



March 26, 2015

BY EMAIL

Tracy Sandler
Osler, Hoskin & Harcourt LLP
Barristers and Solicitors
100 King Street West
Suite 6100
Toronto, ON M5X 1B8

Alan Mark
Goodmans LLP
Barristers and Solicitors
333 Bay Street
Suite 3400
Toronto, ON M5H 2S7

Dear Counsel:

**Re: Target Canada Co. CCAA – Response to Supplier Questions
and Fifth Report of the Monitor**

Thank you for the responses to the supplier questions contained in Ms. Sandler's letter dated March 16, 2015, and contained in the Fifth Report of the Monitor dated March 16, 2015 (collectively, the "**Response**"). This letter is provided on behalf of our clients and Solmon Rothbart Goodman's client pursuant to the Endorsement of Mr. Justice Morawetz dated February 19, 2015 (the "**Endorsement**"). We are grateful to both Target Canada Co. ("**TCC**") and the Monitor for the considerable effort that was expended in preparing the Response.

We would advise that we have reviewed the answers thoroughly, and have the following comments to make:

1. There were a number of requests for production of documents made in our letter dated March 2, 2015. Almost none of these documentary requests have been complied with. We respectfully disagree with the rationale for this non-production, and we shall be seeking a production order from Mr. Justice Morawetz.
2. Although none of the answers provided in the Response by TCC are under oath, we intend to cross-examine Mr. Wong on the Response. We also require that TCC produce another witness who, in all likelihood, may be more capable of answering these questions. In this regard, we note from the substance of the Response that the full extent of TCC's decision-making and knowledge was at the parent level, Target Corporation. In our view, it makes the most sense for TCC and Target

2 Queen Street East
Suite 1500
Toronto, Canada M5C 3G5
416.593.1221 TEL
416.594.5084 FAX
www.blaney.com

Lou Brzezinski
416.593.2952
lbrzez@blaney.com

Corporation to also produce the CEO of Target Corporation, Brian Cornell, for examination, particularly given that Target Corporation enjoys the benefit of protection of its derivative liability from claims made against TCC as set out in the Initial Order.

3. If consent is not forthcoming, we will conduct the cross-examination of Mr. Wong and thereafter, with the evidence from that motion, if necessary, we will move for an order for the examination of Brian Cornell, unless you insist that Mr. Cornell be examined first, following the procedure required by Rule 39.
4. Likewise, we reserve our rights to seek leave to examine the Monitor on the Fifth Report.

As is apparent from the above, we intend to exercise our rights to cross-examine Mr. Wong on his affidavits as set forth in the Endorsement. I would ask counsel for the Monitor and counsel for TCC to provide us with convenient dates in April to conduct such cross-examination. We suspect that we shall require at least two days to complete these cross-examinations.

We enclose a supplementary list of documents specifically referred to in the Response. We would ask that TCC provide us with copies of these documents and reconsider its refusals in respect of the documents previously requested in our letter dated March 2, 2015. If privilege is maintained, we request to be provided with a list of the documents by date, nature of the document, from whom, to whom (including who was copied or blind copied) and the basis of the claim for privilege.

It also makes sense to provide the documentation as soon as possible so that we have time to prepare. We are certainly not expected to read the documents for the first time either at the examinations or shortly before. We would appreciate the cooperation of all involved in that regard.

Once again, I wish to thank both TCC and the Monitor for their kind cooperation in respect of the Response to date, and we will continue to offer our reasonable cooperation as this process unfolds.

Yours very truly,

Blaney McMurtry LLP



Lou Brzezinski
LB/jb
Encl.

cc. Mel Solmon
cc. Service List