



ONTARIO SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
(COMMERCIAL LIST)

COUNSEL/ENDORSEMENT SLIP

COURT FILE NO.: CV-23-00710795-00CL

DATE: March 18, 2026

NO. ON LIST: 3

TITLE OF PROCEEDING: CAMERON STEPHENS MORTGAGE CAPITAL LTD. v. 2011836
ONTARIO CORP. et al
BEFORE: JUSTICE CONWAY

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION

For Plaintiff, Applicant, Moving Party:

Name of Person Appearing	Name of Party	Contact Info
Wendy H. Greenspoon-Soer	CAMERON STEPHENS MORTGAGE CAPITAL LTD.	wgreenspoon@garfinkle.com

For Defendant, Respondent, Responding Party:

Name of Person Appearing	Name of Party	Contact Info
Ryan Shah	CSL RECEIVER, ALBERT GELMAN INC.	ryan.shah@paliareroland.com

For Other, Self-Represented:

Name of Person Appearing	Name of Party	Contact Info
Fengxi Fansey Wang	SELF-REPRESENTED	fwang2025@icloud.com

ENDORSEMENT OF JUSTICE CONWAY:

- [1] Mr. Wang brings this motion pursuant to Rule 15.01(2) of the *Rules of Civil Procedure*, R.R.O. 1990, Reg. 194 for leave to represent the Respondents in these receivership proceedings. Rule 15.01(2) states: “A party to a proceeding that is a corporation shall be represented by a lawyer, except with leave of the court”.
- [2] Mr. Wang is the principal of the Respondents. He is not a lawyer. Although the court recognized that he had not formally sought leave, Mr. Wang has been permitted to make submissions in court in previous hearings. He now seeks leave as required by the Rules.
- [3] 2011836 Ontario Corp. and Jefferson Properties Limited Partnership (the “**Debtors**”) are in receivership. The Receiver opposes Mr. Wang’s motion, as does the Applicant Cameron Stephens Mortgage Capital Ltd.
- [4] Mr. Wang submits that he should be entitled to represent the Respondents. Otherwise, he says, their voices will be silenced. They are in receivership and have no funds to retain counsel. The only practical way for their corporate voices to be heard is for him to represent them. He is agreeable to the court imposing conditions on any order granting him leave.
- [5] I have considered the factors set out in *Meikle v. Arez Couture Inc. et al*, 2022 ONSC 4306 at para. 9 (citing *Extend-A-Call Inc. v. Dmitri Granovski et al.*, 2009 CanLII 33047 at para. 19.) I acknowledge that Mr. Wang has a connection to the Respondents and that they are not financially capable of retaining counsel.
- [6] However, in the circumstances of this case, the *Meikle* factors militate against granting leave, for the following reasons:
- There are two outstanding cost awards against Mr. Wang. One is from the Court of Appeal for \$13,500 on February 4, 2026, which was payable immediately and has not been paid. The other is my order of March 9, 2026 for \$4,978.22 which was payable in 30 days. Mr. Wang is seeking to appeal that order.

If Mr. Wang is granted leave to represent the Respondents, that will enable him to litigate in the name of the Respondents, while effectively insulating him from personal liability for future cost awards. The result is that the cost of his actions will be borne by the Respondents’ stakeholders (in particular, Cameron Stephens).

- I am not persuaded that Mr. Wang is reasonably capable of advocating on behalf of the Respondents. I understand that this is not a high threshold but it is met in this

case given his history of seeking to relitigate matters. In *Cameron Stephens Mortgage Capital Ltd. v. 2011836 Ontario Corp.*, 2026 ONCA 77, Favreau J.A., at para 30(b) (my emphasis added), stated:

First and foremost, Mr. Wang is essentially seeking to relitigate issues that have already been decided by the court below multiple times. Most recently, Kimmel J. approved the minimum pricing proposed by the Receiver. Mr. Wang did not seek to appeal that order. His proposed appeal therefore appears to be a collateral attack on earlier court orders.

On February 11, 2026, he sought to schedule a Motion for Directions (Governance on Future Sale). I denied his request, holding that the issues on that motion were “subsumed in...prior orders”.

The cost of these attempts to relitigate are borne by the Respondents’ stakeholders, primarily the secured creditor Cameron Stephens. Granting leave to Mr. Wang to represent the Respondents will only increase the costs to those stakeholders and diminish their recoveries from these insolvent Debtors.

- These are receivership proceedings. The Receiver is a court-appointed officer subject to the supervision of this court. As in any insolvency proceeding, the interests of the Respondents and all of its stakeholders must be considered by this court. I do not accept Mr. Wang’s submission that refusing him leave will effectively silence the Respondents’ voice.
- Justice Kimmel in her decision of December 1, 2025 held that Mr. Wang had cited cases that could not be found on CanLII and that the neutral citations he provided were “to other cases with different names dealing with issues unrelated the points that [Fansey] has cited the case for.”
- The Receiver describes in its Third and Fourth Supplements to the Sixth Report how Mr. Wang has repeatedly breached his obligations under a non-disclosure agreement by publishing the contents of the Target Price List, despite demands and warnings not to do so.

[7] Considering all of these circumstances, this is not an appropriate case to grant leave for Mr. Wang to represent the Respondents. His motion is dismissed.

[8] If the Receiver or Cameron Stephens seeks costs of this motion, it shall file cost submissions of not more than two pages, double spaced, within 7 days. Mr. Wang shall file responding cost submissions of not more than two pages, double spaced, within 10 days thereafter.