began?
A. Correct.

691 Q. So if you go, then, to Exhibit B.
A. Okay.

692
Q. This includes a very small stock chart, but is it fair to say this would appear to be from the IPO up through the date of the article, which is March 30?
A. I apologize, I can't see -- there are dates at the bottom that I can't make out. 693 Q. Yes. The first line is --
A. Yes, this would run through July to -- I actually can't read the dates.

694 Q. Right. The point is it starts below -- it starts before July, 2014?
A. Yes. 695 Q. So that would be going back to the April, 2014, IPO?
A. Yes.

696 Q. Okay.
A. Sorry, what date did you say?

April, 2014.

697 Q. April, 2014, yes. I'm sorry if I misspoke.
A. Yes, yes. That's okay.

698
Q. The IPO price was $\$ 14$, correct?
A. Yes.

699
Q. And the shorting occurred, we can see, when the callidus stock was at its peak, around October of 2014?
A. No, the peak I think was in August.

I think.
700 Q. Okay. I don't want to quibble
about the exact --
A. Yeah. I think it was in August.

The peak was in August.
701 Q. But you'd agree that in October the price was still -- sorry, no, that can't be right. If you look in August on this share price chart, it's barely above 20, and then as you get into September/October, it's well above 23.
A. Sorry, which chart are you looking at?

702
Q. I'm on Exhibit B still.

MR. WINTON: Page 16. Right?
MR. MILNE-SMITH: Yes.
THE WITNESS: Sorry, can we look back at
this?
MR. WINTON: This only starts October 1. THE WITNESS: Oh, okay. Got you.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
703 Q. Right. So I'm going before
Exhibit A.
MR. WINTON: This is the October line.
THE WITNESS: Yes. So October would appear to be somewhere between 20 and 25 .

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
704
Q. Right.
A. Is that what you said -- the point you are trying to make? Assuming this is correct. I mean, it's a --

705 Q. Assuming this is correct, then October 14 -- October, 2014, the stock price is at or near its peak?
A. Yes.

706
Q. Okay.

MR. WINTON: I think what Mr. Riley is referring to is, just prior to October, there seems to be a slightly higher peak.

THE WITNESS: And that's why I think that occurred in August. It's hard to extrapolate what the dates are from this chart.

MR. WINTON: Late August or early
September.
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
707
Q. It's at or near the peak?
A. Yes. Somewhere between July and October, it was near the peak.

708 Q. Right. So the short interest only began when the price was roughly 50 percent higher than the IPO price?
A. Yes. No -- yes. Sorry.

709
Q. Yes. 14 up above 20 ?
A. I had to do the math.

710
Q. So you say that West Face's short selling was based on nonpublic confidential information about Callidus disclosed to it by Moyse?
A. Well, no, I think -- I think that's not what I'm saying, precisely. I think what I'm saying is they discovered names, purported to do research on those names, and yet didn't -- weren't as fulsome in their research as they could have been. So I think there's two aspects to it: How did they find out the names, because we are very careful about that, and what did they say about those names. There's two issues in there.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
711
Q. Okay. Given what you have said about the names, our position is that every single one of the names that West Face was able to identify has been traced to a public source which is attached to an exhibit to Mr. Griffin's affidavit. If you have any evidence to the contrary, if you have any evidence that one of the documents that attached is nonpublic or you can show me an identified borrower that cannot be traced to a public document, I would like to know about it before the motion.

MR. WINTON: I think the issue here,
Counsel, is there is a difference between identifying a document that is, at least in theory, public and how that document was found or how one knew to look for that document. And so it's not evidence you'll be hearing, but I will just be fair and to make sure there is no surprise. Given the question you've asked, there will be argument as to whether or not it's reasonable to suggest that the evidence in Mr. Griffin's affidavit is, in fact, the basis upon which West Face discovered of the names was callidus borrowers.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
712 Q. Okay. I appreciate you clarifying what you will be relying on at the motion.

```
                    -- RECESS AT 2:29 --
    -- RESUMING AT 2:32 --
```

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
713
Q. So the only nonpublic -- the only confidential information you say was taken by Moyse and given to West Face relates to the identity of borrowers?
A. Yes.

714
Q. Relating to Callidus?
A. At least that's from what I can
tell. There may be others -- there may -- there may be other information, but that's ...

715 Q. Would it have been the practice of Callidus to carry out intellectual property registration at the time that its loans were initiated?
A. Depends on what the collateral was.

716
Q. To the extent the collateral included IP?
A. Uhm-hmm.

717 Q. You have to say "yes".
A. Yes. Sorry.

718
Q. So to the extent that an IP registration was done at all, it would have been done at the initiation of a loan?
A. Yes.

719 Q. And that --
A. Or contemporaneous with the loan.

720
Q. Contemporaneous. And that would be
in the public domain?
A. Yes.

721
Q. Okay.
A. However -- may I go -- when I tried
to do those searches, I couldn't find it using the lender's name; I could only find it using the borrower's name.

722 Q. But you understand that the
intellectual property registrations are public
information?
A. Absolutely.

723 Q. And some people may be better at searching than you?
A. That could be.

724
Q. Okay. Are you familiar with a company called Veritas?
A. Yes, I am.

725
Q. You are aware that they are an independent market research company?
A. They purport to be an independent research company.

726 Q. They aren't taking the position --
they aren't making investments on stocks?
A. I don't know. I don't know how
they make -- I don't know how their model works, whether they are paid to produce their research and how they are paid for producing their research.
727
Q. Okay. The position they have taken, publicly, at least, is that they do not make investments; they conduct research, correct?
A. Okay.

728
Q. You agree with that?
A. I will take -- if that's what you are saying that's publicly said.

729 Q. Well, I'd also like to know what -your knowledge of them about how they have been marketed to the public. Do you have any awareness?
A. No.

730
Q. Okay. I take it they would have no access to Callidus confidential information?
A. They shouldn't.

731
Q. Okay. And you are aware, of course, that they published a report on Callidus dated April 16, 2015?
A. If you could show me the report again, but $I$ think I am aware of the report.

732 Q. Sure. So let's mark this as the
next -- well, sorry, let me ask you. Have you seen this report before?
A. Yes, I have.

733
Q. So this is --

MR. WINTON: This one is highlighted.
Do you want to hand that back.
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
734
Q. Can I trade?
A. Can I look at this?

735
Q. Well, we're going to be going to the passages.
A. This is the exhibit.

736 Q. We are going to go to the same passages, so this will help me get there quicker.
A. Okay.

MR. MILNE-SMITH: So this is a document
entitled "Accounting Alerts! Callidus Capital
Corporation" dated April 16, 2015.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
EXHIBIT NO. 4: Document entitled
"Accounting Alerts! Callidus Capital
Corporation" dated April 16, 2015
THE WITNESS: Can you tell me what date
April 16 was?

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
737
Q. What day of the week?
A. What day of the week. Was it a

Thursday?
738
Q. Just a second. April 16, 2015, was
a Thursday, yes.
A. Thank you.

MR. WINTON: This is Exhibit 4, I
believe?
MR. MILNE-SMITH: I think that's right.
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
739
Q. Flip over to the second page of the exhibit but it's marked page 1 at the top.
A. Okay. Sorry. Yes. I'm there.

740
Q. So you'll see, at the bottom paragraph, it states that:
"The analysis and estimates included herein are based on our interpretation of publicly available information and applicable accounting standards."
A. Uhm-hmm, yes.

741
Q. And you have no evidence on which to dispute that statement?
A. Not currently.

742 Q. And it says:
"Management has yet to provide responses to our questions."

Were you aware that Veritas had made inquiries of Callidus?
A. The only inquiry that $I$ was aware of was on March 31, when we were releasing our annual statements, that they had launched a call in to our communications officer.

743 Q. And no response was provided?
A. No. To my knowledge, no.

744
Q. And if you go up to the third paragraph on page 1 .
A. Sorry, can I -- it's not -- can we go off the record for a second?

MR. MILNE-SMITH: Sure.
-- OFF THE RECORD --
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
745
Q. So the date of this report is obviously April 16 and, therefore, when Veritas said that there had not been a response to their questions, that was as of April 16, 2015, correct?
A. That is correct.

746 Q. Okay. And has there subsequently been any communications with Veritas?
A. There have been communications to
say that there are a number of misstatements in their report and that they should be aware that we consider that to be defamatory.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
747
Q. Okay. And will you produce any correspondence between Veritas and Catalyst or anybody on behalf of Catalyst?

U/A MR. WINTON: I will take that under advisement.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
748
Q. Okay. If you go up to the third paragraph on this same page 1.
A. Sorry.

749
Q. You see it says:
"Our analysis indicates that investor concerns are well-founded."
A. I'm sorry, where is that?
Q. Third paragraph.
A. Oh, got it.

Yes.
751 Q. And you'd agree that, as of the date of this report, April 16, 2015, West Face was the only other investor on the public record as having a concern about callidus at the time?
A. Were they on the public record at

```
that time? Had that material been filed?
```

752 Q. It had been filed in the court.
A. Yes, then I'm aware of that.

753
Q. Okay. You are also aware, I take
it, of an article published in the Wall Street Journal
yesterday about Callidus?
A. Yes.

754
Q. So this is a May 12, 2015, article
in the Wall Street with the heading "Manager Feels Heat
on IPO". You are familiar with this article?
A. Yes, I am.

755
Q. I'd like to mark that --
A. Sorry, is this the one from the

Journal itself on is this the one online?
756
Q. This is the one online.
A. There was also one -- I have not
tried to compare the two, but there's one in the Journal yesterday.

757 Q. Right.
A. Which I have not read.

MR. MILNE-SMITH: So I would like to
mark this as Exhibit 5 .
EXHIBIT NO. 5: Wall Street Journal
article dated May 12, 2015
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BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
758
Q. So if you look at the fourth paragraph of this article.
A. Starting "Some Callidus"?
Q. Yes. It says:
"Some Callidus investors say they are worried about potential conflicts created by the company's shared management team."
A. Yes.

760
Q. And down at the bottom of the page, it quotes someone by the name Salman Malik, portfolio manager at Toronto-based Barometer Capital Management, expressing concerns about potential conflicts of interest.
A. Yes, I see -- I read -- I see the paragraph.

761
Q. Yes. And I take it Mr. Malik, to your knowledge, has no access to Callidus confidential information?
A. To my knowledge, no.

762 Q. Okay. And over on the second page, in the second-last paragraph, it quotes an Andrew Pink, a fund manager at LDIC Inc.?
A. Sorry, where is that paragraph?

A. Yes.

769 Q. And that concerns an excerpt from a Callidus conference call, the Arthon Resources --
A. Yes.

770
Q. -- A-R-T-H-O-N -- the Arthon

Resources Company and comparisons to BDCs?
A. Correct.

771
Q. So let's start with the Callidus conference call.
A. Okay. What -- can we -- there it is. Okay.

MR. WINTON: I brought the witness to page 4 of his supplementary affidavit, paragraphs 14 and 15.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
772
Q. And you should also have, in fairness to you, I think, Mr. Griffin's affidavit, his March 7 affidavit, which the relevant passage is at paragraph 110 on page 43 of the record.

MR. WINTON: You may want to give me your copy, please. I'll share with the witness. Thank you.

MR. CARLSON: Do you want to just flip the page and see if there is anything on the next page.

MR. MILNE-SMITH: It's fine.
THE WITNESS: Where am I looking now?

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
773 Q. Paragraph 110 quotes from a conference call with investors held by Callidus on November 7, 2014, correct?
A. That is correct, yes.

774
Q. And that paragraph says -- it's
quoting Mr. Glassman saying that:
"Callidus does not have a single loan
that is nonperforming."
Correct?
A. That is correct.

775
Q. And you'll see that there's a footnote at the end of that excerpt, footnote 47?
A. Yes.

776
Q. And that attaches a copy of the entire transcript as Exhibit 42 to the affidavit, correct?
A. Yes.

777
Q. So anybody who wanted to see the context for that statement could look it up at Exhibit 42, correct?
A. That is correct, but I feel it's buried in the affidavit.

778 Q. Okay. But the fact remains it was available for anyone who wanted to look at it?
A. Yes, although with a little bit of obfuscation in the way it was displayed. 779 Q. The paragraph that Mr. Griffin quotes in his affidavit gives an extremely positive portrayal of Callidus, correct?
A. No, but it goes on -- I think it -you have to look at that in the context. So I'm not sure it's glowing. We have to look at what we were -what Mr. Glassman, in a Q\&A period after the announcement of our earnings, was trying to convey in terms of --

780 Q. Okay. We'll get to that. I just want to understand, this paragraph alone, I mean, I struggle to see anything negative about Callidus in this paragraph.
A. That's not what I'm saying. I think you have to look at the whole thing to portray -what I think the context is trying to portray is that there was something misleading about this statement. That's what I think this is -- that Mr. Griffin was trying to say.

781 Q. Okay. So you are saying that this paragraph was -- looked at alone, was -- painted an excessively optimistic view of Callidus?
A. I think it wasn't -- I think it
wasn't balanced in terms of what -- what -- and let me go on to say that we have not experienced any -- what's the phrase he used? No, it's not -- it's -- we have not had any actual loan loss in the portfolio, the current Callidus portfolio.

782 Q. Okay.
A. Recognized loss, if you know what I mean. That's apart from reserves.

783 Q. Okay. We'll get to that.
A. Okay.

784
Q. If a company cannot pay principal and cannot meet interest payments, is that considered to be a performing loan?
A. It's not the way IFRS works, unfortunately. Do we want to refer to it as "IFRS"? 785
Q. That's fine. Okay.
A. IFRS, if you have a contractually committed cash flow, you keep bringing in income, and then you now analyze whether it is actually going to be realized or not. I.e., for example, if you think through a realization process, you will be able to recognize that amount; you don't have to back it out of IFRS. It's different than the old way non-performing loans worked.

786 Q. Or, for example, you say that you
are going to get paid through a guarantee?
A. No, the way we set it up on our
books is that we recognize a loan loss provision and we look at what the guarantee covers. So if you've got $\$ 10$ of loan losses, then you have $\$ 10$-- you may have $\$ 10$ of claim over against the funds.

787 Q. But I want to understand what you say is a performing loan. To be a performing loan, does the borrower have to be able to pay interest and principal as they come due?
A. They don't have to be paying it currently, as I'm talking -- we are talking about an accounting concept.

788 Q. I understand.
A. That I think as long as you are satisfied that you will be able -- that there are amounts available to pay those claims, you can still recognize them.

789 Q. Amounts available at some point in
the future?
A. Yes.

790 Q. Okay. So even if they can't --
A. But determined at the time you are making the calculation. I believe that is the correct analysis.

791 Q. So if you can't pay it now, but you are confident based on the facts as they exist now that they will be able to pay it in the future, then it's performing?
A. I believe that still counts as performing, but in the loans that he was referring to, we were still receiving interest payments as they fell due.

792 Q. So the remaining three paragraphs, which you've quoted at paragraph 14 of your affidavit, provide further support for the statement in the first paragraph, correct?
A. Yes. We didn't see -- we didn't see value at risk other than in two loans.

793 Q. So it refers to a watch list?
A. Yes.

794
Q. Which loans are currently on the watch list?
$R / F$
MR. WINTON: Not going to -- we're not answering that.

THE WITNESS: That's MNPI. Material
nonpublic information.
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
795
Q. Okay. Just so it's clear on the record, the reason why I'm asking this is because I've
been told by the witness that these three paragraphs are necessary to provide the proper context and understand why the first paragraph isn't a fair presentation by Mr. Griffin, and what these paragraphs talk about is watch lists and value at risk and guarantees.
A. Yes.

796
Q. And so that's what I want to understand.

MR. WINTON: Well, I think, first off, I don't think that's quite an accurate summary of the witness's evidence, because $I$ think what the witness is saying, both in his affidavit and today, is that Mr. Griffin's selective quotation from the transcript and then suggesting that that is somehow an inaccurate statement about the state of affairs of Callidus, which is what happens in -- what we say happens in his affidavit, was misleading because he ignored the context provided by the remaining paragraphs.

MR. MILNE-SMITH: I want to understand the remaining paragraphs.

MR. WINTON: Right. You don't need to
know which loans are on the watch list to understand the remaining paragraphs, and that is material nonpublic information. It won't be disclosed in the
course of this litigation.
THE WITNESS: What may help you is the watch list consists of loans where we have a heightened concern and whether we should be taking further action, not necessarily in an insolvency or realization sense but in an increased vigilance over that particular borrowing relationship.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
797
Q. And how do you determine -- what threshold do you use for putting something on the watch list?
A. It's not a dollar amount. It's just in conversations between the Credit Committee and our underwriters whether there should be enhanced supervision or whether a loan should come off. It's a two-way conversation.

798 Q. And who are your underwriters?
A. Craig Boyer, Jim Hall, and Kurt --

Bert Crossin.
799 Q. Can you say --
MR. WINTON: These are employees of Callidus.

THE WITNESS: Yes.
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
800
Q. Okay. And can you say which two
loans have negative value at risk?
A. I can't remember from that time.

This is March 31? I can't remember which two those --
MR. WINTON: And I'm not even sure, even
if he could remember, we would answer that question.
THE WITNESS: I wouldn't be able to give
you the names.
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
801
Q. It would be November, 2014. That's when the conference call took place.
A. Okay. I -- I cannot recall.

802
Q. Okay. I will ask for --
A. And if I recalled, I wouldn't be able to give them to you. I'll adopt my counsel's answer.

MR. MILNE-SMITH: I will take that as refusal, then?

R/F MR. WINTON: Yes.
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
803 Q. Putting aside the identities, how much money was owed by borrowers on the watch list?

MR. WINTON: I'm just going to ask. Is that public information?

THE WITNESS: No.
$R / F \quad$ MR. WINTON: You can't answer that.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
804 Q. Okay. What is the amount of negative VAR?

MR. WINTON: I'm going to assume we can't answer that?

THE WITNESS: No.
$R / F \quad$ MR. WINTON: We can't answer that.
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
805
Q. Have there been any additional
loans placed on the watch list since this conference call?

R/F MR. WINTON: We are not going to answer that as well.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
806 Q. Do you have third-party valuations for loans that are on the watch list?
A. We have third-party valuations for all of the equipment-type collateral or land collateral that forms part of our collateral package. We rely on management information systems subject to our -subject to field examiners for counts, and inventory, we have may have third-party valuations.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
807
Q. Okay. Can you produce any valuations for loans that West Face has identified?
$R / F$
MR. WINTON: No.
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
808 Q. Okay. So I take it that you would have -- the valuations would -- that you have described would apply to anything that is put up as collateral?
A. Yes.

809 Q. You are not interested in valuations of assets that you don't have security over?
A. Well, no. In asset-based lending, you have assets on which you are lending money and then you take what is known as boot collateral. Boot collateral is something you are not lending on but you take as something to boot with the original collateral.

810 Q. So that's additional collateral?
A. Correct. Whatever word you want to use.

811
Q. Okay. So you would have valuations for -- would you have valuations for both classes of collateral?
A. Sometimes, we would, sometimes, we would not. Sometimes, we would take it just because it was there to take.

MR. MILNE-SMITH: Okay. So I would ask that my previous request for an undertaking, which you have refused, I would include both aspects of that
collateral to the extent valuations exist.
R/F MR. WINTON: Doesn't change our answer.
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
812 Q. Okay. And do you conduct any
internal valuations for assets held by borrowers?
A. No. Although we -- the field
examiners may do some assessments relating to value as
to whether they are overvalued. We have our own
internal field examiners, but the answer is, no, we
don't -- we don't -- we -- any valuations we rely upon
like that, we have third-party confirmations.
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
813 Q. Okay. And I'd like financial
statements for any borrowers on the watch list.
R/F MR. WINTON: No.
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
814 Q. Okay. The last paragraph refers to
a guarantee. I'd like to understand the nature of this
guarantee.
A. I'm sorry, where are we now?
MR. WINTON: You're referring to the
last paragraph in the full quotation in Mr. Riley's
affidavit.
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
815 Q. The last paragraph of

Mr. Glassman's quotation on page 5 .
A. Page 5 of mine. Thank you.
Q. Of your reply affidavit.

So I understand that public --
Catalyst -- the funds -- have publicly disclosed a debenture repayment agreement?
A. Yes.

817 Q. And a participation agreement?
A. Yes.

818 Q. Are there any other contracts that relate to or underlie the guarantee?
A. No.

819
Q. I understand Mr. Glassman has made public statements that newly originated loans after the IPO in April, 2014, that subsequently go on the watch list are thereafter guaranteed by the funds?
A. Sorry, let me -- could you read that more slowly, because there are two different types of guarantees, so $I$ want to make sure I'm answering the right question.

820 Q. Well, why don't you describe to me the two guarantees.
A. Well, let met describe how the original guarantee works.
821
Q. Yes.
A. To the extent that they were loans on the watch list at the time of the IPO, we agreed they would be covered in perpetuity by the guarantee. So let's assume that there was a loan on the watch list, it was in insolvency proceedings or it was of concern -- of heightened concern, as I said before; then we agreed that would be covered by 100 percent guarantee in perpetuity until the loan was repaid or realized upon.

822 Q. Okay.
A. So just to stick with that simple example for a moment. Let's assume it was a $\$ 10$ loan -- and I will give you rationale for it. I would like to also give the rationale, because it makes more sense, I think. To me, it makes more sense. It may not to you.

You have a $\$ 10$ loan. It's on the watch list at the time. We agreed 100 percent coverage of the principal amount in perpetuity until it was realized. If it was realized and got $\$ 11$, then there was no impairment of the loan and we didn't have to pay under the guarantee. If there was $\$ 9$ realized, then we had to pay \$1.

823 Q. Right.
A. The rationale for that was we
wanted to sell the whole -- the whole of the loan portfolio, because keeping loans back would have meant we had to manage them; it would be difficult to manage. The underwriter is quite right. He said we don't want to be stuck in a situation where we are accused of taking a bad loan, and we said we won't do that; we will guarantee it.

That guarantee -- so let's assume it's not on the watch list and it goes -- it goes to, in effect, its new credit renewal period, so we're essentially one year down the road and the credit is renewed. On the same underwriting principles that we would on any new loan, then the guarantee ceases to apply. So the third case is if a loan is in between, so it's not on the watch list at IPO time, it never gets to a renewal on the credit cycle, and some credit event occurs, then that is covered by the guarantee of 100 percent in perpetuity.

824 Q. So if anything ever goes on the watch list, it becomes guaranteed in perpetuity?
A. On the original portfolio.
8.25
Q. From the original portfolio.
A. Yes.

826
Q. Whether it was --

MR. WINTON: Let me just stop you --

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
827
Q. -- on the watch list at the time of the IPO or not?
A. Correct.

MR. WINTON: Just to clarify, though, only if it goes on the watch list before the first renewal.

THE WITNESS: Yes, before credit renewal.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
828
Q. Before credit renewal.
A. So let's step back for a second. The same $\$ 10$ loan. Not on the watch list at the time of the IPO. So let's say it was -- originally, it was part of the IPO loan pool. You get six months out, and it goes into insolvency. We push it into insolvency or they take themselves into bankruptcy, whatever -- that will then have the benefit of the same guarantee as if it was on the watch list at IPO.

829 Q. Okay. So anything originated after the IPO is not going to be covered by the guarantee?
A. No. There's -- there's an exception -- sorry, there is another guarantee, a second guarantee.

830 Q. Okay. What is the second
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guarantee?
A. That was all the first guarantee.

831
Q. Okay.
A. That's the first. So that's why --
okay. So that's -- that's the -- think of --
832 Q. Sorry, before we move on to the second guarantee, I take it the guarantee you've just been describing only covers principal, not interest?
A. That's correct.

833
Q. Okay. Sorry I interrupted you.
A. That's okay. But the interest is, in effect, a first claim on the cash flow.

834 Q. I understand. You were then going to talk about the second guarantee.
A. Second guarantee, the funds have participation rights in -- had in the existing loan portfolio, so there's a little bit of overlap here that just -- let's assume away for the sake of the discussion the overlap, because, for the most part, that first guarantee is going to cover the loan pool.

If there is a participation by a loan -by a Catalyst fund in a pool of loans going forward -and that will happen in two occasions. It happened in the initial IPO because there was participation given to one of the funds as consideration for, in effect,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { repayment of the amounts that was it was owing. } \\
& \begin{array}{l}
835 \\
\text { Q. Right. } \\
\text { A. Then a subsequent fund well also }
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$ have similar rights. So fund 5, for example, will have a right to participate in new loans originated while fund 5 is in existence. 836 Q. Yes.

A. Until that loan participation is cancelled. If it has, let's say, a 50 -- let's assume there is $\$ 100$ of loan and Callidus puts up $\$ 50--$ bear with me; you know what I mean by that -- and the funds put up $\$ 50$, when that loan is -- when the participation is cancelled, i.e., gets back whatever amount it put in for its participation, then it will -- it will agree on the same basis as the original guarantee -- the same principles of the original guarantee -- to cover its interest in the loan.

837 Q. So that guarantee, then, is contingent on the funds selling back their participation to Callidus?
A. Correct.

838
Q. And has that actually happened?
A. Fund 4's participation has been purchased back. Fund 5 hasn't started. It's just starting its participation interest, so it has not been
paid back.
839 Q. Why would fund 4 sell back its participation?
A. Because at some point the return on the participation, the -- whatever the -- it's essentially the same as the ROE because it's like an equity piece. When its return on that piece is less than it can get investing in other assets. Essentially, that's when the determination would be made.

840 Q. And all of this that you have described is set out in the debenture repayment agreement and the participation agreement?
A. Correct. Plus there have been -there's an ongoing -- in effect, Callidus and Catalyst will periodically make sure that we are agreeing on how it applies to particular loans, so that's an ongoing discussion from time to time.

841 Q. Sorry, are you saying that there's something that wouldn't be in the participation agreement?
A. No. You will actually see that there is a provision in there for arbitration, but rather than going to arbitration, there is a discussion between the independent directors and Callidus --

Catalyst funds. Just to make sure we're -- make sure we're agreeing on how the participation -- how the guarantee works.

842 Q. Okay. Is there any outside advisory board that reviews transactions between Catalyst funds and Callidus?
A. Yes, the independent directors. 843
Q. Of Callidus?
A. Yes. Those are related part -those would be related-party transactions.

844 Q. And do principals of Catalyst funds like yourself, Mr. Dialba, and Mr. Glassman have economic incentives in the Callidus share price?
A. We -- we have -- our interests are the same as they would be for the fund itself. We have a portion of our -- let me step back. And you tell me if I'm telling you too much.

We have what's called a European
carrier.
MR. WINTON: I doubt he will do that.
THE WITNESS: We have what is called a European carrier.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
845
Q. Yes, I read about that in the affidavit.
A. Okay, okay. So the European carrier says at the end of -- once the -- once the IP's have gotten back their principal plus an 8 percent preferred return, we then -- there's a trueing up provision, but then we share $80 / 20$ in any amounts that are realized subsequent to that -- that date of 8 percent return.
846
Q. Right.
A. So we will have an entitlement to have some of the shares or an economic amount equal to the shares in each of the funds to the extent that there is -- we earn our carry.
Q. I guess what --
A. That's why I'm not sure what your question is, but that's. --

848 Q. Okay. Just to simplify, do the funds hold any -- the funds continue to hold shares of Catalyst -- of Callidus, correct?
A. Yes, fund 3 and fund 4.

849

850
Arthon.

851
A. Yes.
Q. That's the second misrepresentation
you've alleged?
A. Yes.

852 Q. So at paragraph 17 in your
affidavit, in your personal affidavit.
A. Yes. Sorry, for my benefit, could I also have Mr. Griffin's affidavit?
Q. I was going to ask you to do that, yes. So what you are going to want to be looking at --
A. Could you turn to -- there's an appendix, I believe, that contains the Arthon information.

854
Q. Yes. It's appendix $C$, which starts at -- the Arthon information starts at page 80 of the record.
A. May I turn to appendix B? Sorry, where is appendix B?

855
Q. You're in it.

MR. WINTON: This is it.
THE WITNESS: This is appendix B? Okay. Thank you.

MR. WINTON: This is the beginning of $C$. Appendix C .

## BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:

856 Q. This is the one that contains detailed information about certain loans that West Face
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found to be of concern?
A. Excuse me, can I go to the report that -- the ...

MR. WINTON: Monitor's reports?
THE WITNESS: No, no.
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
857 Q. Oh, you mean this report? Tab 46
of Mr. Griffin?
A. Tab 46, as it's known on the street. Can I look at that for a second, please? 858 Q. Yes. I think the analysis of Arthon is near the back of it.
-- OFF THE RECORD --
MR. WINTON: It's page 769 of the record, I believe.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:

859
Q. Okay.
A. And this I think was purporting to be done on the basis of publicly available information? 860 Q. That's correct.
A. Okay.
Q. Do you see any nonpublic information in that report?
A. Well, no. What I do see -- may I?

862
Q. Yes.
A. Do you want to ask your questions or do you want me to put something on the record now? 863 Q. No, I want to ask you a question. You have looked at that -- what page is
that, Counsel?
MR. WINTON: 769.
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
864
Q. 769. Do you see any nonpublic
information on that page?
A. No, but I see a failure to have a complete disclosure of what was on the public record at the time.

865 Q. Okay. Well, that's a separate question. We're going to go through that now.
A. Okay.

866
Q. Can I have that back?
A. Yes. I don't know what I'm looking
at.
867
Q. There are two things you should have in front of you.
A. Okay.

868
Q. Two things you should have in front of you are your reply affidavit.
A. Yes.

869
Q. Dated May 1, 2015, at page 6,
starting paragraph 16.
A. Okay.

870
Q. And Mr. Griffin's exhibit appendix $C$ to his March 7 affidavit, which the information on Arthon starts at page 80 of the record.
A. I'm in the right spot? Thank you.
Q. Ail right. So let's start with paragraph 17 of your reply affidavit.
A. What page is it?

872
Q. Paragraph 17.
A. Thank you.

873 Q. So in that paragraph, is that fair to say you state that Arthon is a construction holding company that owned mining equipment, a coal mine, an aggregate deposit through four subsidiaries?
A. That is correct.

874 paragraph 10 of appendix $C$ to Mr. Griffin's affidavit, on page 81, you will see that paragraph contains those same facts, correct?
A. Yes, correct.

875
Q. Okay. So so far, so good. No inaccuracy so far with Mr. Griffin, correct?
A. Yes. And I believe this was taken from the same source.
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876 Q. Yes. So paragraph 18 of your reply affidavit, then, says that Arthon equipment and Coalmont filed for CCAA protection in order to restructure the HSBC debt.
A. Yes.

877 Q. And it states that Sandhill, the related company, was liable for the debts to HSBC, correct?
A. Yes.

878
Q. If you then go to Mr. Griffin's paragraph 12, you'll see that the same information is there with the exception of the fact that Sandhill did not file for CCAA?
A. Yes.

879 Q. And, in fact, if you look then at Exhibit 138, which is what is cited to in that paragraph. So Exhibit 138 is in Volume 4. It's the second report of the monitor.
A. I'm sorry, where is 138?

MR. WINTON: There's a reference.
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
880
Q. It's Exhibit 138 is what is cited at --
A. Oh, sorry, got it, got it. Okay. It's a footnote.

881
Q. It's footnote 170.

MR. WINTON: Yes. Second report of the monitor dated -- it doesn't actually say Exhibit 138, but we agree that that's -- okay -- the information.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
882 Q. Correct. Exhibit 138 is referred to back on an earlier page.
A. Okay. Got it.

883
Q. And you will see, of course, that on this Exhibit 138, it refers to a plaintiff-compromising arrangement of Arthon Industries, Arthon Contractors, Arthon Equipment, Coalmont, and two other companies, so sandhill is not an applicant, correct?
A. That is correct.

884
Q. That means Sandhill did not file for CCAA?
A. And Sandhill was the aggregates. It was aggregates.

885 Q. Correct. And so that was apparent from the information relied upon by Mr. Griffin?
A. Uhm-hmm.

886 Q. Right. So Mr. Griffin was not purporting to say that Sandhill filed? He never said Sandhill filed for CCAA?
A. Let me just -- can I look back at, again, the 46 report?

887 Q. Yes.
A. I just want to make sure this is
consistent.
Yes. Here, it's -- if you go down to the April, 2014.
888 Q. Yes?
A. It says "The restructuring
focus" -- sorry, it's page 783.
$889 \quad$ Q. 793.
A. Sorry, 793.

There's nothing in here that separates -- that same distinction that Sandhill was not part of the CCAA, which part of that would be that it was not insolvent.
890
Q. Okay.
A. Okay?

891
Q. So it doesn't --
A. It become important later when we get into --

892
Q. It doesn't explicitly say in the report that Sandhill was not insolvent?
A. Well, it also doesn't say in that report -- and this is important, and I'm not trying to
jump ahead -- that there was a successful restructuring of the CCAA in I believe late December or early January.
893
Q. We're going to come to that.
A. Okay. Good.

894 Q. Paragraph 19 of your reply
affidavit says that Callidus assumed the position of HSBC ultimately at a substantial discount to the book value of the secured debt.
A. Yes, yes.

895 Q. Mr. Griffin's paragraph 13 in appendix $C$ at page 82 refers to an assignment to the HSBC loan?
A. Yes.

896 Q. Now, Mr. Griffin does not refer to that assignment taking place at a discount. Did the discount occur at assignment?
A. I think ultimately there was a discount. It wasn't at the initial assignment date. It was -- it was through the whole process -- the whole agreement with HSBC.

897 Q. Right. So if you look at the second report of the monitor at tab 138, which is what Mr. Griffin was relying on, if you go to paragraph 7.4 at page 1131.

Q. Right. But you have to pay it back
if you draw on it?
A. No. It's a -- we are the
beneficiary of the letter of credit.
902 Q. Okay. So that's what you interpret
this as?
A. Yes. Sorry, I'm not -- letters of credit are funny.

903 Q. So that's what you interpret as the discount?
A. Yes, yeah. We are beneficiary of the letter of credit.

904 Q. Okay. And this information was available in the exhibit to Mr. Griffin's report if anybody wanted to look at it?
A. Well, I think he tries to paint it in a different way than what I just said. In other words, you'd have to go in and look at that information, because he didn't synthesize it.

905 Q. He just says in paragraph 13 that the loan was assigned to Callidus?
A. Yes. And he also doesn't -there's also -- and it's a nuance, but this is a dip financing, which is generally considered to be one of the safer ways to provide -- to provide loans.

906 Q. Well, now that I know that you say
the discount is the 10 million, you will look four lines down, it says:
"HSBC agreed" --
A. Sorry, four lines down in what,
please?
907
Q. In paragraph 13 of appendix $C$.
A. Yup.

908
Q. Mr. Griffin says:
"HSBC agreed to provide a $\$ 10$ million
line of credit in favour of Callidus" --
A. Yes.
Q. -- "to be drawn upon."
A. Yes.

909
Q. So he did synthesize that
information?
A. Okay. I apologize, then. 910
Q. So, again, so far, everything we have seen in your paragraphs 17,18 , and 19 has all been faithfully reproduced in one manner or another in Mr. Griffin's affidavit?

MR. WINTON: Save for the exclusion of Sandhill. That was not faithfully represented in Mr. Griffin's affidavit.

MR. MILNE-SMITH: Okay. We have gone over that, so no need to go over it again.

MR. WINTON: Right. I just want to make sure that your summary isn't taken to include that.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
911 Q. So then in paragraph 20, you say -you describe restructuring activities, and you say that Arthon Equipment sold assets to Arthon Industries.
A. Yes.

912
Q. Arthon Industries and Sandhill
assumed joint responsibility for the debt?
A. Uhm-hmm.

913 Q. That's correct?
A. Yes.

914
Q. And Mr. Griffin, at paragraph 12 of appendix C, says that various HSBC facilities were secured and cross-collateralized within the Arthon Group?
A. Uhm-hmm.

915
Q. Yes?
A. Yes, I see it.

916
Q. And "secured and cross-collateralized" means multiple entities had joint responsibility for the debt?
A. Yes, I would -- I would say that, yes.

917
Q. And then if one wanted to find out
the detail behind that, you see there is a footnote 169 that refers to the affidavit of Keri Ming Leong?
A. Yes. That was the original
affidavit sworn in connection with the CCAA.
918 Q. Right. And that, I can tell you,
is at footnote -- at tab 137 in Volume 4. So you recognize that affidavit --
A. Yes.

919 Q. -- as the original application in the CCAA process?
A. Yes. And what paragraph do you want me to look at?

920 Q. Paragraph 25. So you will see, at paragraph 25 , Mr . Leong says that:
"The various HSBC facilities were
secured and, in many respects,
cross-collateralized within the Arthon
Group, Sandhill, and other entities."
A. Yeah. I don't know why he said "many respects". So it's less -- it's not equivocal. Or not unequivocal.

921 Q. Okay. But you can't blame Mr. Griffin for not picking that up?
A. Okay. Well, I could, but let's keep going. You cannot tell me I cannot blame someone.

I think I'm still free to blame people.
922 Q. Okay. Well, let's put it another way. To the extent that Mr. Griffin is relying on the Leong affidavit, he can't be expected to know that Mr. Leong was not entirely correct in that?
A. In other words, he didn't
independently verify anything. He relied on the reports.

923 Q. He relied on the public reports, correct.
A. Okay, yup.

924
Q. So we were talking about paragraph 20 of your affidavit, which talks about an asset sale of equipment to Arthon?
A. Yes.

925
Q. So then if you go to paragraph 19 of Mr. Griffin's affidavit. You'll see there he refers to the --
A. Sorry, what is -- is this --

926
Q. This is appendix C --
A. This is an appendix to an affidavit, right?

927
Q. Appendix C to Mr. Griffin's affidavit.
A. So -- but I'm just trying to --
okay.
928 Q. This is on paragraph 19 of page 85. A. Yup, yup.

929
Q. So you will see there Mr. Griffin refers to the sale of equipment. That's what you were referring to in your paragraph 20, correct?
A. Yes.

930
Q. Okay.
A. No, this is separate. This is a sale outside. Those weren't -- I don't think those were the ones that were ultimately transferred to Sandhill. These were third-party sales. If you see, there was a realization of $\$ 6 \mathrm{million}$ of total net proceeds on a sale of 28 pieces of equipment. The company advised it would no longer focus on the equipment sales.

MR. WINTON: I think it's a reference to a different --

THE WITNESS: These sound to me like third-party equipment sales that he's referring to. The ones that are referred to in here were ultimately Coalmont properties, Coalmont equipment, that was sold to whatever the name of the entity is -- Equipment. I think -- and I'm going by memory, but I think there was a coal wash facility that was transferred up to --
what's the name of the subsidiary, Equipment? I think Equipment.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
931 Q. And that's what we -- that's what you talked before about the ultimate outcome of the restructuring, correct?
A. Yes.

932
Q. So this is what's being described here as the net result of the CCAA process?
A. Yes. Which I describe, I think, in paragraphs $21,22,23$, and 24.

933 Q. Yes, you describe it in 20 and then you characterize it in the remaining paragraphs.
A. Okay. Yeah.

934
Q. So Mr. Griffin's affidavit was sworn on March 7th, 2015, correct?
A. Sorry. Again.

935
Q. Mr. Griffin's affidavit was sworn on March 7, 2015?
A. Yes.

936
Q. Okay. The last monitor's report for Arthon before March 7, 2015, was January 27, 2015, which is tab 146, correct?
A. Yes.

937
Q. And as of that date, the CCAA
process had not yet wrapped up, right?
A. I think it did. I think it was wrapped up at that point.

938 Q. Okay. Well, if you want to look at page 1290 of the record, you'll see that it seeks an extension of the stay period, which was set to expire on January 30 th.
A. Yeah. That's to Equipment and Coalmont.

939
Q. Right. So to seek an extension of the stay period to the earlier of February 18, 2015, or the date on which the respective --
A. It's been assigned into bankruptcy.

940 Q. Right. So that hadn't yet
occurred?
A. I don't have that information, but what that represents is the end of the stay period, okay? It relates only to Equipment and Coalmont.

MR. WINTON: But also --
THE WITNESS: So this is the -- so the other parts of the restructuring have been completed at that time.

MR. WINTON: And just to be clear, Counsel, February -- the earlier of February 18th or the assignment of bankruptcy had occurred by the time

Mr. Griffin swore his affidavit, right?
THE WITNESS: And you'll see --
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
941
Q. Well, the question is whether it was in the public record or not.
A. I think it would have been filed at that time.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
942
Q. Okay. Can you produce it?

THE WITNESS: This document?
MR. WINTON: It's not --
THE WITNESS: This is dated January 27 th, 2015.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
943
Q. Right.
A. So it's got to be in the public record, because it was before the Supreme Court.

944
Q. Look, this -- I mean, Mr. Griffin referred to it, so obviously he had it.
A. Exactly, but, you see:
"Based on the foregoing, the monitor respectfully recommends that this

Honourable Court grant the petitioner's request for the following orders: An order approving the sale of the Coalmont
assets to Sandhill; investing the
Coalmont assets in Sandhill and 102; an
order approving the sale of the
Equipment assets to Industries and
vesting the Equipment assets in
Industries; the bankruptcy orders; and
the extension order."
So then let me just -- to me, having done insolvency work, the only reason you kept the stay in place was to give you time to file the bankruptcy orders and have them become effective. And that's why the first part of 8.1 has two dates.

945 Q. So I'm giving you the twelfth report of the monitor. We were just looking at the eleventh. This is the twelfth report of the monitor dated March 17, 2015.
A. Sorry, what's the date, March 17?

MR. MILNE-SMITH: Yes. Mark that as
Exhibit 6.
EXHIBIT NO. 6: Monitor's report dated
March 17, 2015
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
946
Q. So that obviously is after Mr. Griffin's affidavit?
A. Yes.

947 Q. And I hope this is -- can be taken for granted, but let me make sure. We were looking at the eleventh from January 27th. This is the twelfth. There would have been nothing in between, correct? You can't have a monitor's report between the eleventh and the twelfth?
A. Sorry, what's the --

MR. WINTON: As far as monitor's reports go, yes, we will agree to that.

MR. MILNE-SMITH: Yes.
THE WITNESS: Sorry, what's the date?
MR. WINTON: This is March 17.
THE WITNESS: And this is the eleventh and the twelfth -- or the twelfth and thirteenth.

MR. WINTON: No.
THE WITNESS: Sorry, eleventh and
twelfth.
MR. WINTON: Yes.
THE WITNESS: Okay. Got it.
MR. WINTON: The eleventh is in January, the twelfth is in March.

MR. MILNE-SMITH: Exhibit 6 is the twelfth.

MR. WINTON: Correct.

The Catalyst Capital Group Inc. v. Brandon Moyse et al RILEY, JAMES on May 13, 2015
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH

948
Q. There's no report 11.5?
A. Not to my knowledge, no. Smarty
pants.
949
Q. So if we look at, for example, on paragraph 4.3 on page 5 --
A. Yes.
Q. -- it says that:
"Sandhill entered into an asset
purchase agreement with Coalmont which was approved by this Honourable Court on

January 29, 2015."
So that approval happened after the eleventh report?
A. Yes.

951
Q. And the transaction was closed on February 12 th, also after the eleventh report.
A. Okay.

952
Q. So if one were just looking at the reports of the monitor, there would be nothing in between the eleventh report and the twelfth report?
A. Uhm-hmm.

953
Q. Yes?
A. But they're -- hold on.

954
Q. If you are looking just at the
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```
monitor's reports.
```

A. Okay.
Q. There's nothing between January 27
and March 17, correct?
A. Uhm-hmm.
Q. You have to say "yes".
A. Yes. I'm sorry.

957
Q. Okay. And in terms of the ultimate outcome of this investment --
A. Yes.
Q. -- what's the interest rate that Callidus is enjoying on the loan?
A. I don't know that. I would have to go back and look. I can't remember what rate it's at right now.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
959
Q. Okay. Could you make an undertaking to advise, please.

MR. WINTON: Stop.
THE WITNESS: This is -- again, it's not public information. So -- as far as I know. R/F MR. WINTON: We are not going to answer that.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
960
Q. How much principal or interest has
been repaid to Callidus out of cash generated by Arthon, in other words, not funded by further advances by Callidus?
$R / F$
MR. WINTON: We're not answering that.
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
961
Q. Okay. So Mr. Riley has taken the position that this was a "very successful workout" in paragraph 22.
A. Yes.

962
Q. But you are not willing to tell me how much principal or interest has actually been paid?
A. I can say that there have been paydowns on the loan subsequent to the insolvency proceedings.

963
Q. You but you can't tell me how much?
A. Significant.

MR. MIINE-SMITH: I'd like to know how much principal or interest has been repaid by Arthon out of funds that were not funded by Callidus.

MR. WINTON: I understand the question. It's refused.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
964
Q. Okay. And what are the assets
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securing the loan at present?
A. It is the aggregate.

965
Q. Okay.
A. And others. Equipment and some
other assets.
966
Q. Okay. Well, all equipment was put up for sale, and what could be sold was sold, correct, at the time?
A. Well, there is equipment that's needed to -- there's equipment, as I recall, came from Coalmont.

967 Q. Yes.
A. Excess -- it was just equipment that came from Coalmont, given that they were going to put it into bankruptcy, and then there was equipment used for -- in the operation of the aggregate mine.

968 Q. Okay. So you kept the information -- you kept the equipment necessary for the aggregate mine?
A. Yeah, exactly.

969
Q. But the aggregate mine is not an operating facility, correct?
A. I believe it is, currently, right now. It is either -- it is -- there are contracts relating to that operation. Whether they are actually

The Catalyst Capital Group Inc. v. Brandon Moyse et al RILEY, JAMES on May 13, 2015

Page 213
conveying the aggregate at this time. But there are
contracts in place.
970 Q. If you look at tab 145.
A. Yup.
971
Q. This is a document from June, 2012.
You'll see, at the top, it says "Brief on Projects
Proposed for Kitimat, June, 2012"?
A. Yes.
972
Q. And number 5 is Sandhill materials?
A. Yes.
973
Q. And it says -- this is the Sandhill
project that Callidus has loaned to, correct?
A. Yes, uhm-hmm.
974 Q. It says:
"Marine terminal and aggregate expert
operation construction start date is
contingent on finalizing
pre-construction and sales agreements."
A. Yes.
975
Q. And it says 25 to $\$ 30$ million of
investment is required?
A. Yes.
976
Q. So you are telling me that that 25
to $\$ 30$ million investment was made and then, in fact,
the construction was not just started but was
completed?
A. I actually don't know. I mean, I don't know. I think the main use of the aggregate will be for -- in connection with LNG facilities that are being built.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
977 Q. Okay. Well, if there's any
documentary evidence that the Sandhill facility is up, running, and generating income, I'd like to see it. $\mathrm{U} / \mathrm{A} \quad \mathrm{MR}$. WINTON: I will take that under advisement.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
978 Q. Okay. And let's just make sure we've got a few other things here on the record, and I'm happy to take you to the monitor's reports if you want to, if you are not familiar with it personally. You're aware that the monitor ran a sales process for Coalmont?
A. Yes.

979
Q. And no one submitted an offer?
A. Yes, I'm aware of that.

980
Q. And the assets were transferred to

Sandhill, a related company?
A. I -- well, I think they were put
into a company -- sorry, when you say -- sorry, which
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```
assets? The mine itself --
    981 Q. The assets. Coal.
    A. -- the mine or the assets?
    982
    Q. Yes.
    A. Sorry, the mine itself? The coal
property?
    983
    Q. Correct.
    A. The coal property, I think it was
```

    taken through bankruptcy. It was put into bankruptcy.
    984
    Q. Right. And any remaining assets
    were transferred to Sandhill?
    A. I think that is correct. I think
        that's what the monitor's reports says, and I don't
        think -- I don't know anything inconsistent with that.
    985
                            Q. And there was also a sales process
    with respect to the company known as Arthon Equipment?
A. Can you lead it to me in the
monitor --
986
Q. Okay. So let's --
A. I'm not -- I get very confused when
there are multiple subsidiaries with similar names.
987 Q. I know. It is confusing. So let's
go to tab 146, the eleventh report, at paragraph 4.14.
A. Yes.
988 Q. So it says:
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"On April 15, 2014, this Honourable Court granted an order authorizing the company to undertake a process to market and sell its machinery and equipment." And it says, in the next paragraph:
"The proceeds realized from the equipment sales process total approximately $\$ 769,000$."
A. Yes.
Q. "The majority of the machinery and equipment assets remain unsold." A. Yes.

989
Q. And those assets were transferred
to Arthon Industries?
A. Yes. Hmm, can I just -- can we read the rest of that sentence? Could you read the rest of the sentence for me.

$$
990
$$

Q. Sure.
"In October, 2014, the company
determined that it may require the
machinery and equipment owned by
Equipment for use by Sandhill to fulfill
large extraction agreements that it was planning to enter into and, accordingly,
it re-focussed its efforts on other
restructuring matters."
A. And I would -- I would -- I'm not going to submit, but I would say that's consistent with how the restructure evolved: That that equipment was transferred and that the aggregate -- the aggregate -the aggregate mine is now in or will begin operation. 991 Q. So the assets --
A. I.e., the aggregate is valuable.

992
Q. So to sum up, the assets of both Coalmont and Equipment were put up for sale and garnered net cash proceeds of 769,000 ?
A. Yeah. I'd have -- that's what it says in the monitor's report.

993 Q. Okay.
A. So that was the equipment that was sold.

994
Q. Okay.
A. I thought there were some other numbers in there.

MR. WINTON: And, Counsel, I just want to make sure it's clear. The reference to the capital C "Company" in paragraph 4.1.4 and elsewhere in this monitor's report, that's a defined term that refers collectively to all of the CCAA entities, as I understand from the preamble of the report.

MR. MILNE-SMITH: That's correct.
MR. WINTON: And so the sale of
machinery and equipment, that's not limited to the capital E Equipment as in the subsidiary known as "the Equipment company"; it's referring to all the machinery and equipment collectively owned -- as I read it, collectively owned by all of the applicant companies.

MR. MILNE-SMITH: Well, I don't think we need to debate it on the record.

MR. WINTON: Okay.
MR. MILNE-SMITH: But, I mean, it says the capital C "Company" determined it may require machinery and small E "equipment" owed by big E "Equipment".

MR. WINTON: Yes, correct.
MR. MILNE-SMITH: Okay, So it says what it says.

MR. WINTON: It does. Because of the defined term, I want to make sure there is no confusion as to what we are talking about. Any more than already.

THE WITNESS: You guys think that commercial lawyers are way smarter than they are.

MR. WINTON: No, we don't.
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BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
995
Q. And paragraph 4.11, at the top of that page.
A. Yes.

996 Q. Summarizes that there -- as of the date of this report on January 27, 2015, there was $\$ 53.8$ million owing by Arthon to Callidus?
A. So this is January, 2015, and it's the eleventh report?

997 Q. Correct.
A. Thank you.

998
Q. So that was, to the best of your knowledge, accurate, the 53.8 million?
A. I'm sorry, you are -- 53.8 --

999
Q. You will see in 4.11C.
A. Yes, got it, got it.

1000 Q. And so that 53.8 million, that's, in fact, more than the 47 million plus 5 million dip loan. So the balance has gone up from 47 million assigned from HSBC plus the five million dip loan, correct?
A. I can't do my math quickly enough.

I just --
1001
Q. Sorry. 47 plus 5 is 52 .
A. Can I have a pen just for a second?

1002 Q. Sure.
A. Because I want to make sure we're
taking the same note. And you deducted the 10 out of there? The 10 from the letter of credit? 1003 Q. No. I'm just going directly on what the monitor said.
A. Okay. So you are adding the -- the 18.9, the 34.9. Is that what you are adding?

1004 Q. That's what the monitor appears to have added, yes.
A. Sorry, I want to make sure that I am working this. Okay. So that comes to 53.8. 1005 Q. Yes.
A. Okay. Thank you.

1006 Q. And so that is more than the
47 million plus 5 million that was --
A. Yes.

1007
Q. -- initially loaned?
A. Yes.

1008
Q. okay.
A. Although pretty close.

1009
Q. And so there was no further public information about the amounts of the debt owing by Arthon to Callidus?
A. The other thing, he doesn't break
it -- I assume this is -- I assume he is talking about principal. He doesn't make it clear.

1010 Q. I'm not asking about principal or interest. I'm just saying that, at the time that Mr. Griffin swore his affidavit on March 7th, the most recent public information about the amount of the debt owing was 53.8 million.
A. I think that's fair.

1011 Q. Okay. And that brings us to the BDC comparison. Now, you'd agree with me that Mr. Griffin did not purport to say that Callidus was the same as a BDC, correct?
A. Can you -- well, are we looking at his affidavit or are we looking at the -- the tab 46 report?

1012
Q. No, we are looking at his
affidavit. So if you want to look at --
A. I think we need perhaps to look at

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
1014 Q. That's correct. If you look at


1019 Q. Okay. So are you aware that the Veritas report we looked at, which I believe was Exhibit 4 --
A. Yes.

1020
Q. -- had also indicated that BDCs might be a good comparable to Callidus?
A. I think that, to a certain extent, I find that the Veritas report bears a startling resemblance to what West Face had produced.

1021 Q. In other words, they agreed with West Face?
A. No, I think they were informed by West Face. I don't know whether they agreed.

1022 Q. Okay. Well, they published it, right?
A. Yes, but they don't reference it.

1023 Q. Are you saying they published something that they didn't believe?
A. I think there is that possibility. Possibility.

1024
Q. Veritas' business depends on their reputation for producing accurate research, correct?
A. It would be a factor.

1025 Q. Okay. So it would certainly be against their interest to publish information they
believed to be incorrect?
A. Say that again. Sorry.

1026
Q. It would be against their interest to publish something that they didn't believe to be correct?
A. Had they done enough verification to determine whether it was correct.

1027
Q. That's not my question. The question isn't whether or not they are right, the question is whether or not they believed in it. You have no reason to believe that they didn't believe in what they published?
A. Correct.

1028
Q. Okay. So let's then turn to the differences that you point out in your reply affidavit of paragraph 26 .
A. Okay. So can I put this to one
side now --

1029

1030

1031 four enumerated points you make are on page 8.
A. Can I just read it again?

| 1032 | Q. Yes. |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1033 | A. This is underlined, by the way. |
|  | Q. That's fine. The whole thing is | underlined. No point of emphasis.

A. Yes.

1034 Q. So point number 1 is that BDCs tend to have external management whereas Callidus is managed internally?
A. Correct.

1035
Q. And, in your view, management provided by executives of Catalyst funds through a management services agreement constitutes internal management for Callidus?
A. Let me step back for a second. You're misconstruing what Callidus -- how Callidus is managed. It has its own president and chief operating officer.

$$
1036 \text { Q. Yes. }
$$

A. It also has, I think, 28 or 29 other people who fulfill various functions. Chief financial officer, it has its own underwriters, it has its own originators, it has its own collateral management people, and it has field examiners.

The roles that I play and Newton play
are -- are an adjunct to that. We're on portfolio --
not me, but others are on portfolio companies. So the reason we have a management services agreement was because that's what the underwriters wanted, to make sure that we were available to callidus.
1037
Q. Right.
A. If we did not have that management services agreement, this would be the same issue. Newton is active as CEO, he's active as a chair of the investment committee, he is on the board. What we don't get is any compensation for it, whereas BDCs are externally managed for a fee. They have no -- they have no actual management people at all, no employees. 1038 Q. And the value of management depends on how good they are?
A. I agree.

1039 Q. And so the reason why Mr. Glassman provides value is because you say he is good at what he does?
A. Yes.

1040
Q. And so that's really the most important thing in terms of management is whether it is good or bad?
A. Yes.

1041 Q. Okay. The second point is you say Callidus does not pay dividends, it reinvests its

```
income for future growth?
```

A. Correct. It's a growth company.

1042
Q. Right. And you would agree that

Mr. Griffin recognized that distinction in his affidavit at paragraph 113?
A. Sorry, I don't have any -- sorry, I have no idea which affidavit I'm looking at anymore. 1043 Q. We are looking at Mr. Griffin's affidavit.
A. I've got it.

1044 Q. At paragraph 113, the last sentence says that:
"These comparable businesses" --
A. Uhm-hmm.

1045
Q. Referring to BDCs:
-- "generally provide investors with
attractive dividend yields, whereas
Callidus had publicly disclosed its
intention to not declare or pay
dividends in the foreseeable future."
A. What he doesn't go on to say is that we are considered by the market to be a growth story. I.e., you are investing in us for future growth. Whereas BDCs are, in effect, more like a bond. You are getting back your principal/interest over time.

There's no new assets acquired.
1046 Q. Okay. Different investors will be attracted to different kinds of companies?
A. Fair.

1047
Q. Right?
A. But someone who is attracted to a BDC will not be attracted to a Callidus.

1048 Q. Right. Someone who's attracted to a BDC may not be attracted to Callidus and vice versa?
A. So to compare the two and say they are comparable is very difficult.

1049 Q. Okay. But, again, Mr. Griffin explicitly states that distinction?
A. No, he doesn't.

1050
Q. Between paying dividends or not?
A. No, but he doesn't make the distinction I just made. He's saying they're comparable.

1051 Q. That's not what I am asking,
though.
A. No, but I am saying.

1052
Q. Yes.
A. I'm saying he has said they're comparable, and you have emphasized that several times. I'm saying they're not comparable because of one is a
growth story and one is more like a bond. A BDC is like a bond.

1053 Q. But I'm saying the difference that you point out, Mr. Griffin has acknowledged?

MR. WINTON: No.
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
1054
Q. Not the way you put it, but he's acknowledged the different --
A. No, no, I don't think he's acknowledged it in a way that is accurate, that's what I'm saying.

1055 Q. Okay. So he has acknowledged that they -- that Callidus does not pay dividends --
A. Yes.

1056
Q. -- he just hasn't characterized it the way you would like him to?
A. I don't think I would -- I don't agree with what you've just said.

1057 Q. Okay. Mr. Griffin has acknowledged that Callidus doesn't pay dividends?
A. That is correct.

1058
Q. And that's what you say in your paragraph 26B, that Callidus does not pay dividends?
A. No, but I also say the closed-end funds are required to return cash to investors, so they
are like a bond. There's a payout ratio of 90 percent, so over time, you're going to get back your cash or whatever -- subject to whatever losses there are.

1059 Q. Okay. And if you're not
distributing your dividends, the only other alternative is you're reinvesting it for future growth?
A. Yes.

1060
Q. Okay. So that's implicit in what

Mr. Griffin says? If you are not paying dividends, you are re-investing for future growth?
A. Okay.

1061
Q. Fair?
A. Yes.

1062
Q. Okay. Third point, you say that:
"BDCs tend to finance subordinate debt
in unsecured positions, including equity, whereas Callidus focusses almost exclusively on senior secured debt."
A. Correct.

1063
Q. Now, you'd agree with me that, in some cases, Callidus has taken equity?
A. Only as a result of lending. In other words, we might end up taking equity in a realization situation.

1064 Q. Right. But not --
A. We don't invest in it, we receive it as a result, whereas BDCs do invest in that.

1065 Q. So Callidus winds up holding equity in some circumstances?
A. Purely limited, but, yes.

1066
Q. Okay. And your statement that

Callidus focusses almost exclusivity on senior secured debt, the only way to verify that would be to see the loan book?
A. No. I think we've made public statements in our -- in our IPO and in subsequent documents that that -- we focus on senior secured debt, top of the balance sheet.

1067 Q. You have made the statement and you've also made the statement here, but that's not my question. My question is the only way to verify the accuracy of that statement would be to see your loan book?
A. And I think that's what underwriters do as part of the underwriting process.

1068 Q. Okay. But the public can't do that?
A. No.

1069 Q. And the fourth point is you mentioned that BDCs are not taxable --
A. Although that's not true. They can do the search that was done by West Face and find that.

1070 Q. That's certainly what we say
happened.
The fourth point is you say BDCs are not taxable at the corporate level --
A. Yes.

1071 Q. -- they are taxed at the personal level. Being taxed at the personal level means you're avoiding double taxation, correct?
A. No. What I mean by that is if you look at the return in Callidus.

1072 Q. Yes.
A. And let's say it's 20 percent, for argument's sake, that's post-tax. The BDC references that $I$ think $M r$. Griffin is referring to are before personal tax so that you have to take out some taxation to -- say I get 7 percent net of tax, and in Callidus, I'm getting a 20 percent return net of tax, because we pay no dividends, as he has pointed out. So I'm just trying to get to a comparable return.

1073 Q. Okay. You'd agree that --
A. Both net of tax. That's what I'm
trying to say.
1074 Q. You'd agree that both the BDCs and

Callidus provide customized financing solutions to corporations?
A. I have not seen that for a -- have you got an example of a BDC saying that?

1075 Q. I'm just wondering if you are aware of that from your experience in the market.
A. For us, we would say we do bespoke-type financing. I don't know about BDCs. 1076 Q. Okay. You can't say if they do that or not?
A. Don't know.

1077 Q. Would you agree that both BDCs and Callidus lend to a variety of industries?
A. Yes.

1078
Q. You are not industry-specific?
A. We can being agnostic. We do not lend to E\&P -- resource -- resource development or exploration other than to the extent you want to say that an aggregate pit is a mine, which I don't think it is. It's gravel.

1079 Q. Okay. And both BDCs and Callidus rely on income generated from a loan portfolio?
A. Yes.

1080 Q. And both have portfolio monitoring policies and procedures in place?


BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:

1084 Q. So Mr. Riley, we have been talking about some of the alleged errors you've pointed out in your reply affidavit. I want to look at few other examples of the research that is in Mr. Griffin's affidavit. Let's start with Exchange Technology Group. Are you familiar with that company?
A. Yes.

1085 Q. So Callidus has made a loan to this
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company?
A. Yes.

1086
Q. So if you go to volume 4 , tab

132 -- so tab 132, and if you go in to page 1064 of the record, do you see Callidus is the applicant?
A. Yes.

1087 Q. And this is a report of Duff \&
Phelps Canada --
A. Yes.

1088 Q. -- as proposed receiver?
A. Yes.

1089 Q. So Duff \& Phelps are the party that Callidus put up to be the receiver, correct?
A. Yes.

1090
Q. So I can take it what's in here would be accurate from Callidus' perspective?
A. Yes. Although they are a court-appointed receiver, so there is some degree of independence. We might put them up, but they are still a court officer.

1091 Q. Right, but that's not going to detract from the accuracy of it?
A. Shouldn't.

1092 Q. And this is dated October 25, 2013, just so you have that.
A. Yes.

1093
Q. So if you go to page 1073.
A. Just before we get there, can I
just look at something for a second?
1094
Q. Sure. --
A. Okay.

1095
Q. So if you go to page 1073, at the very top of that page there's a numbered point 2 which says that:
"As at October 24, 2013, the XTG Group was indebted to Callidus in the amount of 36.97 million including an over advance for approximately 4.5 million on the revolving line of credit facility." A. Yes.

1096
Q. An over advance, can you explain what that means?
A. An over advance is where you are lending against -- the easiest way to think of it, let's assume you have an asset on which you are prepared to make an original loan of 50 cents on the dollar, so it's a one dollar asset and you'll advance a loan of 50.

1097 Q. Yes.
A. An over advance is where you are

```
prepared to advance on the value in excess of the 50
cents.
    1098 Q. Right.
                            A. So you may still have collateral
value, but you're over advanced over what you are
anticipating.
    1099 Q. And if you go to page 1072, just
back one page, you'll see the numbered paragraph 3
says --
    MR. WINTON: Sorry?
    THE WITNESS: Got it.
    BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
    1100 Q. It says:
    "XTG Group is presently not generating
    sufficient cash flow to service its
    obligations to Callidus --"
    A. Yes.
    Q. "-- nor does it have sufficient
    funding to continue to operate in the
    normal course."
    A. Yes.
    1 1 0 1 ~ Q . ~ S o ~ t h a t ~ w a s ~ c o r r e c t ~ a t ~ t h a t ~ t i m e ?
    A. It would, I can't -- I can't
        disagree with it, because it's a statement that is
        there. I don't have any information in my mind that's
```

contrary to that.
1102 Q. Okay. That's all I can ask for.
A. Yes.

1103
Q. Then if you flip forward to page 1078.
A. 1078, thank you.

1104
Q. Yes, you will there's a heading "CG Processing Results."
A. Yes.

1105
Q. I will let you know that earlier in the report CG is defined as Canaccord Genuity.
A. Genuity, yes.

1106 Q. So it says the 23 parties executed the CA confidentiality agreement?
A. Uhm-hmm, yes.

1107
Q. And it says in the next paragraph that Canaccord Genuity received five verbal expressions of interest, three terms sheets, only one of these threats parties performed due diligence, and that party passed on the opportunity shortly after it commenced due diligence. So the upshot of that is no one was willing to make an offer, correct?
A. Yes.

1108 Q. And down at paragraph 5 it's explaining the only sort of fruit that emerged from the

CG process was a private equity firm that made an offer to purchase the Callidus debt for 17 million?
A. Correct.

1109
Q. But that was -- less than half of the value that's been described earlier?
A. Yes.

1110
Q. That refers to a KPMG process, and over next page, KPMG process results. Do you see that?
A. Yes, but I'm trying to remember what KPMG was doing.

Sorry, it was part of XTG's attempts, right?

1111 Q. That's correct.
A. Both 4.1 and 4.2 were -- the events described there were attempts by exchange.

1112 Q. Yes.
A. Okay. I just want to make sure
we --
1113 Q. They are trying to find an external party to pay something.
A. Yes, exactly, but it's under their watch.

1114 Q. Right.
A. Yup.

1115
Q. And KPMG turned up only one term
sheet which passed on the opportunity after performing diligence?
A. Yes.

1116
Q. Then if you go to the next tab, that's tab 133, we have excerpts from an affidavit of Craig Boyer?
A. I'm sorry, where are we? Thank you, yes.

1117 Q. I think you referred to Mr. Boyer before. He is a Callidus employee?
A. Yes, he is.

1118
Q. Vice-president of Callidus?
A. Yes, he is, and he is one of our underwriters, one of the peoples experienced in insolvency matters.

1119 Q. Right. So if you just flip over the slip sheet to paragraph 56 , it says that Duff $\&$ Phelps has prepared a liquidation analysis, the liquidation analysis illustrates that Callidus will incur a substantial shortfall on its advances to the XTG debtors should the XTG debtors business and assets be liquidated?
A. Uhm-hmm.

1120 Q. And then over the next page to paragraph 58.
A. Yes.

1121
Q. And paragraph 58, it's fair to say, says that XTG is currently lending -- sorry, Callidus is lending to XTG in excess of the limits under the loan agreement?
A. Yes.

1122
Q. And am I correct that Callidus ultimately made a stocking horse credit bid for the assets of XTG Group?
A. Correct. If I could just draw your attention, just as part of my premise in thinking what you asking me is paragraph 60.

1123
Q. Yes.
A. "-- where Callidus is prepared to
continue its support of the XTG
debtors for a limited period in order
to fund the implementation of a
restructuring to be carried out
through receivership and stocking
horse sales process --
--- Reporter clarification.
1124
Q. Let's just make sure that what I think is clear to all of us in the room is also clear to whoever is reading this transcript.

A credit bid means that you exchange
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your debt for equity in the company?
A. Well, it -- what you do is you say

I -- I will bid my paper, let's say it's $\$ 20$.
1125
Q. Right.
A. For all of the assets of the
company.
1126
Q. Right.
A. Every aspect of the company.

1127
Q. Right.
A. You can think of -- it also
actually I think in this case probably consider also the stocking horse bid. If someone wants to come along and bid $\$ 21$, we are gone.

1128 Q. Right. So Callidus said we will give up our -- the indebtedness that the company owes us, and we get everything in the company?
A. Correct.

1129 Q. And if anybody wants to pay more, be our guest?
A. Yes.

1130
Q. And --
A. But in the context of believing that a restructuring would increase value returns to us.

1131 Q. Well, at this point you didn't

```
really have any alternative, correct?
```

A. No. We could have, we could have let it go into bankruptcy.

1132 Q. Right. And then you would have lost a lot of money?
A. Probably.

1133
Q. Okay. So then if you go to the next tab, paragraph 134, this is the first report of Duff \& Phelps on November 19, 2013, after they have been appointed as receiver.
A. Yes.

1134
Q. Can you flip to page 1096 of the record.
A. Yes.

1135 Q. Sorry, just to be fair in 1095, just to situate you, this is describing the sale process.
A. Uhm-hmm.

1136
Q. So this is the sale. We talked earlier about the sale process run by XTG. This is now the sale process being run by Duff and Phelps.
A. Yup.

1137 Q. So at the top of the page 1096?
A. Sorry, I meant yes.

1138 Q. Top of 1096 they refer to 88
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perspective purchasers?
A. This was the teaser, right?

1139 Q. Yes.
A. Yes, yes.

1140
Q. And then when you go down to look at the results, it says that three parties executed a confidentiality agreement?
A. Uhm-hmm.
$1141 \quad$ Q. And no offers were submitted?
A. Uhm-hmm.

1142
Q. Yes?
A. Yes.

1143 Q. And so the stocking horse bid was final, that went through?
A. Yes, but can I -- can I spend a moment on this?
1144
Q. Sure.
A. Typically when you go into a court-appointed receiver, you have to demonstrate to the Court that you have tried to market the company. 1145
Q. Yes.
A. When I say company, it can be shares or assets, market the company to the universe of people.
1146
Q. Right.
A. And you have -- that takes an extended period of time, and there has to be a confidential information memorandum and all of those things that go towards a sale process that would normally be required by the court. In certain circumstances where there has been efforts by the debtor company to market itself, they will allow for a truncated sale process. In this case Mr. Justice Morawetz was satisfied that there had been enough efforts that we would not be able to get more than our credit, more than we were owed on our credit. so that's -- you have to keep it in the context of, we were trying to get an expedited court-appointed receiver.

1147 Q. Right. And how much money did Callidus ultimately advance to XTG?
A. I --

MR. WINTON: If it's not already in the public record, we are not saying it here.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
1148 Q. All I know is 36.97 million which is --
A. That was in these materials?

1149 Q. Yes.
R/F MR. WINTON: Then we can't answer that
question, other than to say if it's in the public materials, it is in the public materials and we can't say anything else.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
1150
Q. Okay. And we then go to tab 136.
A. Uhm-hmm.

1151
Q. This is a receiver's certificate.
A. Yes.

1152
Q. And this is essentially approving the transaction that was described in the previous receiver's report we just looked at, correct?
A. Correct, yes.

1153 Q. So this is over a year later?
A. Yeah. It would be -- I can't remember when the order was made, but this is January 2nd, 2015.

1154 Q. Right. So it says that the -- if you look at paragraph $B$ of the certificate on page 1104 of the record, it says there was an order of the court dated November 22 nd --
A. Yes.

1155 Q. -- 2013?
A. Uhm-hmm.

1156 Q. Approving the asset purchase
agreement?
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A. Uhm-hmm.

1157 Q. And so the closing -- the receiver doesn't certify the closing of the transaction until January 2, 2015?
A. Yes.

1158 Q. Does Callidus continue to hold the equity of XTG Group?
A. Today?

1159
Q. Yes.
A. Yes, we do.

1160
Q. So you haven't realized anything on that investment to date?
A. No, we have not. And I think it will be -- it's classified as an asset held for sale on our books.

1161 Q. Can you produce financial statements or anything else that might indicate that the asset will return anything of value?
A. Not publicly available.

MR. WINTON: I think there are already published financial statements that refer to subsequent events, because this is a subsequent event --

THE WITNESS: Those are our financial statements.

MR. WINTON: Right. You're asking for
financial statements of?
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
1162
Q. XTG.

MR. WINTON: NO.
THE WITNESS: No.
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
1163
Q. Okay. If you go back to tab 132, this was the original report of the proposed receiver on October 25th, 2013. If you go to page 1080, at the bottom, at the very bottom of page 1080 is says that Callidus would provide "new or amended credit facilities to the purchaser to facilitate its restructuring and future growth." Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do see that.

1164 Q. So has Callidus, in fact, advanced additional funds to XTG to facilitate its restructuring and future growth?

MR. WINTON: Is that public information?
THE WITNESS: No.
$R / F$
MR. WINTON: We can't answer that.
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
1165
Q. Okay.
A. What I can say is that we have restructured exchange, as is evidenced by the receiver's certificate.

1166 Q. Okay. And how did Callidus value XTG's loan in its financial statements at the time of the IPO?
A. I don't -- I don't know how it was
valued.
1167
Q. Do you know how it's currently valued?
A. Well, an asset held for sale is based on enterprise value.

1168 Q. And how do you determine the enterprise value?
A. Enterprise value is a function of the EBITDA of the enterprise and the appropriate multiplier.

1169 Q. What multiplier do you apply?
A. I think that's not in the public domain, but the valuation is reviewed, in our case, by PWC and KPMG. When we have -- in Catalyst, I suppose we've now taking the practice to callidus. When we value assets for our purposes for public reporting or even reporting to LPs, we have two people evaluate it: PWC who is external and provides third-party verification and then it's reviewed as KPMG as part of their audit process.

1170 Q. Do you know if XTG, the XTG asset
is held at a premium to its book value?
MR. WINTON: I don't think we can answer that specifically, but I think -- I don't think that's possible, is it?

THE WITNESS: Sure. You can -- in fact, it's common. Most companies, the value of the company is in excess of the book value of its assets. Can I ask you why you are asking that question? I'm not sure -- I don't want to say something that's wrong because I don't understand your question.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
1171 Q. I'm just interested in testing the assertion that $M r$. Griffin's research with respect to XTG was inaccurate.
A. He had no basis to establish a value one way or another for XTG.

1172 Q. Okay.
A. And didn't provide any that I recall in his report. Indeed if you're asking that question, if I can make the observation that the attempt to value was not based -- or the attempt -- the observation on the loan is not based on any valuations that I can see. So, in other words, there were observations about credits without any -- without appointing any values. Just an observation.

1173 Q. Because Mr. Griffin didn't have access to the nonpublic information he needed to do that.
A. Yup, so I guess you would say -you would agree with me that he didn't have a basis for established values. He could ask questions, but not establish values.

1174 Q. I don't know where Mr. Griffin purported to do that.
A. Okay.

1175 Q. But we can each interpret it our way own way.
A. Okay.

1176 Q. Another loan that West Face identified was Sherwood Hockey. Is that a loan by Callidus?
A. Sherwood was an asset acquired as part of an original purchase of distressed assets from one of the Canadian charter banks. They had financed a particular entity that was, in turn, lending to companies one of which was Sherwood Hockey.

1177 Q. Right. If we look at the Callidus IPO -- sorry, the Callidus prospectus, this is tab 33 in Volume 2 of Mr. Griffin's materials.
A. Yes.

MR. WINTON: There's some flagging and highlighting, but no comments.

MR. MILNE-SMITH: That's fine.
MR. WINTON: Okay. Which page?
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
1178
Q. Page 623.
A. And where are we?

1179
Q. Page 623 under, "Assets held for sale."
A. Yes.

1180
Q. So this says during 2011 the company received 100 percent of the common shares of a borrower in exchange for a loan valued at 12.6 million. "The asset held for sale is a corporation which distributes athletic equipment." That's Sherwood?
A. Yes.

1181
Q. Okay. So this is another case where you held equity?
A. Yes, but -- but be careful though. We didn't pay anything for that equity. When we acquired the assets from the Canadian chartered bank, we were handed, in effect, a loan plus the shares of that company.

1182 Q. Right.
A. That's -- so we didn't -- we

```
didn't -- we were -- it was part of our overall
acquisition of a portfolio in various states.
1 1 8 3 ~ Q . ~ O k a y . ~ Y o u ~ p a i d ~ m o n e y ~ t o ~ a c q u i r e
that portfolio?
A. We -- we --
1 1 8 4
Q. Paid valuable assets?
A. Yeah, we paid value to the bank in
```

question.
1185
Q. Right.
A. At -- I think we acquired everything at a discount, an overall discount.
1186
Q. I think you said earlier that XTG was held on the books as assets for sale?
A. Asset held for sale.

1187 Q. Asset held for sale. Why wouldn't
it show up in this note on page 623?
A. What date was that?

1188 Q. December 31, 2013.
A. Because it's -- these, this is year
ended 2013?
1189 Q. Yes.
A. So the date on which the receivership was completed was, I believe, 2015.

1190 Q. Okay. So it's not as of the date of the approval. It has to be when it closes.
A. Well, yes. Well, XTG at that time was a functioning loan, right. In 2013? End of -during this period for the period 21 -- 2012, 2013.
1191
Q. So you will recall, though, when we
look at XTG at the end of 2013, the sale processes had -- run by the company had failed --
A. Yes.

1192 Q. -- with respect to $C G$ and KPMG?
A. Yes.

1193
Q. And no buyer had been produced by stocking horse bid process run by Duff and Phelps, correct?
A. Uhm-hmm.

1194
Q. And the only person willing to pay anything was paying 17 million, which was less than half the value of the loan?
A. Yes.

1195
Q. But on your books that was still a performing loan?
A. I -- there might be loan lost provisions in here, but $I$ can't -- I don't recall whether there were any attributions of loan lost provisions against that particular loan at that time.

1196 Q. Okay.
A. The other is that these statements
are -- these in the context of restating the financials. In, during the period -- until the IPO -1197 Q. Yes.
A. -- exchange was a loan held directly -- in effect, directly by the funds. 1198
Q. Okay.
A. So these were restatements of the financial statements which KPMG was satisfied as to how we characterized the assets.

1199 Q. And Sherwood Hockey was ultimately sold to a company called Gracious Living?
A. Yes.

1200 Q. For how much?
A. I don't recall.

1201 Q. Would you undertake to advise?
U/A MR. WINTON: I'll take that under
advisement.
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
1202
Q. The principals of that company were Enzo Macri and Vito Galloro?
A. Yes.

1203
Q. Did you have any prior relationship with those individuals?
A. I did. I had acted as their counsel. They were part of Royal Group Technologies
and I had acted for Royal Group Technologies and subsequent to its evolution into Georgia Pacific. I did some work for Gracious Living, but not much. 1204 Q. Okay. At Exhibit $D$ to your reply affidavit -- that's the May 1 affidavit -- you have included correspondence between --- I believe it's between myself and Mr. Winton actually.

MR. WINTON: This is the May affidavit?
MR. MILNE-SMITH: No. This is the May 1, the reply.

MR. WINTON: The reply affidavit.
MR. MILNE-SMITH: D as in Donald.
MR. WINTON: D. Okay.
THE WITNESS: Can I look at this?
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
1205 Q. Yes. And it's between myself and Mr. Winton or Mr. DiPucchio.
A. Okay.

1206 Q. Just to situate you, there's an e-mail chain here.

This is correspondence surrounding the filing of Mr. Griffin's affidavit, and it was sent electronically to your counsel before it was filed. A. Okay.

1207 Q. And your counsel took objection to
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the contents. And you'll see --
A. Yes. This is over tab 46?

1208 Q. Page 46.
A. Okay.

1209 Q. Sorry --well, it's not just about
tab 46. It's about the entire record.
A. Okay.

1210
Q. So we're at page 45 of your record.
A. Yes.

1211
Q. I guess you can go over to 44 and see the date. It's a March 9 e-mail from me. You will see the last paragraph of --
A. Sorry, I'm having trouble getting this in focus. So this is March 9? You to --
Q. Yes.
A. Okay.

MR. WINTON: Over here, it's the chain so it's reading backwards.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
1213 Q. Right. So it's March 9 from me to Rocco, and then you have to go back to page 45 to see the content. And the last paragraph says:
"While we see no merit to your client's attempt to control the court record, we will defer filing West Face's
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responding motion record until Wednesday at 10 a.m. so that you may obtain instructions in respect of the foregoing."
A. Sorry, so I'm having -- what date would Wednesday be?
1214
Q. I will tell you.
A. Sorry, I just ...

1215
Q. I will tell you. It was March 9th,
that was the Monday. So offering to defer for two days. I'm just giving you all the context here before I asked the ultimate question, okay.
A. Is it okay to look through all the
e-mails?
1216 Q. Sure. I'm going to walk you
through it.
A. Why don't you do that. I won't take the time.

1217 Q. So then Mr. Winton's reply comes on March the 12th, so that's on page 44 now.
A. That's -- how many days later?

1218
Q. Three days later.
A. Oh, there -- sorry, okay. Yes.

1219
Q. So you'll see Mr. Winton does not accept the -- Catalyst does not accept the offer that I

```
had set out. It says that:
                    "Catalyst's position is that the
                    Griffin affidavit contains material
                    misstatements of fact about callidus.
                    If West Face proceeds to file the
                    Griffin affidavit in the public record,
                    Catalyst will be sending a copy of the
                    affidavit to the OSC to deal with that
                    matter."
                    A. Hmm.
1220
    Q. Did Catalyst, in fact, do that?
    A. We had discussions with the OSC,
```

        but the ultimate result, as you know, in enforcement
        they don't tell you what's happening.
            1221 Q. Okay. So you are not aware of them
        doing anything in response?
            A. No.
            1222
            Q. And the next paragraph:
            "Catalyst was not willing to advise
            West Face of what the alleged
            misstatements were."
            A. Yes.
            1223 Q. And then the last paragraph says
                that if West Face agreed to keep the Griffin affidavit
                out of the public record by agreeing to a sealing
    order, Catalyst will agree to seal its reply to that affidavit.
A. Correct.

1224
Q. And then if you go to the next
e-mail in the chain on paragraph 43 --
A. Okay.

1225
Q. -- Mr. Winton -- on page 43, sorry,

Mr. Winton clarifies:
"The suggestion that West Face can file the Griffin affidavit under seal and Catalyst will file its reply under seal is a suggestion, not a firm offer. To the extent the e-mail below suggests otherwise, I misstated Catalyst's position."
A. Okay.

1226
Q. So is it fair to say that Catalyst's position was that West Face should file under seal but Catalyst would not undertake to do the same?
A. I think -- well, you tell me. I don't remember the context of this.

MR. WINTON: That's not what is being suggested here. It's being suggesting if the parties can agree the parties can agree, but catalyst wasn't
willing to bind itself yet until it understood what West Face, if West Face was interested in that suggestion. At that point we would seek instructions.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
1227
Q. Right. Is it fair to say Catalyst took no steps so seal the record?

MR. WINTON: Yes.
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
1228
Q. If we go to paragraph 12 of the reply affidavit.
A. I think it's fair to say from my
point of view the cat was out of the bag.
MR. WINTON: Paragraph 12?
MR. MILNE-SMITH: Paragraph 12.
MR. WINTON: Of the affidavit?
MR. MIINE-SMITH: Of the affidavit.
That's on page 4.
MR. WINTON: Yes.
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
1229
Q. The last sentence there says:
"Griffin also implicitly admits
without giving details that West Face
circulated to third parties its research
with respect to Catalyst."
Where do you say Mr. Griffin made that
admission?
A. May I go back? Can I also see his -- his testimony? If you can give me his testimony.

1230 Q. Just to clear, Mr. Riley, you said this before you had his testimony, so you couldn't --
A. I agree with that.

1231 Q. okay. So you are not referring to anything in his testimony when you swore your reply affidavit?
A. I agree with that.

MR. WINTON: If I may?
MR. MILNE-SMITH: Yes.
MR. WINTON: I think it's implicit in paragraph 120 that the preparation of the PowerPoint document which is the Callidus' analysis --

MR. MILNE-SMITH: Yes.
MR. WINTON: -- is the report that has the appearance and trappings of being presented for public consumption and not for internal use.

THE WITNESS: That was, I think, my -one doesn't prepare a deck of that number of pages for an internal review and also, in effect, making a case for the public as opposed to case for internal position given that they had already put on their short -- I
don't know -- I don't know when they started -- I don't know they completed their research, but they certainly said they put their short on before they did the research.

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
1232
Q. They don't say that, sir, but we will leave that for the judge to determine.
A. Okay.

1233
Q. I take it, sir, you'd agree with me that once you have opened a short position you need to continue tracking the stock so you can decide when to consolidate it?
A. I agree.

1234 Q. So it would certainly make sense for West Face, after it had opened its short position, to continue following and updating its research on Callidus?
A. I agree with that.

1235 Q. You never worked at West Face obviously?
A. No.

1236 Q. You have no idea how they present things externally?
A. Sorry, sorry. No, I have not. It's only -- sorry, it's only I understand why you are
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asking the question.
1237 Q. So you have no idea how they might present things internally?
A. No, I do not.

1238 Q. And you aren't able to point to anyone they disclose some version of that report to outside of West Face?
A. I would like confirmation that they did not share it, share the substance and issues of it with Veritas.

1239 Q. That's been the subject of examination of Mr . Griffin. But I'm asking about what you are aware. So you are not aware of them giving it to anybody?
A. No. Well I am aware of several people who were -- referenced that they were, that there was discussions with West Face as to certain aspects of the report. Whether the report was finished or not, I don't know.
1240
Q. Who was that?
A. Certain of our investors.

1241
Q. Who?
A. Do I have to --

U/A
MR. WINTON: We can -- we will take it under advisement. Probably refuse it, but ...

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
1242
Q. Okay. Just to be clear, the paragraph that you say is where he implicitly admits to circulating it to third parties is paragraph 120?
A. I believe that is correct. Can I go back and refresh?

1243
Q. Yes.

Mr. Riley, Catalyst has taken the position in this litigation that West Face --
A. Sorry, can I go back to it again for a second?

1244 Q. Sure.
A. Okay. Thank you.

1245
Q. So Catalyst has taken the position in this litigation that West Face is a competitor of Catalyst, right?
A. Yes.

1246 Q. So they -- one of the things they compete for is investments?
A. Yes.

1247 Q. And is it also fair to say that your position is they compete for investors, people who are willing to give you money?
A. I don't know who their investors are. I know who our investors are, but I can't -- I
can't say. Because we have a certain type of investors; they may have different type.

1248 Q. Okay. You can't say one way or another?
A. No.

1249 Q. To the extent that West Face's investment in Wind were to be impeded or harmed, that would lower West Face's value and perception in the market, fair to say?
A. I'm sorry. What do you mean by
impeded or harmed?

| 1250 | Q. The value of it were diminished. |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1251 | A. In what way? |
|  | Q. Well, for example, by -- |
| 1252 | A. Of Wind? |
|  | Q. For example, by the relief sought | in this motion being granted?

A. It depends whether or not the relief is -- if the relief is granted --

$$
1253
$$

Q. Yes?
A. -- then it's not their value.

Right? In other words, if we are successful in getting result in trust, it's not diminished. It's not their investment.

1254 Q. Let's distinguish between the
motion and the action. So in the action you are
seeking constructive trust.
A. Got you.

1255 Q. In the motion you are seeking
injunctive relief to prevent them from exercising any control over the asset?
A. Yes.

1256 Q. Or any influence over the asset?
A. Yes.

1257 Q. So that would --
A. Yes.

1258 Q. -- harm West Face if that were to happen?
A. I don't know if that's true.

1259 Q. Okay. Fair to say that if an order was made enjoining West Face from playing any role in Wind, that would have a negative impact on West Face's standing in the market?
A. It may. I don't know how I can assess that because it depends ultimately on the outcome of the action.

1260 Q. And to the extent that West Face, an alleged competitive of Catalyst, were to be harmed, that would also help Catalyst, correct?

> A. Again, I can't say.
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1261 Q. As an investment manager, Catalyst has an incentive to maximize returns on investments in its funds, obviously?
A. Yes, that's fair enough.

1262
Q. And you have no reason to dispute that West Face would have the same incentives?
A. Yes.

1263
Q. So West Face would obviously have an incentive of maximize the value of its investment in Wind?
A. Yes.

1264 Q. Let's take a break there. I want to check a couple of things and then we will close up.
-- RECESS AT 4:35 --
-- RESUME AT 4:39 --
BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
1265 Q. Mr. Riley, I thank you for your patience. Just one last point. Earlier in your cross-examination $I$ referred to earnings not meeting expectations from the May 31st?
A. Yes.

1266 Q. And I just wanted to give you an example of that.
A. March 31, sorry.

1267 Q. March 31, yes, I'm sorry.
A. That's okay.

1268 Q. That is an analyst report from M.
Partners. You recognize them as one of the companies that -- one of the analysts that follows Callidus?
A. Uhm-hmm.

1269 Q. So this is dated April 2, 2015. Do you follow analyst reports for callidus?
A. I look at them. I don't follow
them religiously. I kind of look at them from time to time.

1270
Q. Okay, but you presumably --
A. We do. Catalyst, or Callidus and Catalyst are well aware of the analyst reports. 1271 Q. So you can recognize this as one of the reports following the release of the $Q 4$ ?
A. Yes, I'm trying to remember. $M$ Partners chose to follow us. I don't think we had any -- they were not part of the original underwriting group.

1272
Q. Right. So you will see that it says, just at the very top of the text, it says:
"As a result of reduced gross yield expectations higher provisions to
reflect risk in the book and a lower
target multiple, our target price moves
to \$24 from \$34."
A. Yes.

1273 Q. So what that means to a layperson is that their projection for the future share price of Callidus dropped from 34 to 22?
A. On their methodology, and I'm not here to debate. Every -- I think the other analysts are looking -- I think the consensus is 25. Did you look at that? Are you looking at just -- this is an isolated report.
1274
Q. There are many different numbers and I think that goes to the point we discussed earlier about how analysts can look at the same facts and come to different projection.
A. Although again, $I$ don't recall. I know -- I don't recall the details of this report. Can I look at it for a second to try to help you with the question you are asking me?

1275 Q. Sure. In the interim I will mark this as Exhibit 7, the morning note from M Partners dated April 2, 2015.

EXHIBIT NO. 7: Morning note from M
Partners dated April 2, 2015
THE WITNESS: Yes, without going through this in detail right now, if you go through it --
there's some, if you look at the estimates that they had for net income and our actual --

BY MR. MILNE-SMITH:
1276
Q. Where are you looking?
A. Just looking in the table, the Q4,

14 results.
1277 Q. Yes.
A. Trying to remember whether they
were looking at Q14 [sic] or full year.
$1278 \quad$ Q. Looks like Q4.
A. It's Q4? I'm not sure. Oh, there we are. Review, okay. This is Q4. If you look at their estimate for total revenue and actual --

1279 Q. Yes.
A. -- net income, ours was actually
higher, earnings per share was higher, gross loans receivable was -- give a push, right. Average outstandings we were higher than they were.

1280 Q. Sorry, total revenue was lower.
Actual is 33.5, consensus was 34.39 .
A. Yes, and you'll see that -- sorry, you're quite right. You will see there's a slight compression of gross yield as they go on to talk about. 1281 Q. Yes.
A. What people are starting to talk
about is we have a mixture of Callidus light and Callidus. We have two types, two general products. And in that particular quarter there was more callidus light. And as we pointed out to the market, that number will go up and down, the gross yield, because it depends on what -- how much of the light product compared to the regular product.

So that's what I think, that's what -they are saying that will perpetuate forever. We don't believe in that. They are saying until we see -- I think what they are saying is until we see proof over time, they are just saying what's your return, not any other issue than that. So I can't remember why we started this analysis.
1282 Q. And to be fair, the gross yield compression is something that Mr. Griffin had -- or that West Face had predicted in the, what you call the exhibit 46 report.
A. But that wasn't -- he did no analysis as to how much was Callidus light and how much regular Callidus.

1283 Q. Yes, but just to get the basic facts on the record, West Face had predicted that Callidus light loans would take up, in the future, a bigger proportion and that Callidus loans would take up
a smaller portion resulting in overall reduction of gross yields?
A. He had no basis to make that conclusion. That just happens to be in this quarter we did more Callidus light.

1284 Q. Again, that's not my question. It's not whether he had a basis to say it. It's that that's what he predicted.
A. Can you show me his prediction?

That doesn't necessarily reduce our returns, because with Callidus light you can use more leverage in the book.

1285 Q. Again, not my question.
A. I'm just -- you started down this
line of questioning, so $I$ just want to make sure we have facts on the record.

1286 Q. Look at page 784 of the record. So it says:

> "Analysts currently expect Callidus will have a gross yield of approximately 19.4 percent in $2016 . "$
> It says:
> "Analysts underestimate the diluted impact that competition in callidus light will have on gross yields."

So whether, whether you think he was justified in doing so or not, he was predicting that gross yields would come down?
A. Could you please read the next point?
Q. "For reasons already elucidated, the traditional Callidus loan book is very difficult to monitor and scale. Therefore, Callidus light will likely outpace growth in the traditional Callidus loan book and become a
larger portion of the loan book."
A. And could you tell me how he gets to those elucidations?

1287 Q. That's not the purpose of this cross-examination, sir. I'm just trying to make a simple factual point. Let's just be clear on this. The court isn't being asked to determine whether west Face was correct or not in its analysis of Callidus. All the Court is being -- all we're looking at here is a simple question of whether or not the gross yield compression referred to in Exhibit 7 is the same phenomenon that's being referred to in page 784 , regardless of whether you think it's hogwash or not.
A. I don't think it is. I think that
he is saying that over time it will be for sure that it
is going to compress. This is taking a one quarter
compression and implying that, he has implied that that
kind of compression will last forever. This is just
one notation of a compression.
1288 Q. Well, the M Partner says "gross
yield as a result of Callidus light will -- well in
excess of expectations and we expect it to continue."
A. To be compressed?
1289
Q. Yes. That's what it says.
A. Okay. But this is the only report
you are going to put in?
1290 Q. Yes.
A. Okay.
1291 Q. And this report agrees with the
predictions made by West Face on gross yield
compressions.
A. Dated April 2.
1292 Q. Yes. At least one analyst agreed,
right?
A. Subsequent to, not before.
1293 Q. After seeing the results.
A. In that one quarter.
Q. Yes.
A. Okay.

1295 Q. Subject to the undertakings and questions taken under advisement, those are my questions. Thank you.

MR. WINTON: I do have a brief re-exam.
RE-EXAMINATION BY MR. WINTON:
1296
Q. Mr. Riley, you recall that earlier
today Mr. Milne-Smith asked you some questions regarding catalyst's communication with Industry Canada?
A. Yes.

1297
Q. And one of those questions concerned the discussions regarding concessions that Catalyst would be seeking from Industry Canada?
A. Yes.

1298
Q. You recall that in particular he posited to you that any discussions with Industry Canada that took place on May 24 th or thereafter would not be within the knowledge of Mr. Moyse.
A. That's correct.

1299 Q. You agreed with that?
A. I did.

1300 Q. My question for you is, when did the discussions with Industry Canada regarding concessions Catalyst may be seeking first take place?
A. Prior to that date. On several
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```
occasions prior to that date.
```

    1301 Q. You recall that this afternoon
    Mr. Milne-Smith asked you questions regarding Arthon?
A. Yes.

1302
Q. In particular he brought you to at
least one, I think two, maybe three of the monitor's report that were filed in that proceeding?
A. Yes, he did.

1303
Q. And you recall that he brought you to the monitor's report that was filed in late January of 2015?
A. Sorry what was the date again?

1304 Q. Late January 2015.
A. Yes, I recall that one.

1305 Q. The 11 --
MR. MILNE-SMITH: The 11th report.
BY MR. WINTON:
1306 Q. And the 12 th report which is an exhibit to this examination --
A. Yes, yes.

1307 Q. -- which is Exhibit 6 is dated March 17th, 2015?
A. Correct.

1308 Q. This is just to situate where we are going here. To your knowledge what other documents
are publicly posted on a monitor's website in relation to a CCAA proceeding?
A. I believe the bankruptcy filings would have been posted as part of the court record. In fact, and I can't speak for Alvarez' filing, but you have all of the pleadings made, you have the reports, and you have any of the orders made that relate to it, so one of those would be the bankruptcy order for Coalmont.

1309 Q. Now you recall in relation to the discussions concerning BDCs, Mr. Milne-Smith asked you certain questions about catalyst's loan behaviour and I'm going to review them it summary for you. One, he made mention of the fact that Catalyst loans to a variety of industries, and you agreed with that statement?
A. Yes.

1310 Q. Two, he suggested that Callidus relies on the income from its loan portfolio?
A. Yes.

1311 Q. Third was that Callidus has portfolio monitoring policies and procedures in place? A. Yes.

1312 Q. Aside from BDCs, are you aware of any other lending institutions that would share those
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A. Banks.

MR. WINTON: No further questions.
MR. MIINE-SMITH: okay.
-- Whereupon the cross-examination concluded at 4:52 p.m.
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| 1246 265:18 | 1279 271:14 | $1308277: 24$ | $15539: 8$ |
| 1247 265:21 | 128 32:12 | 1309 278:10 | 156 |
| 1248 266:3 | 1280 271:19 | 13133.2 | 156 39:13 |
| 1249 266:6 | 1281 271:24 | $13133: 2$ | 157 39:17 |
|  |  | 1310 278:18 | 158 39:22 |
| 125 31:18 | 1282 272:15 | 1311 278:21 | 159 40:7 |
| 1250 266:12 | 1283 272:22 | 1312 278:24 |  |
| 1251 266:14 | 1284 273:6 | 132 33:8 235:4 248:7 |  |
|  |  | 13233.8235 .4248 .7 | $\begin{gathered} 168: 22 \text { 10:1 13:24 } \\ 16: 2599: 11 ~ 118: 5 \end{gathered}$ |

The Catalyst Capital Group Inc. v. Brandon Moyse et al RILEY, JAMES on May 13, 2015

Index: 160.. 238

| 130:19 154:23 160:22 | 183 47:22 | 2008 119:21 | 21 9:20 17:17 20:21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 161:18,22,24 162:5 | $184 \text { 48:2 }$ | 2009 92:15,23,25 93:2, | 204:11 254:3 |
| 163:19,21 164:22 192:1 |  | 2009 92:15,23,25:93.2, $3$ | 210 52:19 |
| 160 40:11 | 185 48:5 | 201 50:21 |  |
| 161 40:15 | 186 48:8 | 201 50:21 | 3 |
| 16240.21 | 187 48:11 | 2011 50:25 133:1,4 | 212 53:4 |
| 162 40:21 | 18748.11 | 252:11 | 213 53:7 |
| 163 41:1 | 188 48:14 | 2012 213:5,7 254:3 | 214 53.10 |
| 164 41:6 | 189 48:17 | 2013 93:7,16 94:22 |  |
| $16541.9105 \cdot 7812$ | 18th 205:24 | 95:6 235:24 236:10 | 215 53:15 |
| $108: 4110: 2$ | 19 9:10 56:17 196:6 | $243: 9246: 22$ 248:9 253:18,20 254:2,3,5 | 216 53:20 |
| 166 41:12 | 199:18 202:16 203:2 | 253.18,20 254.2,3,5 | 217 54:2 |
| 167 | 2 | 2014 7:1,7,15 10:1,10, | 21854.5 |
| 167 | $19.4273: 21$ | $42: 21 \text { 55:3 56:11 58:9 }$ | 219 54:13 |
| 41:19 | 190 48:21 | 60:20 62:10 76:3 77:12 | 21st 18 |
| 169 42:5 115:6 201:1 | 191 48:23 | 79:21 80:12 81:2,10 | 21st 18:22 |
| 16th 12:5,15 108:7 | 191 48:23 | 93:7 98:23 99:7 104:15 | 22 10:3 204:11 211:10 |
| $130: 15$ | 192 49:1 | $\begin{aligned} & 118: 5 \text { 119:19 121:22,23 } \\ & 123: 24 \text { 130:6 136:3 } \end{aligned}$ | 270:5 |
| 17 9:2 189:3 192:8,10 | 193 49:6 | 139:1 144:14 145:11 | 220 54:17 |
| 199:18 207:16,17,21 | 194 49:9 | 146:7 151:10 153:18, | 221 54:22 |
| 208:12 210:4 239:2 | 195 49:12 | 21,25 154:1,8 155:16 | 222 55:1 |
| 254:15 | 195 49:12 | 169:4 176:9 180:15 | 222 55:1 |
| $17042: 13194: 1$ | 196 49:20 | 195:7 216:1,19 | 223 55:5 |
| 171 43:20 | 197 49:24 | 2015 6:19,20 7:18,20 | 224 55:9 |
| 172 43:25 | 198 50:2 | 8:10,17 28:12:61:2 90:16 94:8 95:21 96:1, | 225 55:11 |
| 17 | 199 50:9 | 8,22 119:20,21,23,25 | 226 55:14 |
|  | 1A 104:6,11105:13 | 120:13 137:20 138:23 | $22755:$ |
| 174 45:3 | 107:4,18,21 110:19 | 139:22 140:21 143:21 160:22 161:18,22 162:5 | 227 55:1 |
| 175 45:6 | 111:3112:15 114:9 | 163:21 164:22 165:8,24 | 228 55:22 |
| 176 45:14 | 1E 57:11 110:21 | 191:25 204:16, 19,22 | 229 56:1 |
| 177 45:19 115:1 |  | 205:11 206:13 207:16, | 22nd 246:20 |
| 178 |  | 246:16 247:4 253:23 | 23 10:14 111:18 112:1 |
|  | 2 | 269:6 270:21,23 | 117:2 126:21 154:19 |
| 179 46:25 |  | 277:11,13,22 | 204:11 238:13 |
| 17th 277:22 | 2 6:5 7:10 10:10 64:12, | 2016 273:21 | 230 56:5 |
| 18 6:18,19 8:10,16 9:8 | 14,16 94:24 96:18,19 | 202 50:24 | 231 56:10 |
| 20:261:2 96:1 99:15 | 134:4,5 188:21 236:8 |  | 232 56:15 |
| 101:3 120:13 121:22 | 247:4 251:24 269:6 | 203 51:2 | 232 56:15 |
| 123:3 137:15 143:3,21, | 270:21,23 275:18 | 204 51:7 | 233 56:17 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 25 \text { 144:10 145:22 193:1 } \\ & 199: 18 \text { 205:11 } \end{aligned}$ | 20 9:15 96:8,22 154:18 | 205 51:19 | 234 57:7 |
|  | 155:9 156:11 200:4 | 20651.23 | 23557.9 |
| 18.9 220:8 | 202:13 203:6 204:12 | 206 51:23 | 235 57:9 |
| 180 47:8 | 232:14,19 | 207 52:4 | 236 58:2 |
| 181 47:13 | 200 50:16 | 208 52:9 | 237 58:7 |
| 182 47:18 | 2000 42:21 | 209 52:14 114:5 | 238 58:12 |
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| 239 58:22 | 265 63:4 | 293 69:7 | 311 73:16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23rd 99:15106:18 | 266 63:8 | 294 69:10 | 312 73:19 |
| 118:13 121:5,21 | 267 63:12 | 295 69:18 | 313 73:24 |
| 24 10:19 55:2,11 59:8 | 268 63:19 | 296 69:22 | 314 74:5 |
| 204:11 236:10 | 269 64:16 | 297 70:1 | 315 74:10 |
| 240 58:25 | 26B 229:23 | 298 70:11 | 316 74:16 |
| 241 59:3 | 26th 59:19,20 | 299 70:22 | 317 74:20 |
| 242 59:7 | 27 11:7 62:10 145:11 | 29th 77:15 | 318 74:23 |
| 243 59:13 | 204:22 210:3 219:6 | 2:03 132:4 | 319 75:2 |
| 244 59:18 | 270 65:15 | 2:29 158:1 | 31st 98:23 139:2 |
| 245 59:20 | 271 65:25 | 2:32 158:2 | 268:20 |
| 246 59:23 | 272 66:3 | 2A 57:9 | 32 12:10 13:15,22 |
| 247 60:1 | 273 66:7 | 2nd 246:16 | 320 75:8 |
| 248 60:4 | 274 66:10 |  | 321 75:11 |
| 249 60:9 | 275 66:13 | 3 | 322 75:22 |
| 24th 55.7 276.17 | 276 66:17 |  | 323 76:2 |
| 24th $55: 7$ 276:17 | 277 66:20 | $36: 9,208: 17$ 27:9 34:16 97:8,9 98:6 100:13.14 | 324 76:5 |
| 25 10:23 133:2 155;9 |  | 97:8,9 98:6 100:13;14 |  |
| 201:13,14 213:20,23 | 278 66:23 | 120:7 134:4,6 143:8 | 325 76:7 |
| 235:24 270:8 | 279 67:2 | 188:19 237:8 | 326 76:12 |
| 250 60:11 | 27th 141:14 206:13 | 30 11:23 28:12 60:22, | 327 77:8 |
| 251 60:15 | 208:3 | $\begin{aligned} & 23 \text { 138:23 152:20 } \\ & 153: 11 \end{aligned}$ | 328 77:10 |
| 252 60:19 | 28 7:15 11:12 203:14 | 300 71:6 | 329 78:8 |
| 253 60:24 | 225:19 | 301 71:12 | $3312 \cdot 1317 \cdot 2019.4$ |
| 254 61:2 | 280 67:5 | 30271.19 | $56: 10,13,1558: 8$ |
| 255 | 281 67:8 |  | 251:23 |
| 256 | 282 67:11 | 303 71:23 | 33(b) 58:13 |
| 256 | 283 67:14 | 304 72:13 | 33.5 271:20 |
| 257 61:20 | 28367.14 | 305.72:20 |  |
| 258 62:1 | 284 67:17 | 30672.23 | 330 78:14 |
| 259 62:8 | 285 67:22 | 306 | 331 78:20 |
| 25th 248.9 | 286 67:25 | 307 73:2 | 332 78:22 |
| 25th 248:9 | 287 68:6 | 308 73:5 | $33379: 6$ |
| 26 7:1 11:3 56:11 58:9 | 287 68:6 | 309 73:9 |  |
| 59:10 97:1,9 224:16,23 | 288 68:11 |  | 334 79:10 |
| 26-27th 141:14 | 289 68:16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 30th 8:24 12:5,14 } \\ & 138: 18 ~ 140: 8 ~ 205: 7 \end{aligned}$ | 335 79:15 |
| 260 62:13 | 29 11:16 76:3 209:12 | 31 8:1812:3 80:12 | 336 79:18 |
| 261 62:17 | 225:19 | 163:6 176:3 253:18 | 337 79:24 |
| 262 62:20 | 290 68:19 | 268:24,25 | 338 80:3 |
| 263 62:23 | 291 68:24 | 31-103 52:19 | $33980: 8$ |
| 264 63:2 | 292 69:2 | 310 73:12 | 34 12:17 270:5 |
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Index: 34.39.. 451

| 34.39 271:20 | 370 86:11 | 133:18 134:4,6 161:20 | 420 97:4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 34.9 220:8 | 371 86:14 | $\begin{aligned} & 162: 8 \text { 168:12 186:2 } \\ & 188: 19 \text { 193:17 201:6 } \end{aligned}$ | 421 97:12 |
| 340 80:11 | 372 86:17 | 223:3 235:3 261:17 | 422 97:17 |
| 341 80:14 | 373 86:23 | 4's 185:23 | 423 97:25 |
| 342 80:24 | 374 87:5 | $4.1239: 14$ | 424 99:5 |
| 343 81:6 | 375 87:9 | 4.1.4 217:22 | 425 99:11 |
| $34481: 9$ | 376 87:14 | $4.11219: 2$ | 426 99:14 |
| $34581: 15$ | 377 87:17 | 4.11C 219:15 | 427 99:18 |
| 346 81:22 | 378 87:24 | 4.14 215:23 | 428 99:22 |
| $34782: 3$ | $37988: 4$ | 4.2 239:14 | 429 100:2 |
| 348827 | 38 13:10 | 4.3 209:6 | 43 14:6 168:18 260:5,7 |
| 349 82:11 | 380 88:11 | 4.5 133:18 236:13 | 430 100:7 |
| $3512: 22$ | 381 88:15 | $40 \quad 13: 22$ | 431 100:10 |
| 350 82:15 | 382 88:19 | 400 92:21 | 432 100:25 |
| 351 82:18 | 383 89:4 | 401 92:24 | $433101: 9$ |
| 352 82:21 | 384 89:13 | 402 93:3 | $434101: 14$ |
| 353 83:4 | 385 89:20 | 403 93:5 | $435101: 23$ |
| 354 83:6 | 386 89:24 | 404 93:11 | 436 103:4 |
| 355 83:9 | 387 90:1 | 405 93:14 | 437 103:14 |
| $35683: 12$ | 388 90:5 | 406 93:20 | $438103: 17$ |
| 357 83:18 | 389 90:10 | 407 94:4 | 439 103:20 |
| 358 83:24 | 39 13:14 | 408 94:7 | 44 14:11 222:1 257:10 |
| 359 84:11 | 390 90:16 | 409 94:13 | 258:20 |
| 36 13:1 16:22 19:15 | 391 90:24 | 41 14:1 122:3,12,21. | 440 103:25 |
| 89:2 90:10 112:15 | $39291: 5$ | 123:18,22,23 | 441 104:6 |
| 36.97 236:12 245:21 | 393 91:9 | 410 94:17 | 442 104:10 |
| 360 84:15 | 394 91:13 | 411 94:24 | 443 104:14 |
| 361 84:23 | 395 91:17 | 412 95:2 | 444 104:18 |
| 362 85:3 | 396 91:23 | 413 95:8 | 445 105:2 |
| 363 85:5 | 397 92:6 | 414 95:12 | 446 105:5 |
| 364 85:9 | 398 92:13 | 415 95:23 | 447 105:10 |
| 365 85:12 | 399 92:18 | $41696: 7$ | 448 105:19 |
| 366 85:15 | 3:46 234:15 | 417 96:11 | 449 105:21 |
| 367 85:24 | 3B 37:21,22 | 418 96:13 | $45 \text { 14:14 120:8 257:8 }$ |
| 368 86:1 |  | 419 96:25 |  |
| 369 86:8 | 4 | 42 14:3 126:12 169:16, | 450 105:24 |
| $3713: 4$ | 4 6:15 28:15 106:4 | 21 | 451 106:3 |
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Index: 452.570

| 452 106:11 | 484 114:1 | $507118: 13$ | 539 124:8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 453 106:14 | 485 114:3 | $508118: 17$ | 54 16:7 |
| 454 106:16 | 486 114:8 | 509 118:19 | 540 124:11 |
| 455 106:19 | $4871.14: 11$ | 51 15:21 105:3,4 | 541 28:17 124:17 |
| 456 106:23 | $488114: 16$ | 510 118:22 | 542 124:23 |
| 457 107:12 | 489 114:20 | 511 119:1 | 543 125:1 |
| 458 107:14 | 49 15:6 | 512 119:4 | 544 125:10 |
| 459 107:17 | 490 114:23 | 513 119:7 | 545 125:17 |
| 46 14:19 190:7,9 195:2 | 491 115:12 | 514 119:15 | 546 125:22 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 221: 14257: 2,3,6 \\ & 272: 18 \end{aligned}$ | 492 115:18 | $515119: 18$ | 547 125:25 |
| 460 108:17 | 493 116:1 | $516119: 23$ | 548 126:5 |
| 461 109:2 | 494 116:8 | 517 119:25 | 549 126:12 |
| 462 109:5 | 495 116:10 | 518 120:6 | 55 16:13 |
| 463 109:12 | $496116: 19$ | 519 120:12 | 550 126:21 |
| 464 109:17 | $497116: 23$ | 52 15:25 219:24 | 551 127:1 |
| 465 109:20 | 498 116:25 | $520120: 15$ | 552 127:6 |
| 466 109:23 | 499 117:4 | 521 121:9 | 553 127:13 |
| 467 110:1 | 4:00 234:16 | $522121: 15$ | $554127: 15$ |
| 468 110:5 | 4:35 268:14 | $523121: 19$ | $555127: 18$ |
| 469 110:11 | 4:39 268:15 | $524121: 21$ | 556 127:20 |
| 47 14:23 169:13 197:6 | 4:52 279:6 | 525 122:2 | 557 127:24 |
| 219:18,19,24 220:16 | - | 526 122:6 | 558 128:6 |
| $470110: 13$ | 5 | $527122: 12$ | 559 128:11 |
| 471 111:2 | 5 6:17 80:4,5 134:7,8 | 528 122:15 | 56 16:18 240:17 |
| 472 111:9 | 165:22,23 180:1,2 | 529 122:21 | 560 128:16 |
| 473 111:16 | $\begin{aligned} & 185: 4,6,24209: 6213: 9 \\ & 219: 18,24: 220: 16 \end{aligned}$ | 53 16:5 | 561 128:19 |
| 474 112:5 | 238:24 | 53.8 219:13,14,17 | 562 128:22 |
| 475 112:9 | 50 15:17 64:12,16 | 220:12 221:7 | 563 129:3 |
| $476112: 12$ | 156:8 185:9:222:2 236:21, 23237.1 | $530122: 24$ | 564 129:5 |
| 477 112:14 | $500117: 11$ | 531 123:1 | 565 129:9 |
| 478 112:21 | 501 117:15 | 532 123:6 | 566 129:12 |
| 479 112:23 |  | 533 123:9 | 567 129:17 |
| 48 15:1 | $503117: 2$ | $534123: 13$ | 568 129:25 |
| 480 113:3 | $504118 \cdot 1$ | $535123: 18$ | 569 130:5 |
| 481 113:7 |  | 536 123:22 | 57 16:21 |
| 482 113:18 |  | 537 123:24 | $570 \text { 130:9 }$ |
| 483 113:23 | 506118.9 | 538 124:3 |  |
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Index: 571.. 695

| 571 130:12 | 241:12 | 631 142:1 | 663 148:9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 572 130:16 | $600135: 16$ | 632 142:20 | $664148: 16$ |
| 573 130:19 | 601 135:19 | 633 142:25 | $665148: 22$ |
| 574 130:22 | 602 135:23 | 634 143:2 | 666 149:3 |
| 575 130:25 | 603 136:2 | $635143: 8$ | 667 149:6 |
| 576 131:8 | 604 136:7 | $636143: 12$ | 668 149:10 |
| 577 131:15 | $605136: 14$ | 637 143:18 | 669 149:13 |
| 578 131:19 | $606136: 18$ | 638 143:25 | 67 19:12 |
| 579 132:1 | 607 136:23 | 639 144:5 | 670 149:19 |
| 58 17:8 240:25 241:2 | 608 137:1 | 64 18:24 32:24 33:2 | 671 149:25 |
| 580 132:6 | 609 137:4 | 34:14 | 672 150:3 |
| 581 132:14 | 61 18:622:8,21 | 640 144:9 | 673 150:7 |
| 582 132:19 | 610 137:8 | 641 144:16 | 674 150:11 |
| 583 132:25 | 611 137:11 | 642 144:19 | $675150: 15$ |
| 584 133:6 | 612 137:14 | 643 144:23 | 676 150:17 |
| 585 133:10 | 613 137:18 | 644 145:5 | 677 150:20 |
| 586 133:13 | 614 137:25 | $645145: 9$ | 678 150:24 |
| 587 133:15 | 615 138:2 | $646145: 13$ | 679 151:4 |
| 588 133:19 | 616 138:5 | 647 145:18 | 68 16:23 19:15 |
| 589 133:25 | 617 138:7 | 648 145:20 | 680 151:9 |
| 59 17:15 | 618 138:10 | 649 146:3 | 681 151:13 |
| 590 134:3 | 619 138:15 | $65 \text { 13:18 19:3 32:22 }$ $33: 14$ | 682 151:17 |
| 591 134:7 | 62 18:13 23:12,21,24 | 650 146:5 | 683 151:23 |
| 592 134:10 | 27:19,22,23 28:3 | 651 146:9 | 684 152:3 |
| 593 134:14 | 620 138:21 | 651 146.9 | 685 152:6 |
| 594 134:17 | 621 138:25 | $652146: 14$ 653146.18 | 686 152:8 |
| 595 134:21 | 622 139:4 | 653146 | 687 152:14 |
| 596134.25 | 623 139:8 252:6,8 | 654 146:24 | 687 152.14 |
| 596 134:25 | $253: 16$ | 655 147:2 | 688 152:19 |
| $597135: 4$ | 624 139:12 | $656147: 7$ | 689 152:23 |
| 598 135:8 | $625139: 15$ | 657 147:10 | 69 19:19 |
| 599 135:12 | $626139: 21$ | 658 147:13 | 690 153:2 |
|  | 627 140:14 | 659 147:17 | 691 153:6 |
| 6 | $628 \text { 140:18 }$ | 66 19:10 | 692 153:8 |
| 6 6:24 191:25 207:19,20 | 629 141:4 | 660 147:20 | 693 153:14 |
| 208:22 277:21 | 63 18:19 22:25 23:1,7 | 661 147:23 | $694153: 17$ |
| $6.5113: 8$ | $630141: 19$ | 662 148:1 | 695 153:20 |
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Index: 696.. 809

| 696 153:23 | 72 20:4 | 752 165:2 | 784 171:11 273:17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 697 154:1 | 720 159:3 | 753 165:4 | 274:23 |
| 698 154:4 | 721 159:6 | 754 165:8 | $785171: 16$ |
| 699 154:6 | 722 159:11 | 755 165:12 | 786 171:25 |
| 6th 140:21 142:22 | 723 159:15 | 756 165:15 | 787 172:7 |
| 143:4 | 724 159:18 | 757 165:19 | 788 172:14 |
|  | 725 159:21 | 758 166:2 | 789 172:19 |
| 7 | 726 | $759186.5$ | 79 22:7 |
| 7 7:610:11 93:16 | 727 160:6 | 76 20:23 | 790 172:22 |
| 130:19 137:20,25 |  |  | 791 173:1 |
| 139:16,22 168:17 169:4 | 728 160:10 | 760 166:11 |  |
| 192:4 204:19,22 232:18 | 729 160:13 | 761 166:18 | 792 173:9 |
| 270:20,22 274:22. | 73 20:8 | 762 166:22 | 793 173:15 195:11,12 |
| 7.3 113:3 114:12 | $730160: 17$ | 763 167:1 | 794 173:17 |
| 7.3B 111:5 | 731 160:20 | 764 167:3 | 795 173:24 |
| 7.4 196:24 | 732160 | 765167 | 796 174:8 |
| 70 19:22 143:12 | 732160.25 | 165107.13 | 797 175:9 |
| 700 154:11. | 733 161:4 | 766 167:16 |  |
| 700154.11. | 734 161:8 | 767 167:18 | 798 175:17 |
| 701 154:15 | $735161: 10$ | 768 167:22 | 799 175:20 |
| 702 154:22 | $736161: 13$ | 769 168:1 190:14 | 7th 130:6 204:16 221:5 |
| 703 155:5 | $737 \text { 162: }$ | 191:6,8 | - |
| 704 155:11 | $738 \quad 162: 5$ | 769,000 217:11 | 8 |
| 705 155:15 | $739162 \cdot 12$ | 77 21:3 | 8 7:9 27:20 28:6 61:3 |
| 706 155:19 | 7420.1222 .9 | 770 168:4 | 119:20,25 188:3,7 |
| 707 156:4 | 74 20.1222 | 771 168:7 | 224:24 |
| 708 156:7 | 740 162:15 | $772168 \cdot 15$ | 8.1 207:12 |
| $709156 \cdot 11$ | 741 162:22 | 772 | 80 22:23 189:13 192:5 |
| 709 156:11 | 742 162:25 | 773 169:2 | $80 / 20 \quad 188: 5$ |
| 71 20:1 | 743163.9 | 774 169:6 | 80/20 188.5 |
| 710 156:13 | 743 <br> $744163: 9$ | 775 169:12 | 800 175:25 |
| 711 157:2 | 744 163:11 |  | 801 176:9 |
|  | $745163: 18$ | $776169: 15$ | 802 176:12 |
| 712 157:24 | 746 163:23 | 777 169:19 | $803$ <br> 176:20 |
| 713 158:4 | $747164: 5$ | 778 169:24 | 803 176:20 |
| 714 158:9 | $\begin{array}{lll}747 & 164: 5 \\ 748 & 104: 11\end{array}$ | 779 170:3 | 804 177:2 |
| $715158: 13$ | 748 164:11 |  | $805177: 9$ |
| $\begin{array}{lll} \\ 715 & 158: 13\end{array}$ | 749 164:14 | 78 21:8 | $806177: 15$ |
| $716158: 17$ | $75 \quad 20: 18$ | $780 \quad 170: 12$ | 806177.15 |
| 717 158:20 |  | 781 170:22 | 807 177:24 |
| 718 158:22 | 750 164:18 | $782 \text { 171:6 }$ | 808 178:3 |
| 719 159:1 | 751 164:21 | $783 \text { 171:9.195:10 }$ | 809 178:7 |
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Index: $81 . .936$

| 81 23:2 192:19 | 842 187:4 | 875 192:22 | 904 198:12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 810 178:14 | 843 187:8 | 876 193:1 | $905198: 19$ |
| 811 178:17 | 844 187:1.1 | 877 193:6 | $906198: 25$ |
| 812 179:4 | 845 187:24 | 878 193:10 | 907 199:6 |
| 813 179:13 | 846 188:8 | 879 193:15 | 908 199:8 |
| 814 179:17 | 847 188:13 | 88 24:14 243:25 | 909 199:14 |
| 815 179:25 | 848 188:16 | 880 193:22 | 91 25:1 |
| 816 180:3 | 849 188:20 | 881 194:1 | 910 199:17 |
| 817 180:8 | 85 23:23 203:2 | 882 194:6 | 911 200:4 |
| 818 180:10 | 850 188:22 | 883 194:9 | 912 200:8 |
| 819 180:13 | 851 188:25 | 884 194:16 | 913 200:11 |
| 82 23:6 196:12 | 852 189:3 | $885194: 20$ | 914 200:13 |
| 820 180:21 | 853 189:7 | $886194: 23$ | 915 200:18 |
| 821 180:25 | 854 189:12 | 887 195:3 | 916 200:20 |
| 822 181:10 | 855 189:17 | 888 195:8 | 917 200:25 |
| 823 181:24 | 856 189:24 | 889 195:11 | 918 201:5 |
| 824 182:19 | 857 190:7 | 89 24:18 | 919 201:9 |
| 825 182:22 | $858190: 11$ | 890.195:17 | 92 25:10 57:15 |
| 826 182:24 | 859 190:17 | 891 195:19 | 920 201:13 |
| 827 183:2 | 86 24:6 | 892 195:22 | 921 201:22 |
| 828 183:11 | 860 190:20 | 893 196:4 | 922 202:2 |
| 829 183:20 | 861 190:22 | 894 196:6 | 923 202:9 |
| 83 23:12 | 862 190:25 | $895196: 11$ | 924 202:12 |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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List of Undertakings, Advisements, and Refusals
Given at the Cross-Examination of JAMES RILEY, held May 13, 2015
Examination by Mr. Borg-Olivier

| No. | P. | Q. | Category | Question | Answer |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1. | $41-43$ | $168-$ <br> 170 | Undertaking | To advise whether or not it is Catalyst's <br> position that emails wiped from a <br> Blackberry would not otherwise be <br> maintained on Catalyst's servers. | Emails sent through a Catalyst account would <br> be maintained on Catalyst's servers or servers <br> to which Catalyst has access, even if a <br> Blackberry is wiped. But emails sent through a <br> non-Catalyst account via a Blackberry would <br> not be maintained on a Catalyst server. |
| 2. | $41-43$ | $168-$ <br> 170 | Advisement | To advise what Catalyst's backup data <br> retention policies are and, if the evidence <br> is that emails wiped from a Blackberry <br> would not be maintained, to advise why <br> that is with respect to its data retention <br> policies. | Refused - in light of the answer to \#1, this <br> information is irrelevant. |
| 3. | $43-44$ | $171-$ | Undertaking | To make inquiries of IT and advise <br> whether it is possible to determine now <br> whether Mr. Moyse's Blackberry was <br> synchronized with the Catalyst server <br> such that emails deleted from one would <br> be deleted from the other. | Catalyst's standard practice is to synchronize <br> Blackberry devices, but there is no way to <br> determine whether Mr. Moyse's Blackberry was <br> synchronized. |
| 4. | 46 | 178 | Undertaking | To provide confirmation that during the <br> relevant timeframe, Catalyst would <br> receive bills in respect of a work-issued <br> blackberry that would include records of <br> phone calls made and received [the <br> number of calls of the sender or recipient <br> of the phone calls]. | Catalyst received invoices that showed the <br> telephone number of an incoming caller or to <br> which an outgoing call was made. However, the <br> invoices do not contain the name of the <br> caller/recipient, which is recorded on a <br> Blackberry and which was wiped when Mr. <br> Moyse wiped his company-issued Blackberry <br> prior to returning it to Catalyst. |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. | P. | Q. | Category | Question | Answer |
| 5. | 63-65 | $\begin{array}{\|l} 268- \\ 269 \end{array}$ | Advisement | To advise whether at any time after the unsealing of the court record, Jean Lepine, Mr. Glassman or any other individual at Catalyst spoke about this case with anyone at the Globe and Mail or National Post, specifically with either Ms. Tedesco or Mr. Kiladze. | Refused. |
| 6. | 71-72 | 303 | Advisement | Further to ADV 5, to advise whether at any time after the unsealing of the court record, Jean Lepine, Mr. Glassman or any other individual at Catalyst had any indirect communications about this case with any external press agent. | Refused. |
| 7. | 76-77 | $\begin{array}{\|l} 326- \\ 328 \end{array}$ | Undertaking | To advise whether the evidence given at Mr. Riley's July 29 ${ }^{\text {th }}, 2014$ crossexamination is correct, that Mr. Moyse was only assigned to work on Wind Mobile the week before he left on vacation two weeks before he resigned. | As stated in Mr. Riley's April 30, 2015 affidavit, Mr. Moyse worked on a PowerPoint presentation in March 2014 that related to Wind Mobile, approximately two months before his resignation. |
| 8. | 77-78 | 328 | Advisement | Further to UT 7, to provide any documents that support Mr. Riley's suggestion that Mr. Moyse was involved with Wind Mobile before the two-week period in question. | As previously explained, all copies of the PowerPoint prepared in March 2014 were destroyed. |


| No. | P. | Q. | Category | Question | Answer |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9. | $\begin{aligned} & 100- \\ & 101 \end{aligned}$ | 432 | Advisement | To provide any evidence concerning Catalyst's negotiations with VimpelCom that support Mr. Riley's assertion in his February 18, 2015 affidavit that Catalyst and VimpelCom had negotiated everything except for a term relating to regulatory approval. | Attached at Tab 9-A is the Share Purchase Agreement negotiated by the parties as of August 8, 2014, together with related email messages. <br> Attached at Tab 9-B is an email chain dated August 8-10, 2014, with an attached press release drafted by VimpelCom. <br> These documents demonstrate that the parties were on the verge of completing a deal for Catalyst to purchase Wind Mobile as of August 8, 2014. |
| 10. | $\begin{aligned} & 106- \\ & 108 ; \\ & 110 \end{aligned}$ | 456- <br> 460; <br> 470 | Undertaking | If the Catalyst Group intends to take a position to the contrary than what is at Tab 1A of Mr. Griffin's supplementary affidavit is the same draft that was marked <br>  Mr. Riley's supplementary affidavit, with the only apparent difference being the date, to advise. | Catalyst does not take this position. |
| 11. | 123 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} 532- \\ 533 \end{array}$ | Advisement | To produce the final but unsigned paper work for the transaction to acquire Wind, as referenced at paragraph 41 of Mr . Riley's May $1^{\text {st }}, 2015$ affidavit. | Attached at Tab 9-A. |
| 12. | 124 | 540 | Advisement | Further to ADV 11, to provide any documentary evidence demonstrating that VimpelCom was prepared to accept the terms. | Attached at Tab 9-B. |
| 13. | $\begin{aligned} & 124- \\ & 125 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 541- \\ 543 \end{array}$ | Advisement | To make inquiries of Mr. De Alba, review diaries or long-distance phone records to try to determine when exactly the call with Industry Canada took place. | The call with Industry Canada took place on August 11, 2014. |


| No. | P. | Q. | Category | Question | Answer |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 14. | $125-$ <br> 126 | $544-$ <br> 548 | Undertaking | Further to ADV 12 and 13, to make <br> inquiries and provide Catalyst's <br> understanding whether the transaction <br> was conditional upon VimpelCom board <br> approval. If any VimpelCom approval had <br> been communicated, to provide evidence <br> of it. | The transaction was conditional upon <br> VimpelCom board approval. Board approval <br> was not formally communicated to Catalyst, but <br> was assumed given that VimpelCom had <br> drafted and circulated to Catalyst the press <br> release attached at Tab 9-B. |
| 15. | 127 | $554-$ <br> 556 | Undertaking | To advise whether VimpelCom ever <br> asked for a break fee. | The parties never negotiated a break fee. |
| 16. | $127-$ <br> 128 | 557 | Advisement | Further to UT 15, if VimpelCom did ask for <br> a break fee, to provide its precise terms <br> and whether Catalyst agreed to it. | N/A |
| 17. | $130-$ <br> 131 | $574-$ <br> 576 | Undertaking | To advise whether Catalyst ever <br> considered a strategy to engage in a two- <br> part structure to the transaction whereby <br> VimpelCom only transferred nonvoting <br> shares at the first stage of the transaction. <br> lf so, to provide evidence of ever having <br> done so. | A two-part structure to the transaction was <br> considered but not pursued. |
| 18. | $163-$ <br> 164 | $745-$ | Advisement | To provide any correspondence between <br> Veritas and Catalyst, or anybody on <br> behalf of Catalyst, listing the number of <br> misstatements in the report entitled <br> "Accounting Alerts! Callidus Capital <br> Corporation" dated April 16, 2015. | Attached at Tab 18 is a letter to Veritas from <br> Catalyst's outside counsel dated April 24, 2015. |
| 19 | 173 | 794 | Refusal | To advise which loans are currently on the <br> watch list. | Refusal maintained. This is material, non-public <br> information. |
| 20. | $175-$ |  |  |  |  |
| 176 | $800-$ | 803 |  |  |  |
| Refusal | To advise which two loans have negative <br> value at risk and how much money was <br> owed by borrowers on the watch list. | Refusal maintained. This is material, non-public <br> information. |  |  |  |


| No. | P. | Q. | Category | Question | Answer |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21. | 177 | 804 | Refusal | To provide the amount of negative VAR. | Refusal maintained. This is material, non-public information. |
| 22. | 177 | 805 | Refusal | To advise whether there have been any additional loans placed on the watch list since the conference call in November, 2014. | Refusal maintained. This is material, non-public information. |
| 23. | $\begin{aligned} & 177- \\ & 179 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 807 ; \\ & 811 \end{aligned}$ | Refusal | To provide any valuations for loans that West Face has identified, including both aspects of that collateral, to the extent valuations exist. | Refusal maintained. This is material, non-public information. |
| 24. | 179 | 813 | Refusal | To provide financial statements for any borrowers on the watch list. | Refusal maintained. This is material, non-public information. |
| 25. | 210 | $\begin{aligned} & 958- \\ & 959 \end{aligned}$ | Refusal | To advise what interest rate Callidus enjoys on the loan. | Refusal maintained. This is material, non-public information. |
| 26. | 211 | $\begin{aligned} & 960 ; \\ & 963 \end{aligned}$ | Refusal | To advise how much principal or interest has been repaid to Callidus out of cash generated by Arthon, not funded by further advances by Callidus. | Refusal maintained. This is material, non-public information. |
| 27. | $\begin{aligned} & 213- \\ & 214 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 971- \\ & 977 \end{aligned}$ | Advisement | If there is any documentary evidence that the Sandhill facility is up, running, and generating income, to provide. | Attached at Tab 27. |
| 28. | $\begin{aligned} & 243- \\ & 246 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1136- \\ & 1149 \end{aligned}$ | Refusal | To advise how much money Callidus ultimately advanced to XTG. | Refusal maintained. This is material, non-public information. |
| 29. | $\begin{aligned} & 247- \\ & 248 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1161- \\ & 1162 \end{aligned}$ | Refusal | To provide financial statements of XTG. | Refusal maintained. This is material, non-public information. |
| 30. | 248 | $\begin{aligned} & 1163- \\ & 1164 \end{aligned}$ | Refusal | To advise whether Callidus has, in fact, advanced additional funds to XTG to facilitate its restructuring and future growth. | Refusal maintained. This is material, non-public information. |


| No. | P. | Q. | Category | Question | Answer |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 31. | 255 | $1199-$ <br> 1201 | Advisement | To advise how much Sherwood Hockey <br> was sold for to Gracious Living. | Refusal maintained. This is material, non-public <br> information. |
| 32. | 264 | $1238-$ <br> 1241 | Advisement | To provide the names of the investors Mr. <br> Riley had discussions with that had <br> become aware of certain aspects of the <br> report. | Refused. |

