

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Citation: *1145194 B.C. Ltd. v. MKB Investments Ltd.*,
2026 BCSC 1183

Date: 20260610
Docket: S227630
Registry: Vancouver

Between:

**1145194 B.C. Ltd.
1076897 B.C. Ltd.**

Plaintiffs

And

**MKB Investments Ltd., Berarco Investments Ltd.,
Berar Capital Corporation, 1180423 B.C. Ltd., 651365 B.C. Inc.,
653965 B.C. Inc., and 1140912 B.C. Ltd.**

Defendants

- and -

Docket: S227631
Registry: Vancouver

Between:

**1145198 B.C. Ltd.
1145182 B.C. Ltd.**

Plaintiffs

And

**1140909 B.C. Ltd.
1140910 B.C. Ltd.
1140912 B.C. Ltd.
1140398 B.C. Ltd.**

Defendants

- and -

Docket: S232892
Registry: Vancouver

Between:

**1145194 B.C. Ltd.
1076897 B.C. Ltd.**

Plaintiffs

And

**MKB Investments Ltd.
Berar Capital Corporation
1247381 B.C. Ltd.
1368236 B.C. Ltd.**

Defendants

- and -

Docket: S236346
Registry: Vancouver

Between:

Karmjit Kaur Berar

Plaintiff

And

**Sundeep Gill, Pawandeep Gill, 1318801 B.C. Ltd.,
Amarjeet Gill, 1145198 B.C. Ltd. and
Warwickshire Homes (Bedford Gardens) Ltd. Inc. No. BC1510644**

Defendants

Corrected Judgment: The text of the judgment was corrected at the cover page on
June 25, 2026.

Before: The Honourable Justice Stephens

**Oral Ruling
Re Re-Examination of Manpreet Berar on Certain Text Messages**

Counsel for 1145182 B.C. Ltd., 1076897
B.C. Ltd., 1145194 B.C. Ltd., 1145198 B.C.
Ltd., Amarjeet Gill, Pawandeep Gill, and
Sundeep Gill:

F. Lamer
M. Sveinson

Counsel for 1140398 B.C. Ltd., 1140909 B.C. Ltd., 1140910 B.C. Ltd., 1180423 B.C. Ltd., Berar Capital Corporation, Berarco Investments Ltd., 1368236 B.C. Ltd., 1247381 B.C. Ltd., 651365 B.C. Inc., 653965 B.C. Inc., and Karmjit Kaur Berar:

R. Basham, KC

Counsel for 1140912 B.C. Ltd., and MKB Investments Ltd.:

Y. Li-Reilly

Place and Date of Trial/Hearing:

Vancouver, B.C.
June 10, 2026

Place and Date of Judgment:

Vancouver, B.C.
June 10, 2026

[1] **THE COURT:** I will make a ruling on that objection as follows.

[2] In the course of cross-examination of Ms. Manpreet Berar, which has occurred over several days, she has at times answered a question from Mr. Sundeep [Sunny] Gill's counsel with reference to text messages that she had not been taken to. Now in re-examination, as I understand it, Ms. Li-Reilly, counsel for Ms. Berar's companies, wishes to take her to some of those text messages.

[3] The principles in connection with re-examination I have stated earlier in a previous ruling, which I am not going to repeat here, but I reference *R. v. Sipes*, 2011 BCSC 1906 in this regard.

[4] I am of the view that this is a matter which does arise out of cross-examination, albeit not in connection with a specific question asked of Ms. Berar but with an answer that she gave. So I find that re-examination is permissible.

[5] However, given the way that this topic has arisen, in that Ms. Berar has in essence raised these issues in connection with different questions on cross-examination, I find that it is appropriate for me to give leave to Mr. Lamer (counsel for Sunny Gill) to re-cross on the documents in connection with this re-examination. I refer to in that connection – i.e. giving leave to re-cross – to *International Hi-Tech Industries Inc. v. FANUC Robotics Canada Ltd.*, 2006 BCSC 2009 at para 6.

[6] In short, the objection to re-examination is overruled, with the qualification that cross-examination may be permitted by Mr. Sunny Gill's counsel on that topic.

[7] And I add that nothing in this ruling expresses any view about what weight, if any, I may put on the answers or evidence given on this topic. That is my ruling.

“Stephens J.”