THIS IS EXHIBIT O ATTACHED TO THE PHIDAIT
OF HARD CATTY OF NEW WESTMINSTER, IS C.

A COMMISSIONER FOR TAKING METIDINITS

No. B05161 Vancouver Registry

In The Supreme Court of British Columbia

(Before the Honourable Mr. Justice Meiklam)

Vancouver, B.C. August 31, 2006

IN BANKRUPTCY AND INSOLVENCY

IN THE MATTER OF THE BANKRUPTCY OF SHEILA FRANCES GAFFNEY

ESTATE NUMBER 11-795533

PROCEEDINGS IN CHAMBERS (Submissions)

Appearing on behalf of Himself: H. Gaffney

Appearing as agent on behalf of Harold Gaffney: T. Zanetti

Appearing on behalf of Ms. Gaffney: K.Oliver

Appearing on behalf of the trustee: D. Donohoe



special costs in light of the nature of the very serious allegations made against the trustee of participation in fraud and criminal activity. Those are the kinds of allegations that should attract some sort of centre from the court with respect to costs ordered. And also I would say that if Your Lordship was disposed to grant some sort of amendment to the form of relief being sought by the applicant, then obviously we'd have to deal with this on another date because we're opposed to having to deal with that sort of last-minute change here today and that type of remedy. Thank you, My Lord.

THE COURT: There's just two questions I have for you, Mr. Oliver. Of the many mysteries before me on this matter, two of them involve your client's actions. Why has she not registered the transfer from the trustee back to herself?

MR. OLIVER: The transfer documents are in my office well after Mr. Gaffney served me with the notice of motion in this matter and I felt it was --

THE COURT: You felt in the face of his claim for relief that it not be conveyed, that you shouldn't do it?

MR. OLIVER: That's correct.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. OLIVER: I do continue to hold the transfer in trust in my office.

THE COURT: Do you want to volunteer anything to me about why, when she wasn't insolvent, she went bankrupt and when she realized that she wasn't insolvent why she continued?

MR. OLIVER: Certainly. She was insolvent. The debts that you've heard of --

THE COURT: Well, she wasn't insolvent as of the day Mr. Gaffney paid the bank off; right?

MR. OLIVER: That was after the bankruptcy.

THE COURT: After the assignment.

MR. OLIVER: That's right.

THE COURT: But why did she continue? Why did she resist the notion of annulling it? She wasn't -- I mean, she no longer had a debt problem at that point in time.

MR. OLIVER: I'm not sure that Mrs. Gaffney was in a position to understand the difference between continuing with the bankruptcy and being discharged and an annulment of the bankruptcy.

1 THE COURT: Well, I'm sure that the trustee wouldn't 2 have made the comments he did in the section 170 3 report if he hadn't explained that to her. 4 MR. OLIVER: That may be. I'm not instructed about 5 what happened there. I was not on the file until 6 well after that. 7 THE COURT: And I suppose you're saying she was 8 insolvent in the sense that she couldn't meet her 9 obligations as they came due, but that does not 10 follow from the fact that you have a line of 11 credit that you don't have the liquid cash to pay 12 off. It may apply if you've got a demand later 13 you can't fulfill or that your joint-and-several 14 covenantor can't pay. But when you're a joint, 15 you know, wouldn't the first response be, I 16 haven't got the money, hubby, you pay it? 17 MR. OLIVER: And that, indeed, is the first response. 18 And the debt -- I'm not sure it's adequately 19 spelled out in detail in Ms. Gaffney's affidavit, 20 but the debt is a debt that was incurred on joint 21 obligations between Harold and Sheila Gaffney. 22 THE COURT: Of course. 23 MR. OLIVER: Those --24 THE COURT: So --25 MR. OLIVER: Those --26 THE COURT: -- why would she treat it not only as hers 27 alone but too burdensome, overwhelming? Why would 28 she treat it like that? 29 MR. OLIVER: Well, the background that isn't in the 30 affidavit, I'm afraid, explains that. 31 background is partly is Ms. Zanetti and her 32 sister, who operate some sort of a legal 33 assistance organization -- I'm not sure how close 34 they come to actually practicing law without 35 licences to do so, but, in any event, they require 36 funding and Mr. Gaffney was providing a lot of 37 funding to them. That was coming out of family 38 income. Mrs. Gaffney was using the line of credit 39 to pay all the family debts because Mr. Gaffney 40 wasn't contributing his share. 41 MS. ZANETTI: May I object, Your Honour, that there's 42 no evidence of such a thing. 43 THE COURT: I asked the question, ma'am. 44 MS. ZANETTI: Sorry, Your Honour. 45 THE COURT: I want the answer. 46 MS. ZANETTI: I'm very well aware --47 MR. OLIVER: And I advise that it's not in the

affidavit.

- MS. ZANETTI: There's nothing in the affidavit and that is \neg
- MR. OLIVER: That's my understanding. The debts arose because Mrs. Gaffney had to use the joint obligation line of credit in order to pay the family debts as they arose, the payment on mortgage, the payment of food, cash that was given directly to Mr. Gaffney for whatever purposes. She does say in one of her affidavits that he would usually go out without his wallet so whenever he wanted to purchase something, she ended up paying for it --
- THE COURT: Even more reason not to go bankrupt yourself. Even more reason to have him look after the obligation.
- MR. OLIVER: Then they separated and what she was very concerned about, she expressed this to me, was that her credit would be affected; she wouldn't be able to --
- THE COURT: And it won't be by bankruptcy.
- MR. OLIVER: Well, certainly it is by bankruptcy. But her initial problem with Mr. Gaffney's behaviour in running up the debts in the first place, was that she didn't want to have to pay his debts and continue to have to pay his debts and she [indiscernible] take the advice of a trustee in bankruptcy and explain to the trustee what she understood her situation was and he followed through with providing her with the opportunity to the assignment.
- MR. DONOHOE: My Lord, if I may, your line of questioning to my friend reminds me that there is some evidence from the trustee on this point and it may be that it would be helpful to the court for me to just refer you to that briefly -- THE COURT: Okay.
- MR. DONOHOE: -- about this \$20,000. So if I could refer you to tab 7, which is the affidavit of Kenneth Rowan, which was filed May 16th, and at page 6, paragraph 22, he said:

"I'm informed by the bankrupt of the approximate \$20,000 obligation of the bankrupt CIBC was the debt in respect of which the bankrupt had cosigned with Harold Gaffney and significantly all, if not all, monies from

that line of credit were consumed by Harold Gaffney for his own personal benefit. Draws may have been made by the bankrupt but those draws were made at the instruction of Harold Gaffney and attached as Exhibit G is a memo we received from the bankrupt advising of her involvement vis-a-vis the line of credit. I have no reason not to believe the bankrupt's version of events. The primary party responsible for the line of credit debt is in all likelihood Harold Gaffney. I believe it would be improper for Harold Gaffney to obtain a benefit vis-a-vis the bankrupt simply because Harold Gaffney paid back one of his debts."

Now, during her submission, Ms. Zanetti said that Harold Gaffney informed the trustee of his payment of the \$20,000 line of credit when he made such payment to the creditor and, although there is a reference here by Mr. Rowan to the fact that he's aware that at some point Mr. Gaffney paid that line of credit off, I can't verify without consulting with Mr. Rowan exactly when he became aware of that, whether it may have been just before the discharge hearing or when.

THE COURT: But at some time very early on, as early as when Mr. -- or when the trustee put down the value of \$90,000-odd on the half interest, he was -- he was well aware that there was no real insolvency issue here. There was no insolvency.

MR. OLIVER: I presume. He did not communicate that with Mrs. Gaffney. I just asked her a specific question that Your Lordship was asking me about the difference between annulling the bankruptcy and having a discharge and she was not understanding what the difference was. She took the question from Mr. Rowan would you like to annul as an indication that if she annulled the bankruptcy she would no longer have his assistance and she felt that she required his assistance.

THE COURT: All right. Briefly.

MS. ZANETTI: I'm going to try to go very briefly.

I'll bring you to tab 9. In response to paragraph
22 of Mr. Rowan -- and I'll bring you to page -paragraph 16B, we'll go to 16B -- and insofar as
-- before I go into this, Mr. Donohoe brought up