

**CITATION:** Dario v. Pleterski, 2022 ONSC 4036  
**OSHAWA COURT FILE NO.:** CV-22-00915-00  
**DATE:** 20220707

**ONTARIO**

**SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE**

**BETWEEN:** )  
 )  
Sacha Amar Dario Singh and 9319697 )  
Canada Ltd. ) Tanya C. Walker and Jordan Koeing, for the  
 ) Plaintiffs  
Plaintiffs )  
 )  
– and – )  
 )  
 )  
Aiden Pleterski and AP Private Equity Ltd. )  
 )  
Defendants )  
 )  
 ) **Heard: June 28, 2022-in writing and oral  
submissions on July 7, 2022.**

**ENDORSEMENT**

**SUTHERLAND J.:**

**Overview**

- [1] The plaintiffs bring an *ex parte* motion seeking a worldwide *Mareva* injunction. The plaintiffs have commenced their action but have not served the Statement of Claim upon the defendants.
- [2] The plaintiffs allege that there were induced into making substantial investments with the defendant Aiden Pleterski (Aiden) between April 2021 and January 2022. The plaintiffs claim that the inducement was based on fraudulent misrepresentation and that their investment has been transferred to the defendant corporation, AP Private Equity Ltd. (AP Equity), which is owned and solely controlled by Aiden.
- [3] On April 21, 2022, the plaintiffs commenced this proceeding claiming relief based on breach of contract, fraudulent misrepresentation, civil fraud, misappropriation of funds, conversion, and unjust enrichment.

- [4] The plaintiffs claim that the Defendants have assets in Ontario and that there is a serious risk that the Defendants will dissipate or remove assets from Ontario prior to a judgment being granted in this proceeding and that they would suffer irreparable harm if the injunction requested is not granted.
- [5] For the reasons that follow, a *Mareva* injunction is granted.

### **Background**

- [6] The Plaintiff, Sacha Amar Dario Singh (Singh), is a businessperson and licensed real estate salesperson, who is also the sole director and officer of the Plaintiff corporation, 9319697 Canada Ltd, (931).
- [7] In or around March 2021, Singh was introduced to the defendant Aiden by an Akil Heywood (Heywood) after informing Singh that Aiden had superior trading ability in cryptocurrency and other investments.
- [8] Singh conducted some research into Aiden through social media and the numerous posts by Aiden.
- [9] Between April 1, 2021, and January 16, 2022, the Plaintiffs invested \$4,565,000 with the Defendants. These funds were provided by a series of wire transfers, bank drafts and cash payments. The wire transfer payments were submitted to the TD Canada Trust (TD) account and a Bank of Nova Scotia (Scotiabank) account registered to Aiden.
- [10] Each investment made by the Plaintiffs with the Defendant Aiden was documented in a written contract that was prepared by Aiden. Each contract contained various identical terms, including *inter alia* the following:
- a) that the Plaintiffs were investing funds with Aiden in exchange for a 70%/30% split on capital gains, whereby the Plaintiffs would receive 70% of capital gains and Aiden would receive 30% of capital gains;
  - b) that if the investment were lost, the full initial investment plus any subsequent additions to capital would be repaid to the Plaintiffs, in increments of 25% of the total amount, in biweekly instalments;
  - c) that the Plaintiffs would be entitled to withdraw any amount they choose from their personal portion of capital gains and that such withdrawals would be provided by Aiden within three business days of being requested; and
  - d) that Aiden's target goals for capital gains would be in the range of 10% - 20% growth biweekly.

- [11] The contract provided that the brokerage company used for the investment was FXChoice Ltd. (FXChoice), which is a company headquartered and registered in Belize. The plaintiffs allege that Aiden represented to Mr. Singh that Aiden's brokerage account with FXChoice held funds in excess of \$100,000,000 CAD.
- [12] Between approximately April 1, 2021, and approximately April 4, 2022, Aiden regularly sent weekly updates to Singh to inform him the rate of return the investments the Plaintiffs had yielded. Singh kept records of the return rates Aiden represented he had achieved, which showed that Singh's investment had earned approximately \$23,292,096 CAD in profit, in addition to his principal investments.
- [13] On or around February 6, 2022, Singh requested to Aiden that he withdraw \$1,000,000 CAD from his investments with the Defendants, so that he could meet certain financial obligations. On or around February 20, 2022, Singh requested to Aiden that he be able to withdraw \$300,000 CAD from the investment fund. On or around March 5, 2022, Mr. Singh requested to Aiden that he be able to withdraw \$3,500,000 from the investment fund. Aiden informed Mr. Singh that this withdrawal would be arranged within 2-3 weeks. The Plaintiffs stated that they have only received \$10,000 of these funds.
- [14] On March 28, 2022, Singh deposes that Aiden informed him that Aiden had been having issues withdrawing funds from FXChoice and, as a result, had started an account at a newer brokerage. Aiden and an associate of his, Mitchell Learning (Learning), informed Singh that the new account that belongs to Aiden was held with Friedberg Direct. On or around May 23, 2022, Learning told Mr. Singh that this Friedberg Direct account had been closed and the funds had been moved to Forex.com. The global head office for Forex.com is located in New Jersey, USA.
- [15] On March 12, 2022, Singh indicates that Heywood forwarded to him a document that was purported to be a financial statement from the Defendants' FXChoice account, which he had been provided by Learning. This purported statement provided that the Defendants' FXChoice account contained approximately \$135,000,000 USD and that Aiden had conducted a trade for \$1,279,252.37 USD.
- [16] Singh deposes that FXChoice's Legal Department confirmed in an email dated May 5, 2022, that this account statement was not from FXChoice.
- [17] On May 18, 2022, Heywood informed Singh that he had been sent \$53,000 from AP Equity, which was a company controlled by Aiden. On May 20, 2022, Singh met with Learning, who showed him pictures and a video displaying another account statement from FXChoice, which was in the name of AP Equity. One picture that Learning showed Singh indicated that there was \$311,300,307.15 CAD in the AP Equity FXChoice Account. The video that Learning showed Singh indicated that there was \$1,401,494.45 in Aiden's personal FXChoice account.
- [18] Singh states that AP Equity is an active corporation, of which Aiden is the sole director and officer.

- [19] On or around May 21, 2022, Singh had a meeting with a representative of FXChoice, Paul Tagger (Tagger). Singh indicates that he showed Tagger the pictures and video that Learning had provided displaying what were purported to be account statements for Aiden's and AP Equity's FXChoice accounts. Tagger confirmed that \$311,000,000 was not in any FXChoice accounts held by Aiden or AP Equity.
- [20] Singh deposes that on June 23, 2022, Heywood learned from Aiden that Aiden had taken pictures of all his vehicles and was listing them for sale. Aiden also informed Heywood that Aiden removed a bank safe from a rental storage facility that he had been storing his vehicles in.
- [21] Singh deposes that Aiden is taking steps to dissipate, sell or hide his assets to prevent any creditor from acquiring said assets. This includes expensive vehicles such as Lamborghinis, Audis, Ferrari, Land Rover along with liquid assets in bank and cryptocurrency accounts in other countries, such as Belize.
- [22] Singh deposes that on or around June 16, 2022, Singh had a phone call with Aiden to discuss the repayment of his investment funds. Prior to having this call, Singh had requested that Aiden pay him a good-faith payment of up to \$50,000, in order to reassure him that Aiden intended to repay the funds that he owed to him. During the call, Aiden represented that he would make such a good faith payment and that he would meet with Singh for lunch at 1:00 p.m. on June 18, 2022, to further discuss the status of repaying Singh's full investment.
- [23] Aiden cancelled the lunch meeting and stated that he would submit a good-faith payment later that day. The payment that Aiden transferred to Singh was only in the amount of \$10,000 CAD. Singh states that Aiden represented that he would reschedule the lunch meeting. Mr. Singh deposes that he has been unable to contact Aiden, despite making numerous attempts to do so via WhatsApp and telephone. Aiden has not responded to Singh's attempts to reach him.
- [24] The evidence provided also indicates that there are other individuals who were introduced to Aiden and have provided millions of dollars and Bitcoin to Aiden for investment. These investors have requested repayment of substantial amounts of their investment money, being millions of dollars and Bitcoin, and have not received any funds from Aiden repaying their principal investments.
- [25] One of the investors, Mr. Rumble, retained Kroll, Inc. (Kroll), a corporate investigation and risk consulting firm, to investigate the crypto wallet that he had deposited funds into, at Aiden's direction. This Investigative Analysis revealed that Aiden had transferred, at most, 2.867 of the Bitcoin Mr. Rumble had sent him on FXChoice and that some of the Bitcoin Mr. Rumble had sent him was being held in a Bitcoin wallet associated with Aiden. The Investigative Analysis further showed that some of the Bitcoin Mr. Rumble transferred to Aiden had been transferred to various cryptocurrency exchanges, as well as a cryptographic-asset-based gambling service.
- [26] Singh alleges that Aiden is taking steps to dissipate and sell his assets.

## **Legal Framework**

- [27] Section 101 of the *Courts of Justice Act*<sup>1</sup> and Rule 40.01 of the *Rules of Civil Procedure*<sup>2</sup> authorize the Court to grant an interlocutory injunction: “where it appears to a judge of the court to be just or convenient to do so.”
- [28] Rule 40.01 mandates that an interlocutory injunction may be granted for a period not exceeding 10 days and that the moving party shall undertake to abide by any order concerning damages that the Court may make. The Plaintiff has provided such an undertaking.
- [29] A *Mareva* injunction is an extraordinary remedy. If granted, it, in effect, freezes assets of the recipient. Thus, it becomes a form of execution before judgment.
- [30] The leading cases on temporary or final injunctions are *RJR MacDonald Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General) (RJR MacDonald)*<sup>3</sup> and *R. v. Canadian Broadcasting Corp.*<sup>4</sup> (*R. v. CBC*).
- [31] The test to grant an injunction as set out in *RJR MacDonald* is well known. The criteria that the party requesting an injunction must demonstrate are:
- (a) From a preliminary assessment of the merits of the case, there is a serious question to be tried;
  - (b) Irreparable harm will result if the relief is not granted; and
  - (c) Which of the parties would suffer greater harm from the granting or refusing of the injunction pending a decision on the merits.<sup>5</sup>
- [32] The test in *RJR MacDonald* was slightly modified by the Supreme Court of Canada in *R. v. CBC*. In *R. v. CBC*, the Court indicated:

The applicant must demonstrate a strong prima facie case that it will succeed at trial. This entails a strong likelihood on the law and the evidence presented that, at trial, the applicant will be ultimately successful in proving the allegations set out in the originating notice.<sup>6</sup>

The party seeking the injunction would, unless the injunction is granted, suffer irreparable harm that is not susceptible or would be difficult to be compensated in damages.

---

<sup>1</sup> RSO 1990 c. C.43

<sup>2</sup> RRO 1990, Reg.194

<sup>3</sup> [1994] 1 S.C.R. 311.

<sup>4</sup> 2018 SCC 5 (CanLII).

<sup>5</sup> *Supra*, note 3, at para 43.

<sup>6</sup> *Supra*, note 4, at para 18.

The party seeking the injunction “must show that the balance of convenience favours granting the injunction.”<sup>7</sup>

- [33] The Court, in *R. v. CBC*, emphasized that the burden upon the party seeking the injunction is to show a case of “such merit that it is very likely to succeed at trial.” The Court defined the meaning of “very likely to succeed at trial” in stating: “Meaning, that upon a preliminary review of the case, the application judge must be satisfied that there is a strong likelihood on the law and the evidence presented that, at trial, the applicant will be ultimately successful in proving the allegations set out in the originating notice.”<sup>8</sup>
- [34] In the *Mareva* injunction context, when the moving party is seeking a freezing of the assets of the recipient, the moving party must establish:
- i. A strong *prima facie* case against the defendants;
  - ii. The defendants have assets in the jurisdiction;
  - iii. There is a risk of the assets being removed from the jurisdiction, or disposed of within the jurisdiction or otherwise put beyond the reach of the Court such that the plaintiff will be unable to realize on a judgment in its favour;
  - iv. The moving party would suffer irreparable harm if the order is not made; and
  - v. The balance of convenience favours the granting of the order.<sup>9</sup>
- [35] The overriding consideration of the Court “is that the defendant threatens to so arrange his assets as to defeat his adversary, should that adversary ultimately prevail and obtain judgment, in any attempt to recover from the defendant on that judgment.”<sup>10</sup>
- [36] In cases concerning fraud or the removal or dissipation of assets, the moving party need not show direct evidence of dissipation or removal of assets. It is sufficient to show “that all the circumstances, including the circumstances of the fraud itself, demonstrate a serious risk that defendant will attempt to dissipate assets or put them beyond the reach of the plaintiff.”<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid* at para 18.

<sup>8</sup> *Supra*, note 4 at para 17.

<sup>9</sup> *HZC Capital Inc. v. Lee*, 2019 ONSC 4622, at para. 45.

<sup>10</sup> *Aetna Financial Services Ltd. v. Feigelman*, [1985] 1 S.C.R. 2, at para. 25 quoted from *HZC Capital Inc.*, *supra*, note 9 at para. 46; *Chitel v. Rothbart*, 1982 CarswellOnt 508 (CA) at paras. 30-32.

<sup>11</sup> *Sibley & Associates LP v. Ross*, 2011 ONSC 2951, at para. 63.

**Position of the Plaintiffs**

- [37] The Plaintiffs argues that they have a strong *prima facie* case of civil fraud/fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of contract, conversion, and misappropriation of funds.
- [38] The Plaintiffs submit that the Aiden made numerous false representations to Singh which include:
- i. That in the event of any loss, Aiden would fully indemnify the initial investments plus additions to capital.
  - ii. The target goals on the investments in the range of 10% to 20% per week and would pay to the Plaintiffs 70% of the return on investments.
  - iii. The investments would have consistent profit from week to week.
  - iv. Aiden would personally be liable for any loss of the investments.
- [39] The Plaintiffs contend that they have a strong *prima facie* case on unjust enrichment. Aiden has received an enrichment of million of dollars. The Plaintiffs have been deprived of these monies and there is no juristic reason why the Defendants should retain these funds. Accordingly, the plaintiff submits, they have a strong *prima facie* case based on unjust enrichment.
- [40] In addition, the Plaintiffs contend that they have a strong *prima facie* case on conversion and misappropriation of funds. The Plaintiffs contend that Aiden has wrongfully interfered with their money, that is inconsistent with the Plaintiffs' right to possession. Aiden has not provided the investment monies though having been requested to do so. This is conversion and misappropriation of funds.
- [41] The Plaintiffs would suffer irreparable harm if the injunction is not granted. Aiden has and is taking steps to dissipate his assets. If the Plaintiffs would obtain judgment with no injunction in place, there will be no assets that would be recoverable to satisfy any judgment. Aiden is selling or removing his assets, his luxury vehicles, safe and accounts, money, and cryptocurrency out of the reach of any creditor.
- [42] Aiden does have substantial assets in Ontario which include the luxury vehicles of a Ferrari, four Audis, three Lamborghinis, three McLarens, a Land Rover, and a BMW. He has also has \$300 million dollars in cryptocurrency, and bank accounts in Ontario.
- [43] Considering all the circumstances and the pattern of conduct of Aiden of not responding, not transferring the principal investments, not paying monies promised, the social media posts of assets purchased along with cancelling of meetings and his conduct with other investors, there is a demonstrable pattern of behaviour that the balance of convenience favours the Plaintiffs, and an injunction should be granted.

## Issues

[44] The issues for this Court to determine on this *ex parte* motion are:

- i. Have the Plaintiffs satisfied the criteria for a *Mareva* injunction, and should an injunction be granted?
- ii. If so, what are the terms of the injunction order that should be made?

## Analysis

### **Should a *Mareva* injunction be granted?**

#### *Strong Prima Facie case*

[45] I am satisfied that at this stage that the Plaintiffs have provided a strong *prima facie* case based on breach of contract and civil fraud/fraudulent misrepresentation.

[46] For civil fraud/fraudulent misrepresentation, the Plaintiffs must establish that:

- i. A false representation of the Aiden.
- ii. A level of knowledge of the falsehood of the representation by Aiden, whether through knowledge or recklessness.
- iii. The false representation caused the Plaintiffs to act; and
- iv. The Plaintiffs' actions resulted in a loss to them.<sup>12</sup>

[47] Based on the evidence presented on this motion, the Court is satisfied that there is strong *prima facie* case because:

- i. Aiden has not complied with the term of the contracts to indemnify the Plaintiffs on their monies or losses and has not repaid the investments to the Plaintiffs after numerous requests to do so.
- ii. The representations of the Aiden to indemnify which appears to have been fraudulent, through either knowledge or recklessness.
- iii. The representation of the percentage of return on a weekly basis.
- iv. The representation of repayment in 25% increments.
- v. The entitlement to withdraw any amount chosen from the Plaintiffs' investments on three days notice.

---

<sup>12</sup> *Bruni Appliance and Furniture, Inc. v. Hryniak*, 2014 SCC 8 (CanLII), [2014] 1 SCR 126 at para. 21.



[48] I find that the Plaintiffs have satisfied the first stage of a strong *prima facie* case and, on the evidence, provided that they are likely to be successful at trial. Given my conclusion on breach of contract and civil fraud, I need not consider conversion, misappropriation of funds or unjust enrichment.

*Defendants have assets in the jurisdiction*

[49] There is no issue from the evidence presented that the Defendants have assets in the Ontario. This stage of the test has been satisfied.

*There is a risk of the assets being removed from the jurisdiction or disposed of*

[50] The Plaintiffs have provided evidence that Aiden is attempting to liquidate assets and move assets. The evidence indicates that Aiden has transferred cryptocurrency, vehicles, and entities in his name. He has listed vehicles for sale. He removed a safe from his residence. He has misrepresented his assets and global investment fund assets.

[51] Also, in the world of technology in which we presently live, transferring liquid assets, money, and cryptocurrency, can occur at the click of a mouse.

[52] The overall conduct presented, relating not only to the Plaintiffs but other investors as well, demonstrate a strong likelihood that Aiden will not only remove assets from the jurisdiction but also move his assets to areas that may very well prevent the Plaintiffs, the investors, and any creditor from realizing on any judgment for damages that may be obtained.

[53] I am therefore satisfied that the Plaintiffs have met this stage of the test.

*Will the Plaintiffs suffer irreparable harm?*

[54] I am also satisfied that the Plaintiffs will suffer irreparable harm if the injunction is not granted. The evidence indicates that the Plaintiffs have provided significant funds, over 4 million dollars, to Aiden. These are monies the Plaintiffs require for their businesses and personal use.

[55] If the injunction is not granted, in all likelihood, there will be no assets available for the Plaintiffs to realize on any judgment if they are successful in this action.

[56] I am satisfied that this meets the test of irreparable harm.

*Balance of Convenience*

[57] The balance of convenience is in favour of the Plaintiffs in granting the *Mareva* injunction.

[58] The conduct of Aiden and the ramifications to the Plaintiffs tilt in favour of the Plaintiffs. The precariousness of the type of assets involved – money and cryptocurrency – along with

the actions of Aiden to dissipate and liquidate his assets tilts the balance in favour of the Plaintiffs.

- [59] Furthermore, the overriding consideration of the Court is if the conduct of the Defendants threatens to arrange their assets in such a way to defeat the Plaintiffs if they should ultimately prevail and obtain a judgment. I find that this applies in the factual situation presented to the Court through the evidence provided.

*Conclusion*


- [60] Consequently, I conclude that the Plaintiffs have satisfied the criteria for a *Mareva* injunction and hereby grant a temporary *Mareva* injunction in their favour.

**Terms of the Order**

- [61] The Plaintiffs have provided the Court with a draft order. Having reviewed the order, I am not agreeable to all the terms set out in the order with changes. The Court is not persuaded that evidence has been provided to show that the defendants have an interest in or have the accounts requested at RBC. The Court is persuaded from the material provided that the defendants have accounts or interest in accounts listed in the Order, namely with TD Bank and Bank of Nova Scotia, along with 5.12 BTC from unspent Cluster A Assets as described in the Kroll Report, as summarized at page 22.
- [62] The Court has amended the terms requested by the Plaintiffs in the draft order. The Court is agreeable to provide the Plaintiffs with an order in the form and content as in the Order attached hereto as Schedule "A".

**Disposition**

- [63] A temporary *Mareva* injunction is granted to the Plaintiffs.
- [64] The terms of the temporary *Mareva* injunction and order are as set out in Schedule "A" attached hereto.
- [65] This motion is returnable on July 18, 2022, at 9:30 am.
- [66] Costs reserved.

  
Justice P.W. Sutherland

**Released: July 7, 2022**

**SCHEDULE “A”**

Court File No. CV-22-00000915-0000

**ONTARIO  
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE**

THE HONOURABLE JUSTICE )  
 )  
 ) \_\_\_\_\_, THE \_\_\_\_\_  
 DAY OF JUNE 2022

B E T W E E N:

(*Court Seal*)

**SACHA AMAR DARIO SINGH and 9319697 CANADA LTD.**

Plaintiffs/  
Moving Parties

- and -

**AIDEN PLETERSKI and AP PRIVATE EQUITY LTD.**

Defendants

**ORDER**

**ORDER PROHIBITING DISSIPATION OF ASSETS**

**THIS MOTION**, is made without notice by the Plaintiffs, Sacha Amar Dario Singh and 9319697 Canada Ltd. for an Order in the form of a worldwide *Mareva* injunction restraining the Defendant Aiden Pleterski (“**Mr. Pleterski**”) and AP Private Equity Ltd. (“**AP Private**”) from removing from Ontario or in any way disposing of or diminishing the value of its assets wherever located anywhere in the world, was heard this day in writing at the Oshawa Courthouse at 150 Bond Street.

**ON READING** the Motion Record and Factum of the Plaintiffs, dated June 28, 2022, and upon reading the submissions of counsel for the Plaintiff, and on noting the undertaking of the Plaintiff to abide by any Order this Court may make concerning damages which the Court may make if it is subsequently determined that the granting of this Order has caused damage to the Defendants or any other person for which the Plaintiffs ought to compensate the Defendants or such other person and to pay the reasonable costs of any person other than the Defendants which have been incurred as a result of this Order including the costs of ascertaining whether that person holds any of the Defendants' assets,

**Mareva Injunction**

1. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Defendants (including as known by any aliases, whether listed in the style of cause or otherwise), and their servants, employees, agents, assigns and anyone else acting on their behalf or in conjunction with them, and any and all persons with notice of this injunction, are restrained from directly or indirectly, by any means whatsoever:

- a. from selling, removing, dissipating, alienating, transferring, disposing, assigning, encumbering, or similarly dealing with any assets of the Defendants, other than as provided for in this Order, wherever situated in the world, including but not limited to the following bank accounts:

**Bank:** TD Canada Trust

**Institution Number:** 004

**Transit Number:** 01622

**Account Number:** 6558549 DEPOSIT SLIP VOL 2 156

**Bank:** Bank of Nova Scotia

**Institution Number:** 002

**Swift Code:** NOSCCATT

**Account Number:** 576120034622 VOL 2 80

- b. from selling, withdrawing, removing, transferring, dissipating, or encumbering the funds or financial instruments held in the cryptocurrency wallet identified by the digital address 1PqVKRJL26PX8RZzrh6sijSqmPKYbC1QSD... as detailed in Exhibit "A" in the Affidavit of David Sigmundson, which was affirmed on June 24, 2022; VOL 4 27 and 45
- c. instructing, requesting, counselling, demanding, or encouraging any other person to do so; and
- d. facilitating, assisting in, aiding, abetting, or participating in any acts the effect of which is to do so.

2. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that paragraph 1 applies to all of the Defendants' assets, wherever situated in the world, whether or not they are in their own names and whether they are solely or jointly owned. For the purpose of this order, the Defendants' assets include any asset which they have the power, directly or indirectly, to dispose of or deal with as if it were their own. The Defendants are to be regarded as having such power if a third party holds or controls the assets in accordance with their direct or indirect instructions.

3. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Plaintiffs shall pay to any person served with this order pursuant this Order, the reasonable expenses associated with conducting the therein required searches of records, which expenses shall not exceed \$100.00 or any other amount the parties may agree or a Court may Order.

4. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that if the total value free of charges or other securities of the Defendants' assets exceeds \$33,000,000 CAD, or the equivalent in any other currency, the Defendants may sell, remove, dissipate, alienate, transfer, assign, encumber, or similarly deal with them so long as the total

unencumbered value of the Defendants' assets remains above \$33,000,000 CAD, or the equivalent in any other currency.

### **Ordinary Living Expenses**

5. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Defendants, or any of them, may apply for an order, on at least one (1) business day notice to the Plaintiffs, for an order granting them sufficient funds for ordinary living or business expenses or legal advice and representation.

### **Disclosure of Information**

6. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Defendants prepare and provide to the Plaintiffs within 10 days of the date of service of this Order, a sworn affidavit listing and describing the nature, value and location of their assets worldwide, whether in their own name or not and whether solely or jointly owned. Wrongful refusal to provide this information referred to in this paragraph may result in a finding of contempt of court and may render the Defendants liable to be imprisoned, fined or have their assets seized.

7. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Defendant, Mr. Pleterski submit to an examination under oath, in his personal capacity and on behalf of the Defendant AP Equity Ltd., within 14 days of the delivery by the Defendants of the aforementioned sworn statement. Wrongful refusal to provide this information referred to in this paragraph herein maybe result in a finding of contempt of court and may render the Defendants liable to be imprisoned, fined or have their assets seized.

### **Third Parties**

8. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that TD Canada Trust, FXChoice, Friedberg Direct, and the Bank of Nova Scotia ("**the Banks**") forthwith freeze and prevent any removal or transfer of monies or assets of the Defendants held in any account or on credit on behalf of the Defendants with the Banks, until further order of this Court.

9. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Banks forthwith disclose and deliver up to the Plaintiffs all records held by the Banks concerning the Defendants assets and accounts, including the existence, nature, value and location of any monies or assets or credit, wherever situate, held on behalf of the Defendants by the Banks, which will include the identity of the owner or owners of the said accounts.

10. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Banks, forthwith disclose and deliver up to the Plaintiffs any and all records held by the Banks concerning the Defendants assets and accounts, including the existence, nature, value and location of any monies or assets or credit wherever situate, held on behalf of the Defendants by the Banks.

11. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that any individual or corporation is, upon being served with this order, is prohibited from transferring any asset that they are in possession of which belong to any of the Defendants.

12. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that any individual or corporation shall, upon being served with this order, conduct a diligent search of its records to ascertain if it is in the possession of any of the Defendants' assets and to confirm to the lawyer for the Plaintiffs, in writing within 14 business days of being served with this order, whether or not that individual or corporation is in possession of the Defendants assets.

#### **Further Orders**

13. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Plaintiffs are entitled to an accounting of all funds, assets, effects and property of the Defendants, including any accounts and any improper dissipation thereof, and all funds and assets had or received by the Defendants, or any person or entity on their behalf, and all the dealings and transactions between the Defendants and between the Defendants and Plaintiffs, related to all amounts paid by the Plaintiffs to the Defendants, and any profits thereof.

14. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Plaintiffs are entitled to a worldwide equitable tracing of all funds, which were obtained by the Defendants from the

Plaintiffs, into and through any financial accounts or deposit facilities in the name of, or held on behalf of or for the benefit of, the Defendants and into and through any assets purchased by the Defendants using funds that were fraudulently obtained from the Plaintiffs.

#### **Variation, Discharge or Extension of the Order**

15. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that anyone served with or notified of this Order may apply to the Court at any time to vary or discharge this order in accordance with Rule 37.14 of the *Rules of Civil Procedure* on ten (10) days notice to the Plaintiffs.

#### **Service of Order**

12. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that this Order and the associated motion materials may be served on the Defendants by email service to [aiden.pleterski@gmail.com](mailto:aiden.pleterski@gmail.com) and by WhatsApp messaging to the phone number (289) 387-4751.

13. **THIAS COURT ORDERS THAT** motion be returnable on July 18, 2022 at 9:30 am by zoom. Staff to send out the call-in details.

14. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that this notwithstanding Rule 59.05, this Order is effective immediately and is enforceable without any need for formal entry.

15. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the costs of the Plaintiff's motion for injunctive relief will be reserved to the trial judge.

---

Justice P. Sutherland





SACHA AMAR DARIO SINGH et al.  
Plaintiffs

- and -

AIDEN PLETESKI et al.  
Defendants

Court File No.: CV-22-0000915-0000

\\twdc1\data\S\Singh, Sacha\Orders & Endorsements\2022-06-28 Order re injunction.final.docx

**ONTARIO  
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE**

PROCEEDING COMMENCED AT  
OSHAWA

**ORDER**

**WALKER LAW  
PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION**

1 Adelaide Street E, Suite 2501  
Toronto, Ontario  
M5C 2V4

Tanya C. Walker (52997A)  
[tanya@tcwalkerlawyers.com](mailto:tanya@tcwalkerlawyers.com)  
Tel: 647-342-2234 ext. 302  
Fax: 416-362-2334

Jordan Koenig (75094L)  
[jkoenig@tcwalkerlawyers.com](mailto:jkoenig@tcwalkerlawyers.com)  
Tel: 647-342-2334 ext. 300

Lawyers for the Plaintiffs/  
Moving Parties

**ONTARIO  
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE**

THE HONOURABLE JUSTICE            )  
P. SUTHERLAND                        )  
  )

THURSDAY, THE 7th  
DAY OF JULY 2022

B E T W E E N:

**SACHA AMAR DARIO SINGH and 9319697 CANADA LTD.**



Plaintiffs/  
Moving Parties

- and -

**AIDEN PLETERSKI and AP PRIVATE EQUITY LTD.**

Defendants

**ORDER**

**ORDER PROHIBITING DISSIPATION OF ASSETS**

**THIS MOTION**, is made without notice by the Plaintiffs, Sacha Amar Dario Singh and 9319697 Canada Ltd. for an Order in the form of a worldwide *Mareva* injunction restraining the Defendant Aiden Pleterski (“**Mr. Pleterski**”) and AP Private Equity Ltd. (“**AP Private**”) from removing from Ontario or in any way disposing of or diminishing the value of its assets wherever located anywhere in the world, was heard this day in writing at the Oshawa Courthouse at 150 Bond Street.

**ON READING** the Motion Record and Factum of the Plaintiffs, dated June 28, 2022, and upon reading the submissions of counsel for the Plaintiff, and on noting the

undertaking of the Plaintiff to abide by any Order this Court may make concerning damages which the Court may make if it is subsequently determined that the granting of this Order has caused damage to the Defendants or any other person for which the Plaintiffs ought to compensate the Defendants or such other person and to pay the reasonable costs of any person other than the Defendants which have been incurred as a result of this Order including the costs of ascertaining whether that person holds any of the Defendants' assets,

### **Mareva Injunction**

1. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Defendants (including as known by any aliases, whether listed in the style of cause or otherwise), and their servants, employees, agents, assigns and anyone else acting on their behalf or in conjunction with them, and any and all persons with notice of this injunction, are restrained from directly or indirectly, by any means whatsoever:

- a. from selling, removing, dissipating, alienating, transferring, disposing, assigning, encumbering, or similarly dealing with any assets of the Defendants, other than as provided for in this Order, wherever situated in the world, including but not limited to the following bank accounts:

**Bank:** TD Canada Trust

**Institution Number:** 004

**Transit Number:** 01622

**Account Number:** 6558549 DEPOSIT SLIP VOL 2 156

**Bank:** Bank of Nova Scotia

**Institution Number:** 002

**Swift Code:** NOSCCATT

**Account Number:** 576120034622 VOL 2 80

- b. from selling, withdrawing, removing, transferring, dissipating, or encumbering the funds or financial instruments held in the cryptocurrency wallet identified by the digital address 1PqVKRJL26PX8RZzrh6sijSqmPKYbC1QSD... as detailed in Exhibit "A" in the Affidavit of David Sigmundson, which was affirmed on June 24, 2022; VOL 4 27 and 45
- c. instructing, requesting, counselling, demanding, or encouraging any other person to do so; and
- d. facilitating, assisting in, aiding, abetting, or participating in any acts the effect of which is to do so.

2. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that paragraph 1 applies to all of the Defendants' assets, wherever situated in the world, whether or not they are in their own names and whether they are solely or jointly owned. For the purpose of this order, the Defendants' assets include any asset which they have the power, directly or indirectly, to dispose of or deal with as if it were their own. The Defendants are to be regarded as having such power if a third party holds or controls the assets in accordance with their direct or indirect instructions.

3. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Plaintiffs shall pay to any person served with this order pursuant this Order, the reasonable expenses associated with conducting the therein required searches of records, which expenses shall not exceed \$100.00 or any other amount the parties may agree or a Court may Order.

4. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that if the total value free of charges or other securities of the Defendants' assets exceeds \$33,000,000 CAD, or the equivalent in any other currency, the Defendants may sell, remove, dissipate, alienate, transfer, assign, encumber, or similarly deal with them so long as the total unencumbered value of the Defendants' assets remains above \$33,000,000 CAD, or the equivalent in any other currency.

### **Ordinary Living Expenses**

5. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Defendants, or any of them, may apply for an order, on at least one (1) business day notice to the Plaintiffs, for an order granting them sufficient funds for ordinary living or business expenses or legal advice and representation.

### **Disclosure of Information**

6. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Defendants prepare and provide to the Plaintiffs within 10 days of the date of service of this Order, a sworn affidavit listing and describing the nature, value and location of their assets worldwide, whether in their own name or not and whether solely or jointly owned. Wrongful refusal to provide this information referred to in this paragraph may result in a finding of contempt of court and may render the Defendants liable to be imprisoned, fined or have their assets seized.

7. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Defendant, Mr. Pleterski submit to an examination under oath, in his personal capacity and on behalf of the Defendant AP Equity Ltd., within 14 days of the delivery by the Defendants of the aforementioned sworn statement. Wrongful refusal to provide this information referred to in this paragraph herein maybe result in a finding of contempt of court and may render the Defendants liable to be imprisoned, fined or have their assets seized.

### **Third Parties**

8. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that TD Canada Trust, FXChoice, Friedberg Direct, and the Bank of Nova Scotia ("**the Banks**") forthwith freeze and prevent any removal or transfer of monies or assets of the Defendants held in any account or on credit on behalf of the Defendants with the Banks, until further order of this Court.

9. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Banks forthwith disclose and deliver up to the Plaintiffs all records held by the Banks concerning the Defendants assets and accounts, including the existence, nature, value and location of any monies or

assets or credit, wherever situate, held on behalf of the Defendants by the Banks, which will include the identity of the owner or owners of the said accounts.

10. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Banks, forthwith disclose and deliver up to the Plaintiffs any and all records held by the Banks concerning the Defendants assets and accounts, including the existence, nature, value and location of any monies or assets or credit wherever situate, held on behalf of the Defendants by the Banks.

11. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that any individual or corporation is, upon being served with this order, is prohibited from transferring any asset that they are in possession of which belong to any of the Defendants.

12. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that any individual or corporation shall, upon being served with this order, conduct a diligent search of its records to ascertain if it is in the possession of any of the Defendants' assets and to confirm to the lawyer for the Plaintiffs, in writing within 14 business days of being served with this order, whether or not that individual or corporation is in possession of the Defendants assets.

#### **Further Orders**

13. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Plaintiffs are entitled to an accounting of all funds, assets, effects and property of the Defendants, including any accounts and any improper dissipation thereof, and all funds and assets had or received by the Defendants, or any person or entity on their behalf, and all the dealings and transactions between the Defendants and between the Defendants and Plaintiffs, related to all amounts paid by the Plaintiffs to the Defendants, and any profits thereof.

14. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the Plaintiffs are entitled to a worldwide equitable tracing of all funds, which were obtained by the Defendants from the Plaintiffs, into and through any financial accounts or deposit facilities in the name of, or held on behalf of or for the benefit of, the Defendants and into and through any

assets purchased by the Defendants using funds that were fraudulently obtained from the Plaintiffs.

### **Variation, Discharge or Extension of the Order**

15. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that anyone served with or notified of this Order may apply to the Court at any time to vary or discharge this order in accordance with Rule 37.14 of the *Rules of Civil Procedure* on ten (10) days notice to the Plaintiffs.


### **Service of Order**

12. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that this Order and the associated motion materials may be served on the Defendants by email service to [aiden.pleterski@gmail.com](mailto:aiden.pleterski@gmail.com) and by WhatsApp messaging to the phone number (289) 387-4751.

13. **THIAS COURT ORDERS THAT** motion be returnable on July 18, 2022 at 9:30 am by zoom. Staff to send out the call-in details.

14. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that this notwithstanding Rule 59.05, this Order is effective immediately and is enforceable without any need for formal entry.

15. **THIS COURT ORDERS** that the costs of the Plaintiff's motion for injunctive relief will be reserved to the trial judge.



---

Justice P. Sutherland