



**OPINIONS**  
**OF**  
**THE SUPREME COURT**  
**AND**  
**COURT OF APPEALS**  
**OF**  
**SOUTH CAROLINA**

---

**ADVANCE SHEET NO. 46**  
**November 22, 2023**  
**Patricia A. Howard, Clerk**  
**Columbia, South Carolina**  
[www.sccourts.org](http://www.sccourts.org)

## **CONTENTS**

### **THE SUPREME COURT OF SOUTH CAROLINA**

#### **PUBLISHED OPINIONS AND ORDERS**

Order – In the Matter of George Harold Hanlin	10
Order – In the Matter of Allan Riley Holmes	12

#### **UNPUBLISHED OPINIONS**

None

#### **PETITIONS - UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT**

28145 – State v. Timothy Ray Jones, Jr.	Pending
28149 – The State v. Mary Ann German	Pending
28151 – Ani Creation v. City of Myrtle Beach	Pending

#### **EXTENSION TO FILE PETITION - UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT**

None

#### **PETITIONS FOR REHEARING**

28179 – State v. Corey J. Brown	Pending
---------------------------------	---------

# THE SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS

## PUBLISHED OPINIONS

6037 – United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company v. Covil Corporation 14

## UNPUBLISHED OPINIONS

2023-UP-370 – The State v. Mandy M. Fortson

2023-UP-371 – The State v. Mark R. Volstromer

2023-UP-372 – The State v. Jermaine S. White

2023-UP-373 – The State v. Decota C. Brown

2023-UP-374 – The Shops at Wescott, LLC v. Sake House IV, Inc.

2023-UP-375 – Sharyn Michali v. Eugene Michali

2023-UP-376 – The State v. Nikeen D. Johnson

## PETITIONS FOR REHEARING

5994 – Desa Ballard v. Admiral Insurance Company Pending

6017 – Noel Owens v. Mountain Air Heating & Cooling Pending

6020 – Joseph Kelsey, #217218 v. SCDPPPS Denied 11/17/2023

6024 – Robin G. Reese v. State Pending

6025 – Gerald Nelson v. Christopher S. Harris Denied 11/17/2023

6027 – Ex Parte: Trustgard Insurance Company Pending

6029 – Mark Green v. Wayne B. Bauerle Pending

6031 – The State v. Terriel L. Mack Pending

**EXTENSIONS TO FILE PETITION FOR REHEARING**

None

**PETITIONS – SUPREME COURT OF SOUTH CAROLINA**

5911 – Charles S. Blackmon v. SCDHEC Dismissed 11/15/2023

5912 – State v. Lance Antonio Brewton Pending

5916 – Amanda Huskins v. Mungo Homes, LLC Pending

5930 – State v. Kyle M. Robinson Pending

5933 – State v. Michael Cliff Eubanks Pending

5934 – Nicole Lampo v. Amedisys Holding, LLC Pending

5946 – The State v. Frankie L. Davis, III Pending

5947 – Richard W. Meier v. Mary J. Burnsed Pending

5948 – Frankie Padgett v. Cast and Crew Entertainment Denied 11/15/2023

5954 – State v. Rashawn Carter Pending

5955 – State v. Philip Guderyon Pending

5963 – Solesbee v. Fundamental Clinical Pending

5965 – National Trust for Historic Preservation v. City of North  
Charleston Pending

5972 – McEntire Produce v. SCDOR Pending

5974 – The State v. Calvin D. Ford	Pending
5975 – Rita Glenn v. 3M Company	Pending
5986 – The State v. James E. Daniels, Jr.	Pending
5987 – The State v. Tammy C. Moorer	Pending
5988 – The State v. Sidney S. Moorer (2)	Pending
5992 – Rufus Rivers v. James Smith, Jr.	Pending
5995 – The State v. Kayla M. Cook	Pending
5996 – Palmetto Pointe v. Tri-County Roofing	Pending
6000 – Jeffrey Fossett v. Melissa Fossett	Pending
6001 – Shannon P. Green v. Edward C. McGee	Pending
6004 – Joseph Abruzzo v. Bravo Media Productions, LLC	Pending
6007 – Dominic A. Leggette v. State	Pending
6008 – Tekayah Hamilton v. Regional Medical Center	Pending
6009 – John Doe v. Bishop of Charleston	Pending
6011 – James E. Carroll, Jr. v. Isle of Palms Pest Control, Inc.	Pending
6013 – Jamaine Holman v. SCELC	Pending
6016 – Vista Del Mar v. Vista Del Mar, LLC	Pending
6019 – Portfolio Recovery Associates, LLC v. Jennifer Campney	Pending
6022 – J&H Grading & Paving v. Clayton Construction	Pending

2022-UP-326 – Wells Fargo Bank v. Michelle Hodges	Pending
2022-UP-380 – Adonis Williams v. State	Pending
2022-UP-402 – Todd Olds v. Berkeley County	Pending
2022-UP-413 – Lucas Marchant v. John Doe	Denied 11/15/2023
2022-UP-415 – J. Morgan Kears v. The Kears Family Education Trust	Pending
2022-UP-422 – Paula Russell v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.	Pending
2022-UP-425 – Michele Blank v. Patricia Timmons (2)	Pending
2022-UP-429 – Bobby E. Leopard v. Perry W. Barbour	Pending
2022-UP-436 – Cynthia Holmes v. James Holmes	Denied 11/15/2023
2022-UP-444 – State v. James H. Baldwin	Denied 11/15/2023
2022-UP-452 – In the Matter of Kevin Wright	Pending
2022-UP-462 – Karrie Gurwood & Howard Gurwood v. GCA Services Group, Inc.	Pending
2023-UP-005 – David Abdo v. City of Charleston	Pending
2023-UP-020 – Bridgett Fowler v. Fedex	Denied 11/15/2023
2023-UP-037 – Diana Bright v. Craig Bright	Pending
2023-UP-041 – Joy Wymer v. Floyd Hiott	Denied 11/15/2023
2023-UP-051 – State v. Jason E. Stoots	Pending
2023-UP-055 – M. Baron Stanton v. Town of Pawleys Island	Pending
2023-UP-062 – Raglins Creek Farms, LLC v. Nancy D. Martin	Pending

2023-UP-064 – Karen K. Baber v. Summit Funding, Inc.	Pending
2023-UP-070 – James Kincannon v. Ashely Griffith	Pending
2023-UP-087 – The State v. Seth H. Smith	Pending
2023-UP-091 – The State v. Dale E. King	Pending
2023-UP-096 – Viola M. Hackworth v. Bayview Manor LLC	Pending
2023-UP-118 – Joseph N. Grate v. Jameka Cohen	Denied 11/15/2023
2023-UP-119 – The State v. Angelita Wright	Pending
2023-UP-121 – Mathew C. Dwyer v. State	Pending
2023-UP-126 – Innovative Waste Management v. Crest Energy Partners	Pending
2023-UP-132 – Monica Brown-Gantt v. Centex Real Estate	Pending
2023-UP-138 – In the Matter of John S. Wells	Pending
2023-UP-142 – The State v. Robert M. Watkins	Pending
2023-UP-143 – John Pendarvis v. SCLD	Pending
2023-UP-151 – Deborah Weeks v. David Weeks	Pending
2023-UP-158 – Herman Holcomb v. City of North Augusta	Pending
2023-UP-161 – The State v. Terrell D. Knighter	Pending
2023-UP-164 – Randall G. Dalton v. The Muffin Mam, Inc.	Dismissed 11/16/2023
2023-UP-172 – The State v. Gary M. Wirtz	Pending
2023-UP-177 – John Mayers v. Konan Henthorn	Pending
2023-UP-178 – CRM of the Carolinas, LLC v. Trevor W. Steel	Pending

2023-UP-179 – Ronald Mims v. Diane Ray	Pending
2023-UP-180 – The State v. Samuel L. Burnside	Pending
2023-UP-190 – SCDSS v. Shayne Duckworth	Denied 11/15/2023
2023-UP-202 – SCE&G v. Pitch Landing, LLC	Pending
2023-UP-206 – Andrew McIntire v. Red Bay Constructors Corp.	Pending
2023-UP-232 – Beachwalk Hotel & Condominiums Association, Inc. v. The Town of Hilton Head Island (2)	Pending
2023-UP-236 – U.S. Bank, NA v. Alyce F. Otto	Pending
2023-UP-239 – Wilmington Savings Fund Society v. Rex A. Field	Pending
2023-UP-241 – John Hine v. Timothy McCrory	Pending
2023-UP-243 – David J. Benjamin v. State	Pending
2023-UP-244 – Logan Wood v. Horry County School District	Pending
2023-UP-246 – Ironwork Productions, LLC v. Bobcat of Greenville, LLC	Pending
2023-UP-249 – Buck Investments, LLC v. ROA, LLC	Pending
2023-UP-254 – In the Matter of Lauren Martel	Pending
2023-UP-258 – The State v. Terry R. McClure	Pending
2023-UP-260 – Thomas C. Skelton v. First Baptist Church	Pending
2023-UP-261 – Mitchell Rivers v. State	Pending
2023-UP-263 – Rory M. Isaac v. Laura Kopchynski	Pending
2023-UP-264 – Kathleen A. Grant v. Nationstar Mortgage, LLC	Pending



2023-UP-272 – Estate of Barbara Owens v. Fundamental Clinical and Operational Services, LLC	Pending
2023-UP-274 – Terrence "Terry" Carroll v. Debra Mowery	Pending
2023-UP-281 – Armando Acevedo v. Hunt Valley Holdings, LLC	Pending
2023-UP-289 – R-Anell Housing Group, LLC v. Homemax, LLC	Pending
2023-UP-293 – NCP Pilgrim, LLC v. Mary Lou Cercopely	Pending

# The Supreme Court of South Carolina

In the Matter of George Harold Hanlin, Respondent.

Appellate Case Nos. 2023-001748 and 2023-001749

---

## ORDER

---

The Office of Disciplinary Counsel asks this Court to place Respondent on interim suspension pursuant to Rule 17(c) of the Rules for Lawyer Disciplinary Enforcement (RLDE) contained in Rule 413 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules (SCACR). The petition also seeks appointment of the Receiver to protect the interests of Respondent's clients pursuant to Rule 31, RLDE, Rule 413, SCACR.

IT IS ORDERED that Respondent's license to practice law in this state is suspended until further order of this Court.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Peyre T. Lumpkin, Esquire, is hereby appointed to assume responsibility for Respondent's client files, trust account(s), escrow account(s), operating account(s), and any other law office accounts Respondent may maintain. Mr. Lumpkin shall take action as required by Rule 31, RLDE, Rule 413, SCACR, to protect the interests of Respondent's clients. Except as authorized by Rule 31(d)(5), RLDE, Rule 413, SCACR, Mr. Lumpkin may not practice law in any federal, state, or local court, including the entry of an appearance in a court of this State or of the United States. Mr. Lumpkin may make disbursements from and close Respondent's trust account(s), escrow account(s), operating account(s), and any other law office accounts Respondent may maintain that are necessary to effectuate this appointment.

This Order, when served on any bank or other financial institution maintaining trust, escrow and/or operating account(s) of Respondent, shall serve as an injunction to prevent Respondent from making withdrawals from the account(s)

and shall further serve as notice to the bank or other financial institution that Peyre T. Lumpkin, Esquire, has been duly appointed by this Court.

Finally, this Order, when served on any office of the United States Postal Service, shall serve as notice that Peyre T. Lumpkin, Esquire, has been duly appointed by this Court and has the authority to receive Respondent's mail and the authority to direct that Respondent's mail be delivered to Mr. Lumpkin's office.

s/ Donald W. Beatty C.J.  
FOR THE COURT

Columbia, South Carolina  
November 15, 2023

# The Supreme Court of South Carolina

In the Matter of Allan Riley Holmes, Petitioner.

Appellate Case No. 2023-000054

---

## ORDER

---

By opinion dated August 14, 2013, Petitioner was suspended from the practice of law for a period of nine months. *In re Holmes*, 405 S.C 174, 747 S.E.2d 492 (2013). After referral to the Committee on Character and Fitness, the Committee has filed a Report and Recommendation recommending the Court reinstate Petitioner to the practice of law subject to the conditions of reinstatement set forth in this Court's 2013 opinion.

We find Petitioner has met the requirements of Rule 33(f), RLDE, to be reinstated as a regular member of the South Carolina Bar. Therefore, we grant the petition for reinstatement upon the following conditions:

- (1) Petitioner must enter into a three-year monitoring agreement with Lawyers Helping Lawyers (LHL);
- (2) Petitioner must fully comply with appropriate treatment for his addiction for three years from the date of reinstatement;
- (3) For three years from the date of reinstatement, Petitioner must submit three reports to the Commission on Lawyer Conduct each quarter, including an affidavit of compliance with the terms of his LHL contract and with the recommendations of his treatment provider; a statement from his LHL monitor regarding Petitioner's compliance with the LHL contract; and a report of Petitioner's diagnosis, treatment compliance and prognosis from Petitioner's treatment provider;

- (4) After the three-year period concludes, Petitioner must have his progress and compliance reviewed by an investigative panel of the Commission to determine whether the LHL contract and reporting requirements should be renewed, and if so, for how long; and
- (5) Upon reinstatement, Petitioner must limit his practice to working for a law firm or other organization for at least one year, and if at the conclusion of that year he desires to become a solo practitioner, he will be permitted to do so only upon the approval of an investigative panel of the Commission.

s/ Donald W. Beatty C.J.

s/ John W. Kittredge J.

s/ John Cannon Few J.

s/ George C. James, Jr. J.

s/ D. Garrison Hill J.

Columbia, South Carolina  
November 15, 2023

**THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In The Court of Appeals**

Peter D. Protopapas, as Receiver for Covil Corporation,  
Respondent,

v.

Wall, Templeton & Haldrup, P.A.; Sentry Casualty  
Company; United States Fidelity And Guaranty  
Company; Zurich American Insurance Company,  
Defendants,

of which

United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company is the  
Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2020-001437

---

Appeal From Richland County  
Jean Hoefer Toal, Acting Circuit Court Judge

---

Opinion No. 6037  
Heard October 11, 2023 – Filed November 22, 2023

---

**AFFIRMED**

---

Matthew Todd Carroll, of Womble Bond Dickinson  
(US), LLP, of Columbia, Mary Elizabeth O'Neill, of  
Womble Bond Dickinson (US), LLP, of Charlotte, NC,  
Andrew T. Frankel, of New York, NY, and Mary Beth  
Forshaw, of New York, NY, all for Appellant.

G. Murrell Smith, Jr., Jonathan M. Robinson, and Shanon N. Peake, all of Smith Robinson Holler DuBose Morgan, LLC, of Columbia, for Respondent.

---

**MCDONALD, J:** This appeal arises from an action brought by the dissolved Covil Corporation's appointed Receiver, Peter D. Protopapas, against one of Covil's insurers, United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company (USF&G). USF&G appeals the special circuit court's order clarifying the status of the Receivership and rejecting USF&G's argument that South Carolina's statute of repose available to dissolved corporations bars asbestos personal injury claims against Covil. We affirm the order of the special circuit court.

### **Facts and Procedural History**

Covil sold insulation products for many years, and some of these products contained asbestos. Covil's operations also included the installation and removal of insulation at industrial facilities throughout South Carolina. Thus, Covil has been named as a defendant in asbestos bodily injury suits since 1976. Plaintiffs in these lawsuits alleged that during specified periods, Covil made, manufactured, sold, distributed, installed, or removed insulation materials containing asbestos.

Covil ceased business operations in 1991, and the South Carolina Secretary of State revoked Covil's corporate charter in 1993. Throughout the course of Covil's operations, it had insurance coverage through various insurers, including USF&G, Zurich, Sentry, Hartford, and TIG.

In 1991, the Greenville County master-in-equity appointed a receiver for Covil (the Prior Receiver). By order filed May 12, 1992, the master judicially dissolved Covil and ordered the Prior Receiver to provide known claimants with notice of dissolution pursuant to section 33-14-106 of the South Carolina Code and to publish the notice required by section 33-14-107. The master also ordered the Prior Receiver to gather and dispose of Covil's assets.

On November 11, 1992, the Prior Receiver filed a petition to terminate his receivership. The petition described the actions taken by the Prior Receiver and included an accounting of the Prior Receiver's expenditures. This accounting does

not reference any expenses paid to publish a notice of dissolution or otherwise paid to a newspaper. In a November 12, 1992 order, the master discharged the Prior Receiver, finding he had "fully complied with the previous Orders of this Court in liquidating the assets of his Defendants, that his accounting is in order and that the relief sought by him should be approved."

In 2018, Covil defaulted in two mesothelioma cases, and in November 2018, the special circuit court appointed Receiver to represent Covil's interests. The Receiver later filed a motion to clarify the special circuit court's Appointment Order. The circuit court granted this motion, finding Receiver was vested with all rights of Covil, including the right to access files retained by two law firms Covil's insurers retained to represent their insured.

On April 24, 2019, the Receiver filed a bad faith action against USF&G, Zurich, and Sentry (Insurers) as well as a legal malpractice action against one of the law firms (Law Firm) that represented Covil. The Receiver alleged Insurers acted as Covil's alter ego in conducting Covil's post-dissolution affairs prior to Receiver's appointment, including making decisions as to the disposition of litigation against Covil and the treatment and characterization of claims against Covil's insurance policies. The Receiver further asserted Insurers and Law Firm acted in bad faith in choosing not to appear in the two 2018 cases in which Covil was held in default.

The Receiver subsequently sought an order of contempt to address Insurers' failures to comply with several special circuit court orders, including an order requiring Insurers to provide Receiver with requested insurance documentation. Following a hearing, the special circuit court issued a January 8, 2020 order describing the troubling issues that have arisen in Covil's asbestos litigation involving Insurers. This order noted Insurers had been "operating an otherwise defunct Covil for purposes of managing Covil's asbestos litigation" for over two decades and had failed to cooperate with the Receiver despite several court orders directing them to do so. The special circuit court explained that despite repeated instructions and discovery orders, Insurers failed to provide the Receiver with all relevant insurance policy limits and documentation necessary for the Receiver to participate in mediating Covil's asbestos litigation. This order further noted the Receiver had gone to great lengths in his effort to piece together the necessary coverage information. Notably, the special circuit court found the Receiver had submitted evidence demonstrating USF&G's prior claims practice involved the systematic destruction of historical insurance coverage documentation in the hope



that policyholders would be unable to produce the policy records necessary to establish coverage. The special circuit court found USF&G spoliated relevant evidence and noted it would "issue an appropriate sanction to deter such conduct in the future and attempt to re-level the now uneven evidentiary playing field."

On December 12, 2019, Sandra Hutto, personal representative of the Estate of Donald L. Hutto, and other family members filed an action against numerous defendants, including Covil and Insurers. Hutto's complaint included wrongful death and survival claims arising from Donald's exposure to asbestos-containing materials and raised additional claims related to Insurers' handling of Covil's asbestos litigation. These included Hutto's claims that Insurers acted as Covil's alter ego and with others to effectuate "their common purpose of exclusive, unilateral control by running Covil's affairs in all material respects." Hutto claimed Insurers controlled Covil for nearly thirty years and "made Covil's defense of asbestos litigation nearly, if not completely, impossible." She further asserted Insurers' conduct made them "fully responsible for all of Covil's liabilities prior to appointment of the Receiver."

On February 21, 2020, Covil, by and through Receiver, crossclaimed against USF&G and Zurich. Covil claimed USF&G and Zurich were fully responsible for all of Covil's liabilities prior to Receiver's appointment because they acted as Covil's alter ego in managing Covil's assets and in acting on Covil's behalf. Covil also brought a crossclaim against these insurers for their bad faith failure to defend Covil in the Hutto litigation. USF&G answered, raising as an affirmative defense the statute of repose available to dissolved corporations through sections 33-14-106 and 33-14-107 of the South Carolina Code. USF&G asserted that if it were found to be Covil's alter ego, it was entitled to assert all claims and defenses to which Covil would be entitled, including this statute of repose.

On April 10, 2020, the special circuit court granted joint motions to establish the Covil Qualified Settlement Fund (QSF) and to approve settlements between the Receiver and Sentry and two other insurers.<sup>1</sup> Following the approval of the settlement agreements and the establishment of the QSF, all claims against Hartford, Sentry, and TIG were assigned to the QSF.

---

<sup>1</sup> Hartford, Sentry, and TIG all agreed to buy back their policies in excess of the policy limits.

On July 20, 2020, the Receiver filed an amended complaint in the bad faith and legal malpractice action against Law Firm, USF&G, and Zurich. USF&G timely answered and raised several affirmative defenses. Among these was USF&G's affirmative defense that all claims against Covil or any entity alleged to be Covil's alter ego were barred by the statute of repose for claims against dissolved corporations. Zurich raised the same statute of repose defense.<sup>2</sup>

On July 21, 2020, the Receiver filed a motion to clarify the status of the Receivership. In this motion, the Receiver asked that the special circuit court "clarify the impact, if any, of these affirmative defenses and thus finally adjudicate this issue of South Carolina law."

In its September 25, 2020 order clarifying the status of the receivership, the special circuit court held "nothing from the prior Receivership precludes the current Receivership or personal injury asbestos claimants from filing lawsuits against Covil." The circuit court further found no evidence exists to support a finding that notice of Covil's dissolution was ever published as was required to trigger the statute of repose. The special circuit court specifically referenced the 1992 master's orders addressing the Prior Receivership, explaining the November 1992 order stated only that the Prior Receiver complied with previous orders to liquidate Covil's assets—the 1992 order made *no* finding as to whether the notice of dissolution was ever published. The circuit court determined that even if the notice of dissolution had been published, claims against Covil were not barred as a matter of law under the post-2004 section 33-14-107(c) because the amended version of the statute applied only to corporate dissolutions subsequent to its 2004 enactment. Yet, the circuit court further noted claims against Covil were not barred under the prior version of the statute either because the statute's reference to "unknown claims" referred to claims unknown to the corporation, not those unknown to the claimant. Finally, the circuit court found the Reporter's Comment for § 33-14-107 revealed the intent of the Legislature "to exclude nonexistent claims from the reach of both section 33-14-106 and -107 at the time of Covil's dissolution."

USF&G appealed and in July 2023, the Receiver moved to dismiss this appeal as moot, asserting all underlying cases alleging USF&G acted as Covil's alter ego had settled. USF&G opposed this motion, arguing certain claims remained and the question of whether Covil is subject to future asbestos claims is not moot. The Receiver timely filed a reply and on August 3, 2023, this court requested that

---

<sup>2</sup> The Receiver ultimately settled the claims against Law Firm and Zurich.

USF&G file a surreply responding to five specific questions relevant to the court's mootness inquiry. USF&G filed a surreply largely unresponsive to the court's questions, and the Receiver sought leave to respond. The court granted such leave and accepted the Receiver's response as filed. Although the court declined to dismiss the appeal, it instructed the parties to be prepared to address mootness, in addition to the issues raised in their briefs, at oral argument.

## **Standard of Review**

"Questions of statutory interpretation are questions of law, which we are free to decide without any deference to the court below." *Columbia/CSA-HS Greater Columbia Healthcare Sys., LP v. S.C. Med. Malpractice Liab. Joint Underwriting Ass'n*, 411 S.C. 557, 560, 769 S.E.2d 847, 848 (2015) (quoting *Grier v. AMISUB of S.C., Inc.*, 397 S.C. 532, 535, 725 S.E.2d 693, 695 (2012)). As to findings of fact, however, a circuit court's order "will only be disturbed on appeal if the findings are wholly unsupported by the evidence or controlled by an erroneous application of the law." *Gowdy v. Gibson*, 391 S.C. 374, 379, 706 S.E.2d 495, 497 (2011).

## **Analysis**

### **I. Standing**

USF&G argues the Receiver lacked standing to seek a ruling on section 33-14-107 that could increase Covil's liability by eliminating an affirmative defense to asbestos personal injury actions. We disagree with USF&G's characterization of the Receiver's filing and with its standing argument.

"A party has standing if the party has a personal stake in the subject matter of a lawsuit and is a 'real party in interest.'" *Stoney v. Stoney*, 425 S.C. 47, 64, 819 S.E.2d 201, 210 (Ct. App. 2018) (quoting *Ex Parte Gov't Emps. Ins. Co.*, 373 S.C. 132, 138, 644 S.E.2d 699, 702 (2007)); see also *Sea Pines Ass'n for the Prot. of Wildlife, Inc. v. S.C. Dep't of Nat. Res.*, 345 S.C. 594, 600, 550 S.E.2d 287, 291 (2001) (To have standing, "one must be a real party in interest. 'A real party in interest is one who has a real, material, or substantial interest in the subject matter of the action, as opposed to one who has only a nominal or technical interest in the action.'" (quoting *Charleston Cnty. Sch. Dist. v. Charleston Cnty. Election Comm'n*, 336 S.C. 174, 181, 519 S.E.2d 567, 571 (1999))).

In *Sea Pines*, our supreme court explained:

In *Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555 (1992), the United States Supreme Court enunciated a stringent standing test. *Lujan* set forth the "irreducible constitutional minimum of standing," which consists of the following three elements:

First, the plaintiff must have suffered an 'injury in fact'—an invasion of a legally protected interest which is (a) concrete and particularized and (b) actual or imminent, not 'conjectural' or 'hypothetical'. Second, there must be a causal connection between the injury and the conduct complained of—the injury has to be "fairly . . . trace[able] to the challenged action of the defendant, and not . . . th[e] result [of] the independent action of some third party not before the court." Third, it must be 'likely,' as opposed to merely 'speculative,' that the injury will be 'redressed by a favorable decision.'

*Sea Pines Ass'n for Prot. of Wildlife, Inc.*, 345 S.C. at 601, 550 S.E.2d at 291 (quoting *Lujan* at 559–61) (alterations in original).

Here, the special circuit court appointed Receiver "with the power and authority to fully administer all assets of Covil [including] the right and obligation to administer any insurance assets of Covil Corporation as well as any claims related to the actions or failure to act of Covil's insurance carriers." Thus, the Receiver clearly has an interest in determining whether Covil is subject to future claims as it seeks to fulfill the requirements of the Appointment Order. Moreover, it appears Covil has suffered injury through the conduct of USF&G in the Hutto (and perhaps other) asbestos litigation. The Receiver's need for clarification in considering Covil's potential future liability and proper available defenses relates concretely to the management of Covil's assets and is particularly pertinent to any claims handling or bad faith claims that may remain against USF&G.<sup>3</sup> The record reveals

---

<sup>3</sup> The parties disagree as to whether any such claims remain.

years of concerning conduct on the part of USF&G and others as they prepared for the onslaught of asbestos litigation to come. We accordingly find the Receiver had standing to seek—and properly sought—clarification of the special circuit court's Appointment Order.<sup>4</sup>

## II. Mootness

"An appellate court will not pass on moot and academic questions or make an adjudication where there remains no actual controversy." *Croft as Tr. of James A. Croft Tr. v. Town of Summerville*, 433 S.C. 473, 480, 860 S.E.2d 352, 356 (2021) (quoting *Curtis v. State*, 345 S.C. 557, 567, 549 S.E.2d 591, 596 (2001)). "A moot case exists where a judgment rendered by the court will have no practical legal effect upon an existing controversy because an intervening event renders any grant of effectual relief impossible for the reviewing court." *Sloan v. Friends of the Hunley, Inc.*, 369 S.C. 20, 26, 630 S.E.2d 474, 477 (2006).

In the civil context, there are three general exceptions to the mootness doctrine. First, an appellate court can take jurisdiction, despite mootness, if the issue raised is capable of repetition but evading review. Second, an appellate court may decide questions of imperative and manifest urgency to establish a rule for future conduct in matters of important public interest. Finally, if a decision by the trial court may affect future events, or have collateral consequences for the parties, an appeal from

---

<sup>4</sup> USF&G argued to the special circuit court that the Prior Receivership barred both the institution of the current Receivership and all subsequent litigation by or against Covil. To the extent USF&G seeks to pursue such an argument beyond the context of the statute of repose arguments discussed *infra* in Section III, we find such argument meritless. Abundant evidence in this record establishes USF&G's problematic claims handling and litigation practices related to Covil. This behavior, including but not limited to the policy of systematic document destruction, alone necessitated the appointment of the current Receiver. The deliberate decisions to default in the two 2018 cases further reflect the need for the special circuit court's appointment and clarification orders.

that decision is not moot, even though the appellate court cannot give effective relief in the present case.

*Wachesaw Plantation E. Cmty. Servs. Ass'n, Inc. v. Alexander*, 414 S.C. 355, 359, 778 S.E.2d 898, 900 (2015) (internal citations omitted) (quoting *Curtis*, 345 S.C. at 568, 549 S.E.2d at 596)).

The Receiver argues this appeal is moot because all matters in which USF&G has raised the statute of repose as an affirmative defense have been resolved. Such matters include Covil's action against Law Firm, its alter ego claims against USF&G, and the underlying claims in the cases in which USF&G chose to default. But, even if the prior settlements rendered the current case moot (which USF&G strongly disputes), an exception to the mootness doctrine applies here. *See Wachesaw Plantation E. Cmty. Servs. Ass'n, Inc.*, 414 S.C. at 359, 778 S.E.2d at 900 ("[If the] decision by the trial court may affect future events, or have collateral consequences for the parties, an appeal from that decision is not moot, even though the appellate court cannot give effective relief in the present case." (quoting *Curtis*, 345 S.C. at 568, 549 S.E.2d at 596)).

Under the Appointment Order, the Receiver has authority and control over Covil's assets, including available insurance coverage. Therefore, it is imperative that the Receiver understand Covil's potential remaining liabilities in order to properly manage Covil's assets and any further claims against Covil that may arise. Whether Covil will be subjected to future claims involving USF&G policy coverage remains unclear, but our decision here would likely affect such claims or have collateral consequences for the parties should USF&G or another insurer attempt to raise this affirmative defense in future litigation. Because an appellate ruling addressing the statute of repose may have consequences beyond the current case, we decline to dismiss this appeal as moot.

### **III. Statute of Repose**

In addition to its arguments challenging Receiver's standing and the procedural posture of the motion to clarify, USF&G asserts "the statute of repose bars claims against Covil regardless of whether the 2004 or 1992 version of the statute applies." We disagree.

USF&G argues the special circuit court erred in finding the pre-2004 version of section 33-14-107—effective at the time of Covil's 1992 dissolution—was the applicable version of the statute. Still, USF&G further asserts claims against Covil are barred under either version of the statute because the master's November 1992 order is dispositive as to the question of whether the Prior Receiver published the notice of Covil's dissolution necessary to trigger the statute of repose.

At the time of Covil's dissolution, section 33-14-107 provided, in pertinent part:

- (a) A dissolved corporation may publish notice of its dissolution and request that persons with claims against the corporation present them in accordance with the notice.
- (b) The notice must:
  - (1) be published once in a newspaper of general circulation in the county where the dissolved corporation's principal office (or, if none in this State, its registered office) is or was last located;
  - (2) describe the information that must be included in a claim and provide a mailing address where the claim may be sent; and
  - (3) state that a claim against the corporation is barred unless a proceeding to enforce the claim is commenced within five years after the publication of the notice.
- (c) If the dissolved corporation publishes a newspaper notice in accordance with subsection (b), the claim of each of the following claimants is barred unless the claimant commences a proceeding to enforce the claim against the dissolved corporation within five years after the publication date of the newspaper notice:

(1) a claimant who did not receive written notice under Section 33-14-106;

(2) a claimant whose claim was timely sent to the dissolved corporation but not acted on.

S.C. Code Ann. § 33-14-107 (a)-(c) (1988).

Subsection (c) of 33-14-107 was amended in 2004, and now reads as follows:

(c) If the dissolved corporation publishes a newspaper notice in accordance with subsection (b), the claim of each of the following claimants is barred unless the claimant commences a proceeding to enforce the claim against the dissolved corporation within ten years after the publication date of the newspaper notice:

(1) a claimant who did not receive written notice pursuant to Section 33-14-106;

(2) a claimant whose claim was timely sent to the dissolved corporation but not acted on; and

(3) a claimant whose claim is contingent or based on an event occurring after the effective date of the dissolution.

S.C. Code Ann. § 33-14-107(c) (2006). The 2004 amendment added subsection (c)(3)'s bar for claimants whose claims are "contingent or based on an event occurring after the effective date of the dissolution." *Id.* This amendment also extended the repose period for claims against a dissolved corporation from five to ten years "after the publication date of the newspaper notice." *Id.*

"It is well-established that '[t]he cardinal rule of statutory construction is to ascertain and effectuate the intent of the legislature.'" *Grier*, 397 S.C. at 535, 725 S.E.2d at 695 (quoting *Hodges v. Rainey*, 341 S.C. 79, 85, 533 S.E.2d 578, 581 (2000)). "What the General Assembly says in the text of the statute is the best evidence of its intent, and this Court is bound to give effect to the legislature's



expressed intent." *Aiken v. S.C. Dep't of Revenue*, 429 S.C. 414, 419, 839 S.E.2d 96, 99 (2020). "Where the statute's language is plain and unambiguous, and conveys a clear and definite meaning, the rules of statutory interpretation are not needed and the court has no right to impose another meaning." *Lambries v. Saluda Cnty. Council*, 409 S.C. 1, 10–11, 760 S.E.2d 785, 790 (2014) (quoting *Media Gen. Commc'ns, Inc. v. S.C. Dep't of Revenue*, 388 S.C. 138, 148, 694 S.E.2d 525, 530 (2010)).

Based on the plain language of either version of section 33-14-107, a statutorily compliant notice of publication was necessary to trigger application of the statute of repose available to a dissolved corporation. But the record here is devoid of evidence that Covil or the Prior Receiver *ever* published the necessary notice of dissolution. USF&G references the master's 1992 order finding the Prior Receiver complied with the court's prior orders, but the order merely states the Prior Receiver "fully complied with the previous Orders of this Court in liquidating the assets of his Defendants." The master made *no finding* as to whether a notice of dissolution was published—the order simply does not address publication. Further, when the Prior Receiver filed the petition seeking to dissolve that receivership, he attached a document detailing his expenses; this accounting makes no mention of funds paid to publish a notice of dissolution nor does it reference payment to a newspaper. More notably, a 2001 claim file activity memorandum from a different Covil insurer notes "Covil no longer around . . . dissolution was filed[,] however no evidence that formal notice was filed [illegible] published . . . will investigate; push the law firm that handled the dissolution to file notice.

In sum, evidence in the record supports the special circuit court's finding that publication of the dissolution notice necessary to trigger the statute of repose did not occur during the Prior Receivership. Moreover, there is no evidence in the record to support an argument that Covil published a notice of dissolution following the 2004 statutory amendment.<sup>5</sup> Accordingly, we affirm the order of the

---

<sup>5</sup> In a case involving Covil and Zurich, a North Carolina District Court similarly addressed the lack of published notice of Covil's dissolution. *See Finch v. Covil Corp.*, No. 1:16-CV-1077-CCE-JEP, Memorandum Opinion Order at 9 (M.D.N.C. Oct. 14, 2020) ("The Court finds that the receiver did not publish the notice in compliance with § 33-14-107(b)" and "[t]here is no evidence that Covil published a notice of dissolution after the 2004 provision was enacted, and the Court finds that it did not.").

special circuit court, including the findings that "no version of section 33-14-107 precludes an asbestos personal injury plaintiff from bringing claims against Covil" and "nothing from the prior Receivership precludes the current Receivership or personal injury asbestos claimants from filing lawsuits against Covil."<sup>6</sup>

### **Conclusion**

Based on the foregoing, the order of the special circuit court is

**AFFIRMED.**

**VINSON, J., and BROMELL HOLMES, A.J., concur.**

---

<sup>6</sup> Because USF&G cannot satisfy the necessary predicate of publication, we need not address which version of § 33-14-107(c) might apply had such publication occurred or further consider the operation of the statute. *See Futch v. McAllister Towing of Georgetown, Inc.*, 335 S.C. 598, 613, 518 S.E.2d 591, 598 (1999) (noting a reviewing court need not address remaining issues when disposition of a prior issue is dispositive). And, we reject USF&G's argument that a "presumption of regularity" establishing the Prior Receiver faithfully discharged all responsibilities applies to the question of publication. The crux of USF&G's position as to this claimed presumption appears to be that it would be problematic to allow the Receiver to rely on the absence of evidence of publication to conclude "that such absence implies noncompliance." In light of the evidence of non-publication previously referenced, we disagree with USF&G's contention that the special circuit court used "a negative inference to overcome a well-established presumption." *See also Pike v. S.C. Dep't of Transp.*, 343 S.C. 224, 231, 540 S.E.2d 87, 91 (2000) (acknowledging "the well-established rule that the party pleading an affirmative defense 'has the burden of proving it'" (quoting *Hoffman v. Greenville County*, 242 S.C. 34, 39, 129 S.E.2d 757, 760 (1963))). We further disagree that the special circuit court's findings serve to collaterally attack the master's November 1992 order. Like the circuit court, we do not read the 1992 order to include the finding USF&G so strenuously urges us to presume.