17-17-12

1 2	IN THE GRAND COURT OF THE HOLDEN AT GEORGE TOWN		COURTS OFFICE LIBR
3 4	FINANCIAL SERVICES DIVISIO	N	Cause No: FSD 18/2012
5			
6	IN THE MATTER OF THE COMP	PANIES LAW (2011 REVIS	SION)
7	AND IN THE MATTER OF TRIKE	ONA ADVISORS LIMITE	D SCOUP
8	BETWEEN:		LLC E
10	DEIWEEN.	ARC CAPITAL	
11 12		&	CAPMANIS
12 13		HAIDA INVEST	TMENTS LIMITED
14			PETITIONERS
15	AND:		
16		TRIKONA ADV	ISORS LTD.
17 18			RESPONDENT
19			
20		15 G G	
21	Appearances:	Mr. Guy Cowan the Petitioners	of Campbells on behalf of
23		the 1 cuttoners	
24			yn of Stuarts on behalf of
22 23 24 25 26		the Company,Tr	ikona Advisors Ltd.
20			
27	Before:	The Hon. Mr. Ju	stice Charles Quin
28	Heard:	17 th July 2012	
29			
20		EXTEMPORE F	OUL INC
30 31		EATENITORE	COLING
32	1. Counsel on behalf of the	Company applies for an adj	ournment of the hearing date
33	of the 22 nd and 23 rd of Au	igust 2012. These are also th	e dates set for the hearing of
34	the Petitioners' applicatio	n for Joint Provisional Liqui	dators, as well as the hearing
35	of the Company's applie	cation dated the 23 rd Marc	h 2012 for a stay of these

1	proceedings, and its application dated the 13th April 2012 for an Order dismissing
2	the Petition.

- Counsel for the Company argues that there is a hearing in the United States on the

 17th September 2012 and it has been extremely difficult for the Company to be in a

 position to participate in parallel proceedings in two jurisdictions, and, accordingly,

 applies for an adjournment of the hearing set for the 22nd and 23rd of August 2012.
- In addition, counsel for the Company submits that those instructing her have informed her that the Company is currently in advanced stages of a possible buyout of the Petitioner's shares. Accordingly, an adjournment would give the Company sufficient time to explore, and hopefully put together, an acceptable buyout offer to the Petitioners.

12

13

14

15

16

17

- 4. In response to these grounds, I begin by noting that it was the Company's former attorneys, Harneys, that formally requested that the hearing of the Company's applications be set for the 22nd and 23rd of August 2012.
- 5. As a result of the representations of the Company's former attorneys, the Listing Officer for the Grand Court set the Company's Summons down for the hearing on the 22nd August 2012.
- Paragraph 38(ix) of my Judgment dated the 9th March 2012 directed that the stay
 application and the Company's application be listed for hearing on the first
 available date after the 19th April 2012. Accordingly, the Company has had five
 months to make an acceptable buyout offer to the Petitioners and still has five
 weeks before the hearing to consider its position regarding a possible buyout.

1	y /	Having heard from both counsel, I can find no prejudice to the Company, should
2		the hearing go ahead on the 22 nd August 2012.
3	8.	I have some sympathy for counsel for the Company, as she has candidly admitted
4		that her client's US attorneys had not provided her with a supporting affidavit. In
5		this regard, it is disappointing that the Company's US attorneys have been unable to
6		provide the necessary material to ground the Company's application for the
7		adjournment.
8	9.	Taking all the foregoing facts into consideration, I can find no good reason for the
9		hearing, set for the 22 nd August 2012, not to go ahead. I re-state that the dates of the
10		22 nd August 2012 and the 23 rd August 2012 have been set down for almost three (3)
11		months. In all the circumstances of this case, I consider that this is a matter that
12		should be heard expeditiously.
13	10.	For these reasons, I reject the Company's application for an adjournment of the
14		hearing on the 22 nd August 2012 and make the following directions:
15		
16		i. That by no later than 4:00 p.m. on the 31st July 2012 the Company
17		and/or APL must file and serve evidence in support of:
18		a) APL's Summons dated the 23 rd March 2012 seeking a stay of
19		the Petition ("the Stay Application");
20		b) APL's Amended Summons dated the 17 th July 2012 seeking a
21		dismissal of the Petition or, in the alternative, an order to strike

1	out the Petition as an abuse of the process of the Court, or in
2	the alternative, an order providing for the purchase of the
3	Petitioners' shares in the Company pursuant to s.95(3)(d) of the
4	Companies Law (2011 Revision) ("the Strike Out
5	Application"); and
6	c) The Company's Summons dated the 2 nd April 2012 seeking a
7	validation order ("the Validation Application").
8	ii. That by no later than 4:00 p.m. on the 31st July 2012 the Petitioners
9	must file and serve any evidence in support of their Summons dated the
10	28th March 2012 seeking the appointment of Joint Provisional
11	Liquidators ("the PL Application").
12	iii. That the Petitioners must file and serve any evidence in response to the
13	Stay Application, to the Strike Out Application, and to the Validation
14	Application by 4:00 p.m. on the 10 th August 2012.
15	iv. That APL must file and serve any evidence in response to the PL
16	Application by 4:00 p.m. on the 10 th August 2012.
17	v. That skeleton arguments are to be filed and exchanged by 4:00 p.m. on
18	the 17 th August 2012.
19	

1.1	vi. That the hearing of the Stay Application, the Strike Out Application,
2	the Validation Application and the PL Application, shall take place on
3	the 22 nd and 23 rd August 2012.
4	
5	vii. Costs in the Petition.
6	
7	
8	
9	Dated this the 17 th July 2012
10 11 12 13 14 15 16	CAIMAN 18-18
17 18	Honourable Mr. Justice Charles Quin Judge of the Grand Court