



SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE

COUNSEL/ENDORSEMENT SLIP

COURT FILE NO.: CV-19-628258-00CL DATE: 1 June 2023

NO. ON LIST: 1

TITLE OF PROCEEDING: **Law Society of Ontario v Derek Sorrenti and Sorrenti
Law Professional Corporation**

BEFORE JUSTICE EWEN

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION

For Plaintiff, Applicant, Moving Party, Crown:

Name of Person Appearing	Name of Party	Contact Info
Jeremy Dacks (he/him) Michael De Lellis (he/him) Mary Paterson (she/her) Osler, Hoskin & Harcourt LLP	Counsel for the Trustee, FAAN Mortgage Administrators Inc. in its capacity as Court-Appointed Trustee of Derek Sorrenti and Sorrenti Professional Law Corporation	jdacks@osler.com mdelellis@osler.com mpaterson@osler.com
Naveed Manzoor (he/him) Daniel Sobel (he/him) FAAN Mortgage Administrators Inc.	Trustee	naveed@faanmortgageadmin.com daniel@faanmortgageadmin.com

For other:

Name of Person Appearing	Name of Party	Contact Info
George Benchetrit (he/him) CHAITONS LLP	Court-Appointed Representative Counsel for Investors	george@chaitons.com
Ryan Morris (he/him) BLAKE, CASSELS & GRAYDON LLP	Counsel for Olympia Trust Company	ryan.morris@blakes.com
Serge Kalloghlian(he/him) KALLOGHLIAN MYERS LLP	Counsel to the Raponi Plaintiff Court File No. CV-20- 00643593-00CP	Serge@kalloghlianmyers.com
Lisa Parliament (she/her) Peter Willis (he/him) MCMILLAN LLP	Counsel for the Defendants, ADI Developments (Link) Inc. and ADI Development Group Inc.	lisa.parliament@mcmillan.ca peter.willis@mcmillan.ca

Margaret Waddell (she/her) WADDELL PHILLIPS PC	Counsel for certain proposed representative plaintiffs in class action proceedings against Sorrenti and other parties	marg@waddellphillips.ca
Mitchell Wine (he/him) MSTW Professional Corporation	Counsel for certain proposed representative plaintiffs in class action proceedings against Sorrenti and other parties	Counsel for certain proposed representative plaintiffs in class action proceedings against Sorrenti and other parties

ENDORSEMENT OF JUSTICE MCEWEN:

The three orders sought today shall go as per the drafts filed and signed. AND relief sought is unopposed and supported by the parties represented by Messrs Bencheit/Kaloghlian and Ms. Parliament (without admission of liability).

Generally based on the filed materials and the submissions of counsel for the Trustee I am satisfied that service ought to be validated. The stakeholders, particularly the approx. 2900 investors, have received notice. No investors attended.

The orders sought involve three pieces of complex litigation, including the two class actions. I will first deal with the settlement. The ~~recovery~~ⁱⁿ recovery in the proceeding at approx 91% of amounts sought is very fair and reasonable and in the best interest of all stakeholders. It is necessary that it

be paid over time, but the necessary guarantee / security is in place. The settlement is far preferable to ongoing costly litigation, with its inherent risks and possible delay.

I have also reviewed the releases with counsel. I am satisfied that they strike the necessary balance of ensuring finality, without prejudicing the rights of any stakeholder. The releases sought are properly responsive to the complex multi-faceted litigation and particularly responsive to the class action component of the settlement.

In this regard, however, the stakeholders and parties do not object to wording proposed by the LSO stipulating that nothing in the Seton Settlement Agreement or resulting order and in particular the releases contained in the Settlement Agreement or the definition of the Released Claims, in any way ~~affects~~^{imp} the jurisdiction of the Law Society to initiate, continue, or pursue any future or ongoing investigations or regulatory proceedings in respect of licensees or former licensees.

The fees for class action counsel are fair and reasonable given their participation and are being paid over time.

I pause here to note that class action counsel and representative Counsel fully participated in the settlement.

All other ancillary terms are fair and reasonable.

Insofar as the Distribution Order and Fourth Omnibus Order are concerned I agree that the Pari Passu Approach is fair and reasonable as per the Trustee Report. It is the fairest and most equitable approach given the poor record keeping, misleading information and the fact that all investors are innocent victims.

Given the money received it is also sensible to allow for the 75% distribution at this time and appropriate to do so.

I also approve the Trustee and its counsel's fees and costs, as well as the Trustee activities.

The Sealing order is also appropriate and the Sherman Estate criteria have been met. The issues include privileged and commercially sensitive information regarding the projects and the administration. Disclosure of the selective redaction would have material adverse effects on the stakeholder. The sealing order sought is also consistent with the prior sealing

orders granted by this Court.

Based on the foregoing I granted all three orders sought, including all ancillary relief not referenced in this endorsement.

MEZ

Addendum

As of July 1/23 Justice Osborne has agreed to assume case management of these matters.

MEZ