



ONTARIO SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
(COMMERCIAL LIST)

COUNSEL/ENDORSEMENT SLIP

COURT FILE NO.: CV-24-00725055-00CL DATE: APRIL 21, 2026

NO. ON LIST: 1

TITLE OF PROCEEDING: ROYAL BANK OF CANADA v. AHM TRANSPORT INC. et al

BEFORE: JUSTICE W.D. BLACK

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION

For Plaintiff, Applicant, Moving Party:

Name of Person Appearing	Name of Party	Contact Info

For Defendant, Respondent, Responding Party:

Name of Person Appearing	Name of Party	Contact Info
Howard F. Manis, Counsel	AHM Transport Inc., Aishka Express 2016 Inc., Aishka Express Inc., Aishka Recycling Inc., Tanush Transport Inc., Puvanenthiran Jeyabalasingam and Thushita Puvanenthiran	hmanis@manislaw.ca


For Other, Self-Represented:

Name of Person Appearing	Name of Party	Contact Info
Timothy C. Hogan, Counsel	Receiver, msi Spergel inc.	thogan@harrisonpensa.com

ENDORSEMENT

- [1] The Receiver booked this appointment in circumstances in which, contrary to the endorsement of J. Dietrich J. on February 12, 2026, setting out a timetable for exchange of materials culminating in a hearing on May 4, 2026, the respondents have failed to deliver responding materials by March 13, 2026, as Her Honour directed.

- [2] The Receiver's main concern is to ensure that the motion proceeds on May 4 as scheduled. The court shares that concern; time on this list is precious, and not to be squandered absent exceptional circumstances. Counsel for the Receiver also, understandably, wants to avoid any last-minute surprises, and suggested that the court should not be prepared to consider any responding materials delivered now or later, given that any such materials would be arriving so far past the date specified by J. Dietrich J.
- [3] Mr. Manis was in attendance on behalf of the respondents, as was an individual principal of the respondent companies.
- [4] Mr. Manis explained that he has encouraged his clients to comply with the court's order and deadline, and even prepared draft materials, but that so far no finalized materials have been produced, let alone delivered. Mr. Manis added that he expects, if and when responding materials are delivered, they will contain no surprises, and will be comprised of documents the Receiver has already seen.
- [5] In the circumstances, with Mr. Manis' concurrence, I explained to the parties in attendance that this is a serious matter, and that among the relief sought by the Receiver is a finding of contempt, which could, if ordered, have significant consequences.
- [6] It remains to be seen whether or not the respondents deliver any material. If they do, it will be up to Mr. Hogan of counsel for the Receiver, and ultimately up to this court, as to whether or not to accept any such responding materials.
- [7] If, as Mr. Manis anticipates, the responding materials, if any, contain no surprises, it seems likely that the matter can proceed on May 4, 2026, as scheduled. This is the strong preference of the court.
- [8] However, if responding materials are delivered that cause any concerns or surprise for Mr. Hogan (and his client), the court will be open to hearing his submissions as to what should occur, be it a rejection of the materials as being significantly after the court-ordered deadline or, if the court feels that the materials should be allowed notwithstanding their lateness, an opportunity for the Receiver to respond expeditiously.
- [9] The May 4, 2026 hearing date is confirmed, and, subject to the discussion set out above, the court expects the Receiver's motion to proceed that day.



W.D. BLACK J.

DATE: APRIL 21, 2026