

**CITATION:** Caisse Desjardins Ontario Credit Union Inc. v. Metamore Inc. et. al.,  
**COURT FILE NO.:** CV-26-102797  
**DATE:** 2026 03 17

**ONTARIO SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE  
EAST REGION COMMERCIAL LIST**

**RE:** CAISSE DESJARDINS ONTARIO CREDIT UNION INC., Applicant

- and -

METAMORE INC., JASON BEANGE, THE ESTATE OF JASON COUGHLIN,  
JEREMY JAMES ALLAN STEEVES, LAURIE JOAN CONSITT AND  
SHAWN ANTHONY BEATTIE, Respondents

**BEFORE:** C. MacLeod RSJ

**COUNSEL:** Bart Sarsh, for the Applicant

Dom Michaud, for the proposed Receiver

Wade Ennis, in person, for Metamore Inc.

**HEARD:** March 17, 2026

**ENDORSEMENT**

[1] An application to appoint a receiver was returnable on February 17, 2026 and was adjourned until today on terms. Although I am advised that the proposed payment on account was made by Metamore Inc. yesterday, it was not made by February 20<sup>th</sup> and more importantly there has been no commitment to refinancing.

[2] Counsel for the Applicant acknowledges that Mr. Ennis has been working diligently and will continue to do so and has redrafted the order to provide the proposed receiver with discretion as to when and if to take possession of the property.

[3] Although Mr. Ennis is firmly of the belief that the appointment of a Receiver will make it harder for the corporation to obtain alternative financing or to carry on its business and may discourage tenants from paying their rent, no evidence has been filed in opposition to the Application. As noted in my previous endorsement, over \$5 million is owed to Desjardins and under the terms of the Applicant's security instruments it has the right to take various enforcement steps to protect or realize upon its security and to collect the debt owing. This includes the power to appoint a receiver and that is a significant consideration in determining if it is "just or convenient" to grant the requested order.

[4] A court appointed Receiver provides is a superior option to a private receiver because a court appointed Receiver is an officer of the court impressed with fiduciary duties. In addition, the receivership provides for an orderly process to deal with the obligations owed to all creditors.

[5] The Respondent was granted a significant indulgence in February. There is no justification for requiring the Applicant to return to court repeatedly or to postpone the order further.

[6] I have signed the order appointing the Receiver and it may issue immediately.

---

Justice C. MacLeod

**Date:** March 17, 2026