

Sloppy Accounting Costs Developer

Construction Lien Act Protects Parties Down the Chain

By Jason J. Annibale and Allison Worone

Developers and others with payment obligations in the construction pyramid (payors) can better manage their risk and exposure by ensuring that their payment and accounting practices are well managed and clear – particularly given the Ontario Court of Appeal’s recent decision in *Colautti Construction Ltd v Ashcroft Development Inc.* As the case confirms, payors must clearly allocate their payments to particular invoices or debts.

Failing to do so may in certain circumstances allow those entitled to payment (payees) to apply received payments to other outstanding accounts, even where such accounts are due on other contracts or where the accounts have been outstanding past the two-year limitation period in which a claim for payment could be made. *Colautti* also cautions that payors who comingle project monies received with other funds, may be found to have breached their trust obligations owed to their payees under the *Construction Lien Act*.

THE FACTS

Ashcroft Development Inc. contracted with Colautti Construction Ltd. in 1997 to provide construction services for two major real estate projects in Ottawa. The contractor provided its services to the developer under a series of written contracts and through various development phases.

Initially, the developer paid the contractor with cheques that had counterfoils identifying the specific invoices to which the payments were to be assigned. The contractor allocated these payments accordingly.



In mid-1999, however, the developer changed its payment practice and sent the contractor seven advance payment cheques that contained brief, cryptic counterfoil notations. Six of the seven cheques included the label, “Advance,” and one of the seven cheques referred to a particular contract. However, none of the advances identified the specific invoices to which they were to be applied.

The developer specifically directed the first of the seven advances to old debt from other contracts. The contractor repeatedly requested allocation instructions for the remaining advances, but the developer did not respond. The contractor accordingly allocated the advances to debt that had been outstanding

for more than two years in relation to other contracts with the developer then informed the developer of these allocations, but received no response.

The developer did not maintain separate trust accounts for the projects, instead keeping only a single general account in which all funds received were comingled. Accounting and banking records were poorly kept, if at all.

Eventually, the contractor claimed against the developer for unpaid services respecting the projects. In response, the developer claimed that the contractor had been overpaid and challenged the contractor’s allocation of payments.

THE DECISION

The trial judge found that the contractor was entitled to allocate the advances as it did. The developer was found to have breached its trust obligations owed to the contractor under the Act in that the developer owed the contractor monies and did not have a proper accounting system for funds received and to be paid out in relation to the projects. The developer appealed.

The Ontario Court of Appeal dismissed the developer’s appeal. In doing so, the Court confirmed that where a payee asks its payor how payments are to be allocated and receives no response, the payee may apply such payments to outstanding accounts from other contracts.

The developer changed its payment practice and sent the contractor seven advance payment cheques that contained brief, cryptic counterfoil notations.

The Court noted that this circumstance is an exception to the general principle that payments made on a particular contract are to be applied to debts arising from that contract. In this case, the developer's counterfoil notations were found to be insufficient to constitute an allocation.

The Court rejected the developer's argument that the contractor was prohibited from applying the advances to debts outside the contracts at hand as doing so would have

the contractor breach its own statutory trust obligations owed to its subcontractor payees. Under the Act, project monies received by payors in the construction pyramid are held in trust for the benefit of their payees "down the chain".

This statutory trust applies as between each payor/payee relationship in the construction pyramid. Project monies include funds received in payment for performed services or provided materials and building financing.

Diverting such funds away from payees who have performed services or provided materials on the project constitutes a breach of trust. The Act empowers payees with significant remedies in response to such breaches, including an ability to "pierce the corporate veil" and pursue directors and others personally for the diversion of funds.

The Court held, however, that the Act's trust provisions are only for the benefit of payees as against payors – not the reverse as the developer's argument entailed. Only those down the chain in the construction pyramid can avail themselves to the Act's trust provisions as against those up the chain.

The Court also rejected the developer's argument that the contractor was prohibited from applying the advances to debts that remained outstanding past the expiry of the two-year limitation period in which the contractor could have claimed against the developer for the debt. As the Court put it, "a limitation period bars the remedy, not the right."

BREACH OF TRUST

The developer was, moreover, found to have breached its trust obligations under the Act as it owed the contractor monies and had failed to implement a "proper system... to receive, monitor and disburse the trust funds."


The Court identified the foregoing finding as "inevitable" in the circumstances as the developer: comingled financing received for each of the projects in a single general account; made payments respecting numerous projects from the general account; and failed to produce detailed accounting and banking records.

Colautti thus serves as an important reminder that payors in the construction industry can significantly limit their risk and exposure by: maintaining separate accounts for each project; keeping detailed accounting and banking records; and making clear payment allocations. Those who effectively manage their businesses in this way may also gain significant legal remedies and financial advantages against others who fail to do so. **PMR**

Jason J. Annibale is co-leader of the construction litigation team with McMillan LLP. Allison Worone is a summer student. The preceding article is reprinted from the McMillan Construction Litigation Bulletin, June 2011. For more information, see www.mcmillan.ca.


Leaking Pipes?

Let Us Restore Them In-Place To a Better Than New Condition



No More Rip and Replace

Ask us about our Neofit and Pipes Down Under lining technologies



www.pipe-shield.com


PIPE
REHABILITATION
PROFESSIONALS

- Ontario Building Code Approved
- 20 Year Warranty
- Improved Water Quality - Reduced Lead + Metal Content
- BPA FREE**
- Improved Water Flow
- Better than a New Pipe
- Turn Key Installation
- Certified to NSF 61

Epoxy Application parameters developed with our PIPE SHIELD™ BELT (blown epoxy lining technology) software program, developed with the assistance of **NRC-IRAP and the University of Toronto**

Pipe Shield™ AN500 Epoxy is manufactured with non-toxic base ingredients
www.pipe-shield.com

Division of:



"Experience you can count on since 1985"

"We are a proud supplier to Wilson Blanchard!"

Toll Free: 1.800.463.0251 • Tel: 905.670.7481 • Fax: 905.670.7483
 Email: brad@bradleymechanical.com • www.bradleymechanical.com