IN THE COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH OF ALBERTA JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF EDMONTON

No. 0903-08903

BETWEEN:

WILLIAM PIDRUCHNEY

Plaintiff (Applicant)

- and -

THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF EDMONTON, CITY OF EDMONTON MAYOR STEPHEN MANDEL, THE COUNCILLORS OF THE CITY OF EDMONTON, EPCOR UTILITIES INC., EPCOR POWER SERVICES LTD., EPCOR POWER, L.P., CAPITAL POWER CORPORATION

Defendants (Respondents)

INTERIM INJUNCTION APPLICATION No counsel A. W. Macdonald Jr., Q.C. and D. V. Tupper, Esq. For EPCOR Utilities Inc., EPCOR Power Services Ltd., EPCOR Power L.P., and Capital Power Corporation

M. Young, Esq.
 For The Corporation of the City of Edmonton, City of Edmonton Mayor Stephen Mandel, The Councillors of the City of Edmonton
 C. C. J. Feasby, Esq.
 For TD Securities Inc. and

underwriters

C. L. Stabbler, CSR(A) Court Reporter

Edmonton, Alberta July 3, 2009 1 PROCEEDINGS COMMENCED AT 1:39 P.M.

2 (PORTION OMITTED UPON REQUEST)

3 THE COURT: Thank you. Be seated, please. 4 At a meeting of EPCOR Utilities Inc. in April 5 of 2009, the City of Edmonton as sole shareholder of EPCOR approved a reorganization involving 6 creation of a public company, Capital Power 7 Corporation, and a transfer to that company of 8 9 EPCOR's electrical generating assets and going -concerning electrical businesses. 10

The applicant seeks an interim injunction prohibiting further activity in relation to this transaction claiming that the decision approving the reorganization should have been effected by way of a municipal bylaw or resolution in the context of a public process. That application is denied.

Let me briefly summarize the facts which are,
for the most part, not contentious. I take these
from the brief the respondent EPCOR which in turn
takes them from Mr. Don Lowry's Affidavit.

21 On June 5, 1995, the Minister of Municipal 22 Affairs of the province issued Ministerial Order 23 No. L:307/95 approving the investment by the City 24 of Edmonton in Edmonton Power Corporation 25 subsequently known as EPCOR.

26At the same date, the Minister wrote a letter27to the President and Chief Executive Officer of

Edmonton Power advising that Edmonton Power would not be required to hold meetings open to the public and was not to be treated the same as a council committee.

1

2

3

4

27

5 At a meeting held of City Council on June 26, 1995, the City passed bylaw No. 11071 to establish 6 7 Edmonton Power. Pursuant to the bylaw, the City of Edmonton became the sole shareholder of Edmonton 8 Power. The business of Edmonton Power was to be 9 conducted in accordance with bylaw 11071, Edmonton 10 Power's articles of incorporation, bylaws and any 11 12 unanimous shareholder agreements. The June 26, 13 1995, public meeting was held in public.

14At the June 26, 1995, meeting, council also15approved a voting resolution.

16 On May 5, 2000, EPCOR bylaw No. 1 came into 17 effect. Bylaw No. 1 was passed by the City as sole 18 shareholder in a vote held at a shareholder meeting 19 pursuant to the process set up by the voting 20 resolution to which I had earlier referred.

21 Bylaw No. 1 incorporated the same voting 22 process as prescribed by the voting resolution.

23 Votes of EPCOR have been concluded using a
24 process prescribed by the voting resolution which
25 is consistent with the process prescribed by bylaw
26 No. 1.

On April 17, 2009, a shareholder meeting of

EPCOR was held. The City as shareholder passed 1 2 resolution 2009.09.17-04. This resolution, the 3 April resolution, authorized the Board of Directors 4 of EPCOR to take steps in relation to a transaction 5 that included transfer of EPCOR's power generation business to a new entity, sale of EPCOR's interest 6 in that entity over time either by way of public 7 equity offerings or a staged sale to one or more 8 9 joint venture partners so as to raise capital for investment in EPCOR's water and wires businesses. 10

I want to emphasize that the meeting of April 17, 2009, was held pursuant to bylaw No. 1.

The shareholder meeting was not public, and the chairman of the Board explained the basis for the needed confidentiality of the meeting, more of which I will say later.

11

12

17 After the April resolution was passed, EPCOR, its Board, the management, the legal and financial 18 advisors all worked to determine whether and how 19 20 the transaction should be implemented. On May 8, 21 2009, a preliminary long-form prospectus was filed with respect to the initial public offering of 22 Capital Power Corporation. EPCOR, its shareholder 23 24 and advisors were obligated by securities laws to 25 maintain confidence during this period. On June 26 25, 2009, the final long-form prospectus in respect 27 of the initial public offering of Capital Power

Corporation was filed, and the Alberta Securities Commission issued its receipt.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

Consistent with securities laws, the final prospectus provides full, plain and true disclosure with respect to the initial offering of Capital Power Corporation. A description of the various steps taken in relation to the transaction is included in the final prospectus. And those are found at pages 107 to 120 of that document.

As a result of the initial public offering, 10 Capital Power Corporation expects to receive 11 proceeds from the sale of 21,750,000 common shares. 12 13 Those proceeds would amount to the sum of 468 million to \$539 million after deducting 14 underwriting fees and estimated offering expenses. 15 16 Capital Power Corporation intends to use the net 17 proceeds as partial consideration for the acquisition of the assets and operations of the 18 19 business of Capital Power Corporation from EPCOR as disclosed on page 157 of the prospectus. 20

As a result of the reorganization, Capital Power Corporation will pay total consideration of \$2.864 billion to EPCOR for the assets transferred from EPCOR and its subsidiaries to Capital Power Corporation. Included in the total consideration is \$896 million in cash and a 72.2 percent equity interest in Capital Power.

1 EPCOR requires large amounts of capital to not 2 only grow its business but maintain existing 3 operations. Failure to raise this capital through 4 the transaction creates significant risk and cost 5 to the company as it would be forced to borrow funds at today's rates which Mr. Lowry swears are 6 significantly higher than previous periods. 7 It is this risk and these costs that EPCOR is 8 endeavouring to avoid by the transaction which has 9 10 taken place.

If an injunction were issued according to Mr. Lowry and the closing of the transaction were delayed, EPCOR's professional advisors have advised that it is unlikely that the transaction will not be completed at all.

16 If the transaction and the initial public offering do not proceed as scheduled, there is a 17 risk that market conditions will change such that 18 the current pricing of the initial public offering 19 20 will not be viable in any future offering, and 21 EPCOR will not receive equivalent value for its assets as will be realized through the transaction 22 and the initial public offering as planned. 23

Further, it is argued that if an injunction were issued, any future public offering would be highly unlikely as a result of the additional risk attendant on public offerings of Capital Power Corporation stock thereby making such a transaction unattractive to investors and underwriters because of the resulting uncertainty.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

I've gone through those facts set out in Mr. Lowry's Affidavit to some extent because it underlies the following reasons for my decision and the conclusion to which I have already given you that an injunction will not be issued.

9 The applicant's position, Mr. Pidruchney's 10 position, is that the mayor and the councillors of the City of Edmonton acted without jurisdiction in 11 12 authorizing the transfer of the power generating 13 assets to Capital Power Corporation and in 14 authorizing the IPO, that is the public offering, because City Council did not pass a bylaw or 15 16 resolution in public as required by the Municipal 17 Government Act.

18 The respondents take the position, firstly, 19 that the applicant has no standing and, secondly, 20 that the mayor and the councillors properly 21 authorized the sale of the electrical assets of 22 EPCOR and the creation of a company to purchase the 23 assets which would in turn raise money through the 24 sale of shares to the public.

The voting procedure which was authorized in
June of 1995 at a public meeting was followed. It
was not necessary to hold a public meeting. This

is the position taken by the respondents. They argue further that the applicant cannot show that he will suffer irreparable harm and that in any event the balance of convenience favours the City.

1

2

3

4

5 Let me turn to the issues. Issues are. firstly, does Mr. Pidruchney have standing; 6 7 secondly, if so, has he met the tripartite test of having to satisfy this Court of three things. 8 9 Firstly that -- when I refer to a tripartite test, this is a test set forth by the Supreme Court of 10 Canada in a decision by the name of R.J. MacDonald 11 12 a number of years ago.

13 The tripartite test is this: Has the applicant established that there's a serious issue 14 to be tried? Has the applicant satisfied that he 15 would satisfy the Court that he would suffer 16 17 irreparable harm if an interim injunction were not issued? Thirdly, whether the applicant should be 18 19 entitled to an injunction because the balance of 20 convenience favours him as opposed to the City and 21 EPCOR. Put another way, has in this case Mr. Pidruchney satisfied the Court that he would 22 23 suffer greater harm if the injunction were not 24 granted than the City and EPCOR would suffer if it 25 were.

26The final matter that the Court must take into27consideration is whether Mr. Pidruchney has

8

satisfied the Court that he is able to post a meaningful undertaking in damages.

1

2

The conclusions I have come to are as follows: 3 4 Firstly, Mr. Pidruchney does have standing to bring 5 this application; however, he is not able to satisfy the Court that there is a serious issue to 6 be tried. He has not satisfied the Court that he 7 would suffer irreparable harm. He has not 8 9 satisfied the Court that he would suffer greater harm if the injunction were not granted than the 10 City and EPCOR would suffer if it were. 11 Finally, 12 he is not able to post a meaningful undertaking as 13 to damages.

14 I propose to give relatively brief reasons for having come to my conclusions. With respect to the 15 matter of standing, the respondents have argued 16 17 that in order to have standing before this Court, the applicant must demonstrate a direct 18 interference with a private right or special 19 20 damages peculiar to the applicant as a result of a 21 private act. They argue that Mr. Pidruchney has not demonstrated either of these. 22

With respect, I am of the view that any person
whose rights might be injuriously affected by the
actions of a municipality, which is at least
arguably the point here, may have standing, and I
have so found on Mr. Pidruchney's behalf.

With respect to the matter of the serious issue to be tried -- sorry, bear with me for a moment. Let me say this: That I am sympathetic to the view of the applicant. Clearly the transaction is of a considerable magnitude and therefore has the potential to impact on the City's return from EPCOR.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8 Due to the lack of transparency at the time, 9 there was no basis upon which to satisfy the 10 reasonableness of the consideration. The applicant 11 was understandably frustrated at that point in 12 time; however, I find that the applicant's case 13 does not meet the standard required in the 14 circumstances.

15The Municipal Government Act clearly16contemplates municipalities acting in some cases17under what is described as their natural person18powers as described by the Court of Appeal in a19decision by the name of the County of St. Paul20No. 19 v. Belland, a 2006 decision of the Court of21Appeal.

To construe the Municipal Government Act so as to deem such powers to be equivalent to those expressly required to be exercised by way of resolution of bylaw under that fact would be to severely hamper the workings of municipalities. In this case, the initial ministerial order, the resulting bylaw, that is No. 11071, the special procedure approved in the voting resolution and bylaw No. 1 of EPCOR were the basis upon which the resolution under attack today took place. There was no need at law for public meeting.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

The councillors were there as representatives of the City of Edmonton. All were apprised of the facts, all were apprised of the reasoning of the Board of Directors and the reasoning of the consultants.

11 One may take some exception to the suggestion 12 that -- and I'm quoting basically from Mr. Lowry's Affidavit I believe here -- that as they were 13 advised, the conduct of a public hearing would 14 necessarily entail disclosing the reasons 15 underlying the proposal which public disclosure 16 17 would not serve EPCOR Power's or the shareholders' 18 best interests. My difficulty is taking that at 19 its face value when how that might happen is not 20 set out.

One might also take some exception to the suggestion that a public hearing would be unlikely to raise any new issues or bring forth any new information. One might also take exception to the fact that there was a suggestion that there would be significant damage to employee morale at EPCOR if the public hearing was held and the proposal was not followed.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

16

17

Notwithstanding this apparent lack of faith in the intelligence or common sense of the citizens of Edmonton, there did appear to be some valid concerns by EPCOR about going public before the prospectus was filed.

As well, I have discerned no suggestion of bad faith or impropriety on anyone's behalf, that is either on the City's behalf or on EPCOR's behalf.

10 In this type of an application when an 11 applicant seeks an injunction against a public 12 authority which purports to act on behalf of the 13 public, there should be real merit to the claim 14 advanced. It should be a strong case before an 15 injunction will issue.

I'm simply not satisfied that there is any real merit, with all due respect, in this case.

The sale of the electrical business of the City as managed by EPCOR could have been more transparent, but the sale was made in the best interests of EPCOR and in the best interests of the citizens of Edmonton.

There is no suggestion of bad faith. There is no suggestion of self-interest. There is no suggestion of conflict of interest. Those findings would in themselves be sufficient to dismiss the application; however, because there is and we're often, if not always, referred to the three-part test to which I referred, I will simply briefly touch upon the other two aspects.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

27

The second issue is whether the plaintiff, that is the applicant, will be irreparably harmed if this transaction were permitted to be brought to a conclusion. The answer to this must be no.

8 There's certainly no evidence or argument 9 has been advanced beyond the bare assertion that 10 Edmonton citizens will or may suffer higher taxes 11 because EPCOR will no longer be making annual 12 payments in the millions to Edmonton's coffers.

This is no more than an assertion without taking into consideration any of the reasons for the sale or any of the particulars of the purchase price to which I've already referred.

In fairness, at the time the Statement of Claim was issued and the application -- at the applicant's first Affidavit filed, such information may not have been available, but it was available as of yesterday when the applicant filed his supplementary Affidavit, and this did not deal with this particular aspect at that time.

I find that the applicant has not satisfied the test that he must show irreparable harm to himself.

The third test is whether an applicant is able

to show that the balance of convenience favours a granting of an interim injunction. The applicant has also failed in this respect. It is not enough to argue that if an injunction is not granted, the sale will go through and Mr. Pidruchney and other Edmontonians may lose the benefit of lower taxes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7 The respondents argue that if an injunction is 8 granted at this stage, there's significant risk 9 that the sale will not go through, and EPCOR and 10 the City will be subject to significant damages 11 placing a presently saleable asset in extreme 12 jeopardy.

13 Clearly, in my view, the balance of
14 convenience favours not granting an injunction in
15 this case.

16 For all of these reasons together with the 17 failure of the applicant to put up any meaningful 18 undertaking in damage, the application is 19 dismissed.

I am not, however, awarding costs against
Mr. Pidruchney. This was not a frivolous
application. There was no element of impropriety
or bad faith or bad motive in any nature.

The concern about the lack of disclosure was a
valid concern. The concern about the City
disposing of an extremely valuable asset without
any particulars having been given was genuine.

It may be that there was some legitimate 1 2 reasons for not disclosing anything until this 3 arose; however, when not even the press can find 4 out what happened and why, the fact that one man's 5 Statement of Claim may have helped enlighten the picture should not, in my respectful opinion, 6 warrant a penalty of costs. 7 Is there anything further? 8 9 MR. MACDONALD: Not from our side, My Lord. 10 Thank you very much. 11 THE COURT: Mr. Young? 12 MR. YOUNG: No, My Lord. 13 THE COURT: Mr. Pidruchney? 14 MR. PIDRUCHNEY: Thank you, My Lord. Thank you very much. 15 THE COURT: I want to thank counsel for the briefs. They 16 17 were extremely well done on fairly short notice and 18 very helpful. Thank you. Good day. THE COURT CLERK: 19 Court is adjourned. 20 21 PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED AT 3:54 P.M. 22 23 24 25 26 27

1	CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPT
2	
3	
4	
5	I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the
6	foregoing pages are a true and faithful transcript
7	of the proceedings taken down by me in shorthand and
8	transcribed from my shorthand notes to the best of my
9	skill and ability.
10	Dated at the City of Edmonton, Province of
11	Alberta, this 5th day of July, 2009.
12	
13	
14	
15	Λ
16	1×tabalb
17	()
18	C.L. Stabbler, CSR(A)
19	Court Reporter
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
	A.C.E. Reporting Services Inc.

Phone: (780) 497-4223

16

\$ \$2.864 [1] - 5:23 ability [1] - 16:9 **\$539** [1] - 5:14 able [4] - 9:1, 9:5, 9:12, 13:27 \$896 [1] - 5:26 0 0903-08903 [1] - 1:6 1 **1** [6] - 3:16, 3:17, 3:21, 3:26, 4:12, 11:3 107 [1] - 5:9 **11071** [3] - 3:6, 3:10, 11:1 120 [1] - 5:9 **157** [1] - 5:20 17 [2] - 3:27, 4:12 **19** [1] - 10:20 **1995** [5] - 2:21, 3:6, 3:13, 3:14, 7:26 1:39 [1] - 2:1 2 2000 [1] - 3:16 2006 [1] - 10:20 2009 [7] - 1:58, 2:5, 3:27, 4:12, 4:21, 4:26, 16:11 2009.09.17-04 [1] - 4:2 21,750,000 [1] - 5:12 25 [1] - 4:26 26 [3] - 3:5, 3:12, 3:14 3 **3** [1] - 1:58 3:54 [1] - 15:21 4 468 [1] - 5:14 5 5 [2] - 2:21, 3:16 5th [1] - 16:11 7 72.2 [1] - 5:26 8 7.23 8 [1] - 4:20

accordance [1] - 3:10 according [1] - 6:11 acquisition [1] - 5:18 act [2] - 9:21, 12:12 Act [3] - 7:17, 10:15, 10:22 acted [1] - 7:11 acting [1] - 10:16 actions [1] - 9:25 activity [1] - 2:12 additional [1] - 6:26 adjourned [1] - 15:19 advanced [2] - 12:14, 13:9 advised [2] - 6:13, 11:14 advising [1] - 3:1 advisors [3] - 4:19, 4:24, 6:13 Affairs [1] - 2:22 affected [1] - 9:24 Affidavit [5] - 2:20, 7:5, 11:13, 13:19, 13:22 ago [1] - 8:12 agreements [1] - 3:12 ALBERTA [1] - 1:3 Alberta [3] - 1:57, 5:1, 16:11 amount [1] - 5:13 amounts [1] - 6:1 annual [1] - 13:11 answer [1] - 13:7 apparent [1] - 12:2 Appeal [2] - 10:18, 10:21 appear [1] - 12:4 applicant [17] - 2:11, 7:19, 8:2, 8:14, 8:15, 8:18, 9:18, 9:20, 10:4, 10:10, 12:11, 13:5, 13:21, 13:24, 13:27, 14:2, 14:17 Applicant [2] - 1:13, 1:35 applicant's [3] - 7:9, 10:12, 13:19 application [7] - 2:16, 9:5, 12:10, 12:27, 13:18, 14:18, 14:22 APPLICATION [1] - 1:31 apprised [2] - 11:7, 11:8 approved [3] - 2:6, 3:15, 11:2 approving [2] - 2:13, 2:23 April [5] - 2:4, 3:27, 4:3, 4:11, 4:17 arguably [1] - 9:26 argue [4] - 8:2, 9:21, 14:4, 14:7 argued [2] - 6:24, 9:16 argument [1] - 13:8 arose [1] - 15:3 articles [1] - 3:11 aspect [1] - 13:23 aspects [1] - 13:3 assertion [2] - 13:9, 13:13 asset [2] - 14:11, 14:26 assets [7] - 2:9, 5:18, 5:23, 6:22, 7:13, 7:21, AT [2] - 2:1, 15:21 attack [1] - 11:4 attendant [1] - 6:27

A.C.E. Reporting Services Inc.

authority [1] - 12:12 authorized [3] - 4:3, 7:21, 7:25 authorizing [2] - 7:12, 7:14 available [2] - 13:20 avoid [1] - 6:9 awarding [1] - 14:20

В

bad [4] - 12:7, 12:23, 14:23 balance [4] - 8:4, 8:19, 14:1, 14:13 bare [1] - 13:9 basis [3] - 4:14, 10:9, 11:3 bear [1] - 10:2 became [1] - 3:8 behalf [5] - 9:27, 12:8, 12:9, 12:12 Belland [1] - 10:20 BENCH [1] - 1:3 benefit [1] - 14:6 best [4] - 11:18, 12:20, 12:21, 16:8 BETWEEN [1] - 1:8 beyond [1] - 13:9 billion [1] - 5:23 Board [4] - 4:3, 4:14, 4:18, 11:9 borrow [1] - 6:5 brief [2] - 2:19, 9:14 briefly [2] - 2:17, 13:2 briefs [1] - 15:16 bring [2] - 9:4, 11:23 brought [1] - 13:6 business [5] - 3:9, 4:6, 5:19, 6:2, 12:18 businesses [2] - 2:10, 4:10 Bylaw [2] - 3:17, 3:21 bylaw [11] - 2:15, 3:6, 3:7, 3:10, 3:16, 3:25, 4:12, 7:15, 10:25, 11:1, 11:3 bylaws [1] - 3:11

С

C.L [1] - 16:18 Canada [1] - 8:11 cannot [1] - 8:2 capital [3] - 4:9, 6:1, 6:3 CAPITAL [1] - 1:24 Capital [13] - 1:41, 2:7, 4:23, 4:27, 5:5, 5:11, 5:16, 5:19, 5:21, 5:24, 5:27, 6:27, 7:13 case [6] - 8:21, 10:12, 10:27, 12:14, 12:17, 14:15 cases [1] - 10:16 cash [1] - 5:26 certainly [1] - 13:8 CERTIFICATE [1] - 16:1 certify [1] - 16:5 chairman [1] - 4:14 change [1] - 6:18 Chief [1] - 2:27 circumstances [1] - 10:14 citizens [3] - 12:3, 12:22, 13:10 CITY [3] - 1:18, 1:19, 1:20

Phone: (780) 497-4223

Α

City [21] - 1:43, 1:44, 1:46, 2:5, 2:23, 3:5, 3:6, 3:7, 3:17, 4:1, 7:11, 7:15, 8:4, 8:20, 8:24, 9:11, 11:7, 12:19, 14:10, 14:25, 16:10 City's [2] - 10:6, 12:9 Claim [2] - 13:18, 15:5 claim [1] - 12:13 claiming [1] - 2:13 Clearly [2] - 10:4, 14:13 clearly [1] - 10:15 CLERK [1] - 15:19 closing [1] - 6:12 coffers [1] - 13:12 COMMENCED [1] - 2:1 Commission [1] - 5:2 committee [1] - 3:4 common [2] - 5:12, 12:3 company [4] - 2:7, 2:8, 6:5, 7:22 completed [1] - 6:15 concern [3] - 14:24, 14:25 concerning [1] - 2:10 concerns [1] - 12:5 CONCLUDED [1] - 15:21 concluded [1] - 3:23 conclusion [2] - 7:7, 13:7 conclusions [2] - 9:3, 9:15 conditions [1] - 6:18 conduct [1] - 11:14 conducted [1] - 3:10 confidence [1] - 4:25 confidentiality [1] - 4:15 conflict [1] - 12:25 considerable [1] - 10:5 consideration [6] - 5:17, 5:22, 5:25, 8:27, 10:10. 13:14 consistent [1] - 3:25 Consistent [1] - 5:3 construe [1] - 10:22 consultants [1] - 11:10 contemplates [1] - 10:16 contentious [1] - 2:18 context [1] - 2:15 convenience [4] - 8:4, 8:20, 14:1, 14:14 CORPORATION [2] - 1:18, 1:24 Corporation [14] - 1:41, 1:43, 2:8, 2:24, 4:23, 5:1, 5:6, 5:11, 5:16, 5:19, 5:22, 5:25, 7:1, 7:13 cost [1] - 6:4 costs [3] - 6:8, 14:20, 15:7 council [2] - 3:3, 3:14 Council [2] - 3:5, 7:15 COUNCILLORS [1] - 1:20 councillors [3] - 7:10, 7:20, 11:6 **Councillors** [1] - 1:46 counsel [2] - 1:35, 15:16 County [1] - 10:19 COURT [6] - 1:3, 2:3, 15:11, 15:13, 15:15, 15:19 Court [15] - 1:52, 8:8, 8:10, 8:16, 8:22, 8:26, 9:1, 9:6, 9:7, 9:9, 9:17, 10:18, 10:20, 15:19, 16:19 creates [1] - 6:4

creation [2] - 2:7, 7:22 CSR(A [2] - 1:52, 16:18 current [1] - 6:19

D

damage [2] - 11:26, 14:18 damages [4] - 9:2, 9:13, 9:20, 14:10 date [1] - 2:26 Dated [1] - 16:10 deal [1] - 13:22 decision [5] - 2:13, 7:6, 8:11, 10:19, 10:20 deducting [1] - 5:14 deem [1] - 10:23 Defendants [1] - 1:26 delayed [1] - 6:13 demonstrate [1] - 9:18 demonstrated [1] - 9:22 denied [1] - 2:16 described [2] - 10:17, 10:18 description [1] - 5:6 determine [1] - 4:19 difficulty [1] - 11:18 direct [1] - 9:18 Directors [2] - 4:3, 11:9 discerned [1] - 12:7 disclosed [1] - 5:20 disclosing [2] - 11:15, 15:2 disclosure [3] - 5:4, 11:16, 14:24 dismiss [1] - 12:26 dismissed [1] - 14:19 disposing [1] - 14:26 DISTRICT [1] - 1:4 document [1] - 5:9 Don [1] - 2:20 done [1] - 15:17 down [1] - 16:7 due [1] - 12:17 Due [1] - 10:8 during [1] - 4:25

Ε

EDMONTON [4] - 1:4, 1:18, 1:19, 1:20 Edmonton [20] - 1:44, 1:47, 1:57, 2:5, 2:24, 3:1, 3:7, 3:8, 3:9, 3:10, 7:11, 11:7, 12:4, 12:22, 13:10, 16:10 Edmonton's [1] - 13:12 Edmontonians [1] - 14:6 effect [1] - 3:17 effected [1] - 2:14 either [3] - 4:7, 9:22, 12:9 electrical [4] - 2:9, 2:10, 7:21, 12:18 element [1] - 14:22 emphasize [1] - 4:11 employee [1] - 11:26 endeavouring [1] - 6:9 enlighten [1] - 15:5 entail [1] - 11:15

A.C.E. Reporting Services Inc.

entitled [1] - 8:19 entity [2] - 4:6, 4:7 EPCOR [35] - 1:21, 1:22, 1:23, 1:38, 1:39, 1:40, 2:4, 2:6, 2:19, 2:25, 3:16, 3:23, 4:1, 4:4, 4:17, 4:23, 5:19, 5:23, 5:24, 6:1, 6:8, 6:21, 7:22, 8:21, 8:24, 9:11, 10:7, 11:3, 11:17, 11:26, 12:5, 12:19, 12:21, 13:11, 14:9 **EPCOR's** [6] - 2:9, 4:5, 4:6, 4:10, 6:13, 12:9 equity [2] - 4:8, 5:26 equivalent [2] - 6:21, 10:23 Esq [3] - 1:38, 1:43, 1:49 establish [1] - 3:6 established [1] - 8:14 estimated [1] - 5:15 event [1] - 8:4 evidence [1] - 13:8 exception [3] - 11:11, 11:21, 11:24 Executive [1] - 2:27 exercised [1] - 10:24 existing [1] - 6:2 expects [1] - 5:11 expenses [1] - 5:15 explained [1] - 4:14 expressly [1] - 10:24 extent [1] - 7:5 extreme [1] - 14:11

F

extremely [2] - 14:26, 15:17

face [1] - 11:19 fact [3] - 10:25, 11:25, 15:4 facts [3] - 2:17, 7:4, 11:8 failed [1] - 14:3 Failure [1] - 6:3 failure [1] - 14:17 fairly [1] - 15:17 fairness [1] - 13:17 faith [4] - 12:2, 12:8, 12:23, 14:23 faithful [1] - 16:6 favours [4] - 8:4, 8:20, 14:1, 14:14 Feasby [1] - 1:49 fees [1] - 5:15 filed [5] - 4:21, 5:1, 12:6, 13:19, 13:21 final [4] - 4:26, 5:3, 5:8, 8:26 Finally [1] - 9:11 financial [1] - 4:18 findings [1] - 12:25 first [1] - 13:19 Firstly [2] - 8:9, 9:4 firstly [2] - 7:18, 8:6 followed [2] - 7:26, 12:1 following [1] - 7:6 follows [1] - 9:3 forced [1] - 6:5 foregoing [1] - 16:6 form [2] - 4:21, 4:26 forth [2] - 8:10, 11:23 frivolous [1] - 14:21 frustrated [1] - 10:11

Phone: (780) 497-4223

full [1] - 5:4 funds [1] - 6:6 future [2] - 6:20, 6:25

G

generating [2] - 2:9, 7:12 generation [1] - 4:5 genuine [1] - 14:27 given [2] - 7:7, 14:27 Government [3] - 7:17, 10:15, 10:22 granted [4] - 8:24, 9:10, 14:4, 14:8 granting [2] - 14:2, 14:14 greater [2] - 8:23, 9:9 grow [1] - 6:2

Η

 $\begin{array}{l} \textbf{hamper [1] - 10:26} \\ \textbf{harm [6] - 8:3, 8:17, 8:23, 9:8, 9:10, 13:25} \\ \textbf{harmed [1] - 13:5} \\ \textbf{hearing [3] - 11:14, 11:22, 11:27} \\ \textbf{held [6] - 3:5, 3:13, 3:18, 4:1, 4:12, 11:27} \\ \textbf{helped [1] - 15:5} \\ \textbf{helpful [1] - 15:18} \\ \textbf{hereby [1] - 16:5} \\ \textbf{higher [2] - 6:7, 13:10} \\ \textbf{highly [1] - 6:26} \\ \textbf{himself [1] - 13:26} \\ \textbf{hold [2] - 3:2, 7:27} \end{array}$

impact [1] - 10:6 implemented [1] - 4:20 impropriety [2] - 12:8, 14:22 IN [1] - 1:3 INC [1] - 1:21 Inc [3] - 1:38, 1:49, 2:4 Included [1] - 5:25 included [2] - 4:5, 5:8 incorporated [1] - 3:21 incorporation [1] - 3:11 information [2] - 11:24, 13:19 initial [8] - 4:22, 4:27, 5:5, 5:10, 6:16, 6:19, 6:23, 10:27 **INJUNCTION** [1] - 1:31 injunction [14] - 2:11, 6:11, 6:24, 7:8, 8:17, 8:19, 8:23, 9:10, 12:11, 12:15, 14:2, 14:4, 14:7, 14:14 injuriously [1] - 9:24 intelligence [1] - 12:3 intends [1] - 5:16 interest [4] - 4:6, 5:27, 12:24, 12:25 interests [3] - 11:18, 12:21 interference [1] - 9:19 INTERIM [1] - 1:31 interim [3] - 2:11, 8:17, 14:2 investment [2] - 2:23, 4:10

investors [1] - 7:2 involving [1] - 2:6 IPO [1] - 7:14 irreparable [4] - 8:3, 8:17, 9:8, 13:25 irreparably [1] - 13:5 issue [5] - 8:14, 9:6, 10:2, 12:15, 13:4 issued [7] - 2:22, 5:2, 6:11, 6:25, 7:8, 8:18, 13:18 issues [2] - 8:5, 11:23 Issues [1] - 8:5

J

jeopardy [1] - 14:12 joint [1] - 4:9 Jr [1] - 1:37 JUDICIAL [1] - 1:4 July [2] - 1:58, 16:11 June [6] - 2:21, 3:5, 3:12, 3:14, 4:25, 7:26 jurisdiction [1] - 7:11

Κ

L

known [1] - 2:25

L.P [2] - 1:23, 1:40 L:307/95 [1] - 2:23 lack [3] - 10:8, 12:2, 14:24 large [1] - 6:1 law [1] - 11:5 laws [2] - 4:24, 5:3 least [1] - 9:25 legal [1] - 4:18 legitimate [1] - 15:1 letter [1] - 2:26 long-form [2] - 4:21, 4:26 Lord [3] - 15:9, 15:12, 15:14 lose [1] - 14:6 lower [1] - 14:6 Lowry [2] - 6:6, 6:12 Lowry's [3] - 2:20, 7:5, 11:12 LTD [1] - 1:22 Ltd [1] - 1:39

Μ

 $\begin{array}{l} \textbf{MACDONALD} [1] - 15:9 \\ \textbf{Macdonald} [2] - 1:37, 8:11 \\ \textbf{magnitude} [1] - 10:5 \\ \textbf{maintain} [2] - 4:25, 6:2 \\ \textbf{man's} [1] - 15:4 \\ \textbf{managed} [1] - 12:19 \\ \textbf{management} [1] - 4:18 \\ \textbf{MANDEL} [1] - 1:19 \\ \textbf{Mandel} [1] - 1:45 \\ \textbf{market} [1] - 6:18 \\ \end{array}$

A.C.E. Reporting Services Inc.

matter [3] - 8:26, 9:16, 10:1 MAYOR [1] - 1:19 mayor [2] - 7:10, 7:20 Mayor [1] - 1:45 meaningful [3] - 9:2, 9:12, 14:17 meet [1] - 10:13 meeting [12] - 2:4, 3:5, 3:13, 3:14, 3:18, 3:27, 4:11, 4:13, 4:15, 7:26, 7:27, 11:5 meetings [1] - 3:2 merit [2] - 12:13, 12:17 met [1] - 8:7 might [4] - 9:24, 11:19, 11:21, 11:24 million [3] - 5:14, 5:26 millions [1] - 13:12 Minister [2] - 2:21, 2:26 ministerial [1] - 10:27 Ministerial [1] - 2:22 moment [1] - 10:3 money [1] - 7:23 morale [1] - 11:26 most [1] - 2:18 motive [1] - 14:23 **MR** [3] - 15:9, 15:12, 15:14 Municipal [4] - 2:21, 7:16, 10:15, 10:22 municipal [1] - 2:15 municipalities [2] - 10:16, 10:26 municipality [1] - 9:25 must [4] - 8:26, 9:18, 13:7, 13:25

Ν

name [2] - 8:11, 10:19natural [1] - 10:17nature [1] - 14:23necessarily [1] - 11:15necessary [1] - 7:27need [1] - 11:5needed [1] - 4:15net [1] - 5:16new [3] - 4:6, 11:23notes [1] - 16:8notice [1] - 15:17Notwithstanding [1] - 12:2number [1] - 8:12

0

obligated [1] - 4:24 OF [9] - 1:3, 1:4, 1:18, 1:19, 1:20, 16:1 offering [11] - 4:22, 4:27, 5:5, 5:10, 5:15, 6:17, 6:19, 6:20, 6:23, 6:25, 7:14 offerings [2] - 4:8, 6:27 Officer [1] - 2:27 often [1] - 13:1 OMITTED [1] - 2:2 one [2] - 4:8, 15:4 One [3] - 11:11, 11:21, 11:24 open [1] - 3:2 operations [2] - 5:18, 6:3

3

opinion [1] - 15:6 opposed [1] - 8:20 Order [1] - 2:22 order [2] - 9:17, 10:27

Ρ

P.M [2] - 2:1, 15:21 page [1] - 5:20 pages [2] - 5:9, 16:6 part [2] - 2:18, 13:1 partial [1] - 5:17 particular [1] - 13:23 particulars [2] - 13:15, 14:27 partners [1] - 4:9 pass [1] - 7:15 passed [4] - 3:6, 3:17, 4:1, 4:17 Paul [1] - 10:19 pay [1] - 5:22 payments [1] - 13:12 peculiar [1] - 9:20 penalty [1] - 15:7 percent [1] - 5:26 period [1] - 4:25 periods [1] - 6:7 permitted [1] - 13:6 person [2] - 9:23, 10:17 picture [1] - 15:6 PIDRUCHNEY [2] - 1:10, 15:14 Pidruchney [8] - 8:6, 8:22, 8:27, 9:4, 9:21, 14:5, 14:21, 15:13 Pidruchney's [2] - 7:9, 9:27 place [2] - 6:10, 11:4 placing [1] - 14:11 plain [1] - 5:4 Plaintiff [2] - 1:12, 1:35 plaintiff [1] - 13:4 planned [1] - 6:23 point [2] - 9:26, 10:11 **PORTION** [1] - 2:2 position [4] - 7:9, 7:10, 7:18, 8:1 post [2] - 9:1, 9:12 potential [1] - 10:6 POWER [3] - 1:22, 1:23, 1:24 power [2] - 4:5, 7:12 Power [21] - 1:39, 1:40, 1:41, 2:7, 2:24, 3:1, 3:7, 3:9, 4:23, 4:27, 5:6, 5:11, 5:16, 5:19, 5:22, 5:24, 5:27, 6:27, 7:13 Power's [2] - 3:11, 11:17 powers [2] - 10:18, 10:23 preliminary [1] - 4:21 prescribed [3] - 3:22, 3:24, 3:25 presently [1] - 14:11 President [1] - 2:27 press [1] - 15:3 previous [1] - 6:7 price [1] - 13:16 pricing [1] - 6:19 private [2] - 9:19, 9:21 procedure [2] - 7:25, 11:2

proceed [1] - 6:17 proceedings [1] - 16:7 PROCEEDINGS [2] - 2:1, 15:21 proceeds [3] - 5:12, 5:13, 5:17 process [5] - 2:16, 3:19, 3:22, 3:24, 3:25 professional [1] - 6:13 prohibiting [1] - 2:12 properly [1] - 7:20 proposal [2] - 11:16, 11:27 propose [1] - 9:14 prospectus [6] - 4:21, 4:26, 5:4, 5:8, 5:20, 12:6 provides [1] - 5:4 province [1] - 2:22 **Province** [1] - 16:10 public [28] - 2:7, 2:16, 3:2, 3:13, 4:7, 4:13, 4:22, 4:27, 5:10, 6:16, 6:19, 6:23, 6:25, 6:27, 7:14, 7:16, 7:24, 7:26, 7:27, 11:5, 11:14, 11:16, 11:22, 11:27, 12:5, 12:11, 12:13 purchase [2] - 7:22, 13:15 purports [1] - 12:12 Pursuant [1] - 3:7 pursuant [2] - 3:19, 4:12 Put [1] - 8:21 put [1] - 14:17

Q

Q.C [1] - 1:37 QUEEN'S [1] - 1:3 quoting [1] - 11:12

R

R.J [1] - 8:11 raise [4] - 4:9, 6:3, 7:23, 11:23 rates [1] - 6:6 real [2] - 12:13, 12:17 realized [1] - 6:22 reasonableness [1] - 10:10 reasoning [2] - 11:8, 11:9 reasons [6] - 7:6, 9:14, 11:15, 13:14, 14:16, 15:2 receipt [1] - 5:2 receive [2] - 5:11, 6:21 refer [1] - 8:9 referred [4] - 3:20, 13:1, 13:2, 13:16 relation [3] - 2:12, 4:4, 5:7 relatively [1] - 9:14 reorganization [3] - 2:6, 2:14, 5:21 Reporter [2] - 1:52, 16:19 representatives [1] - 11:6 **REQUEST** [1] - 2:2 required [4] - 3:2, 7:16, 10:13, 10:24 requires [1] - 6:1 resolution [13] - 2:15, 3:15, 3:20, 3:22, 3:24, 4:2, 4:3, 4:17, 7:16, 10:25, 11:2, 11:4 respect [8] - 4:22, 4:26, 5:5, 9:15, 9:23, 10:1, 12:17, 14:3

A.C.E. Reporting Services Inc.

respectful [1] - 15:6 respondent [1] - 2:19 respondents [4] - 7:18, 8:1, 9:16, 14:7 Respondents [1] - 1:27 result [4] - 5:10, 5:21, 6:26, 9:20 resulting [2] - 7:3, 11:1 return [1] - 10:6 rights [1] - 9:24 risk [5] - 6:4, 6:8, 6:18, 6:26, 14:8

S

sale [10] - 4:6, 4:8, 5:12, 7:21, 7:24, 12:18, 12:20, 13:15, 14:5, 14:9 saleable [1] - 14:11 satisfied [7] - 8:15, 8:22, 9:1, 9:7, 9:9, 12:16, 13:24 satisfy [4] - 8:8, 8:16, 9:6, 10:9 scheduled [1] - 6:17 seated [1] - 2:3 second [1] - 13:4 secondly [2] - 7:19, 8:7 Securities [2] - 1:49, 5:1 securities [2] - 4:24, 5:3 seeks [2] - 2:11, 12:11 self [1] - 12:24 self-interest [1] - 12:24 sense [1] - 12:3 serious [3] - 8:14, 9:6, 10:1 serve [1] - 11:17 SERVICES [1] - 1:22 Services [1] - 1:39 set [4] - 3:19, 7:4, 8:10, 11:20 severely [1] - 10:26 shareholder [9] - 2:5, 3:8, 3:12, 3:18, 3:27, 4:1, 4:13, 4:23 shareholders' [1] - 11:17 shares [2] - 5:12, 7:24 short [1] - 15:17 shorthand [2] - 16:7, 16:8 show [3] - 8:2, 13:25, 14:1 side [1] - 15:9 significant [4] - 6:4, 11:26, 14:8, 14:10 significantly [1] - 6:7 simply [2] - 12:16, 13:2 skill [1] - 16:9 sole [3] - 2:5, 3:8, 3:17 sorry [1] - 10:2 special [2] - 9:19, 11:1 St [1] - 10:19 Stabbler [2] - 1:52, 16:18 stage [1] - 14:8 staged [1] - 4:8 standard [1] - 10:13 standing [6] - 7:19, 8:6, 9:4, 9:16, 9:17, 9:26 Statement [2] - 13:17, 15:5 STEPHEN [1] - 1:19 Stephen [1] - 1:45 steps [2] - 4:4, 5:7 stock [1] - 7:1

4

strong [1] - 12:14 subject [1] - 14:10 subsequently [1] - 2:25 subsidiaries [1] - 5:24 suffer [8] - 8:3, 8:16, 8:23, 8:24, 9:8, 9:9, 9:11, 13:10 sufficient [1] - 12:26 suggestion [7] - 11:11, 11:22, 11:25, 12:7, 12:23, 12:24, 12:25 sum [1] - 5:13 summarize [1] - 2:17 supplementary [1] - 13:22 Supreme [1] - 8:10 swears [1] - 6:6 sympathetic [1] - 10:3

Т

taxes [2] - 13:10, 14:6 TD [1] - 1:49 test [7] - 8:7, 8:9, 8:10, 8:13, 13:2, 13:25, 13:27 THE [10] - 1:3, 1:18, 1:20, 2:3, 15:11, 15:13, 15:15, 15:19 themselves [1] - 12:26 thereby [1] - 7:1 therefore [1] - 10:5 third [1] - 13:27 Thirdly [1] - 8:18 three [2] - 8:8, 13:1 three-part [1] - 13:1 today [1] - 11:4 today's [1] - 6:6 together [1] - 14:16 took [1] - 11:4 total [2] - 5:22, 5:25 touch [1] - 13:3 transaction [13] - 2:13, 4:4, 4:20, 5:7, 6:4, 6:9, 6:12, 6:14, 6:16, 6:22, 7:1, 10:4, 13:6 transcribed [1] - 16:8 TRANSCRIPT [1] - 16:1 transcript [1] - 16:6 transfer [3] - 2:8, 4:5, 7:12 transferred [1] - 5:23 transparency [1] - 10:8 transparent [1] - 12:20 treated [1] - 3:3 tried [3] - 8:15, 9:7, 10:2 tripartite [3] - 8:7, 8:9, 8:13 true [2] - 5:4, 16:6 Tupper [1] - 1:38 turn [3] - 2:19, 7:23, 8:5 two [1] - 13:3 type [1] - 12:10

U

unanimous [1] - 3:12 unattractive [1] - 7:2

V

valid [2] - 12:4, 14:25 valuable [1] - 14:26 value [2] - 6:21, 11:19 various [1] - 5:6 venture [1] - 4:9 viable [1] - 6:20 view [3] - 9:23, 10:4, 14:13 vote [1] - 3:18 Votes [1] - 3:23 voting [7] - 3:15, 3:19, 3:21, 3:22, 3:24, 7:25, 11:2

W

warrant [1] - 15:7water [1] - 4:10WILLIAM [1] - 1:10wires [1] - 4:10workings [1] - 10:26wrote [1] - 2:26

Υ

years [1] - 8:12 yesterday [1] - 13:21 Young [2] - 1:43, 15:11 YOUNG [1] - 15:12

A.C.E. Reporting Services Inc.