

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF RICHLAND

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
FOR THE FIFTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

LENORA CHILDERS, Individually and as
Personal Representative of the Estate of
LEWIS C. CHILDERS,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 2021-CP-40-03484

v.

Davis Mechanical Contractors, Inc., et al.,

Defendants.

**ORDER DENYING THIRD-PARTY
DEFENDANT TRAVELERS CASUALTY
AND SURETY COMPANY’S MOTION
TO DISMISS THIRD-PARTY CLAIMS
AND DISSOLVE THE PAYNE &
KELLER RECEIVERSHIP**

Flame Refractories, Inc.; United Construction
Co. of Rome, Inc.; Wind Up, Ltd.,
Individually and as Successor-in-Interest to
Pipe & Boiler Insulation, Inc. f/k/a Carolina
Industrial Insulating Co.; and Payne & Keller
Company, By and Through Their Duly
Appointed Receiver, Peter D. Protopapas,

Third-Party Plaintiffs,

v.

Zurich American Insurance Company, et al.,

Third-Party Defendants.

RECEIVED
Apr 28 2023
SC Court of Appeals

This matter comes before the Court on Third-Party Defendant Travelers Casualty and Surety Company’s (“Travelers”) August 24, 2022 Motion to Dismiss Third-Party Claims and Dissolve the Payne & Keller Receivership.¹ Payne & Keller Company, by and through its duly

¹ On September 19, 2022, Defendants AIG Property Casualty Company, formerly known as Birmingham Fire Insurance Company; Lexington Insurance Company; National Union Fire Insurance Company of Pittsburgh, PA; Berkshire Hathaway Specialty Insurance Company, formerly known as Stonewall Insurance Company; The Continental Insurance Company, individually and as successor in interest to Harbor Insurance Company; and Certain as yet

appointed receiver, Peter D. Protopapas (“the Receiver”), filed a Response in Opposition to the Motion on January 13, 2023, and Travelers filed a Reply in Support of the Motion on January 25, 2023.² The Court heard oral arguments on the Motion during a January 27, 2023 hearing. After careful consideration of the parties’ filings and arguments, and for the reasons stated below, Travelers’ Motion is **DENIED**.

BACKGROUND

On August 27, 2021, this Court entered an Order appointing Peter D. Protopapas as the Receiver for Defendant Payne & Keller Company on Plaintiff’s Motion to Appoint a Receiver. The Court’s Order vested the Receiver “with the power and authority [to] fully administer all assets of Payne & Keller” and, among other things, specifically instructed “the Receiver to investigate the existence of all insurance coverages potentially available to [Payne & Keller].” Thereafter, the Receiver discovered that Payne & Keller Company had conducted business under various corporate names before its dissolution. The Court accordingly granted the Receiver’s Motion to Clarify Order Appointing a Receiver for Payne & Keller Company on September 30, 2021, and entered an Order providing that “all of the Receiver’s duties and protections [in the August 7, 2021 Appointment Order] . . . extend[] to all of the P&K Entities and their predecessors, successors, affiliates, parents, assigns, and subsidiaries that may be discovered in the future.”

Pursuant to that authority, the Receiver initiated an insurance coverage action for Payne & Keller by way of a third-party action against multiple carriers in this case on February 23, 2022. Travelers appeared and filed a motion to dismiss the Receiver’s third-party claims and dissolve the Payne & Keller Receivership on August 24, 2022. After the Receiver served discovery requests

Unnamed Underwriters at Lloyd’s, London and Certain as yet Unnamed London Market Companies (the “Joining Defendants”) filed a Joinder to Travelers’ Motion.

² On January 26, 2023, the Joining Defendants filed a Joinder to Travelers’ Reply.

on Travelers, on November 16, 2022, Travelers moved for a protective order and again moved the Court for an order dissolving the Payne & Keller Receivership and dismissing Travelers from this case.

ANALYSIS

A. Standing

Travelers argues that the Receiver's third-party claims should be dismissed because the Receiver lacks standing to bring them. Specifically, Travelers first contends that under section 15-65-10 of the South Carolina Code, the Receiver only has authority over Payne & Keller property located within the State of South Carolina, and (according to Travelers) Payne & Keller's insurance policies are not property within this State. *See generally* § 15-65-10 ("A receiver may be appointed by a judge of the circuit court, either in or out of court . . . (4) When a corporation has been dissolved, is insolvent or in imminent danger of insolvency or has forfeited its corporate rights, and, in like cases, of the property within this State of foreign corporations . . ."). Even assuming Travelers' interpretation of section 15-65-10 is correct, the Court finds the Receiver has alleged and presented sufficient evidence to demonstrate that Travelers issued insurance policies insuring Payne & Keller risks nationwide, including within South Carolina. Accordingly, the Receiver was properly appointed under section 15-65-10 and has standing to assert the third-party claims raised in this action. *See* S.C. Code Ann. § 38-61-10 ("All contracts of insurance on property, lives, or interests in this State are considered to be made in the State . . . and are subject to the laws of this State."); *Sangamo Weston v. Nat'l Sur. Corp.*, 307 S.C. 143, 149, 414 S.E.2d 127, 130 (1992) ("[I]t is immaterial where the contract was entered into. Further there is no requirement that the policyholders or insurers be citizens of South Carolina. What is solely relevant is where the property, lives, or interests insured are located.").

Travelers cites *Howard v. Allen*, 254 S.C. 455, 176 S.E.2d 127 (1970) for the proposition that insurance policies are not “property.” This case does not support Travelers argument. In *Howard v. Allen*, a personal injury plaintiff sought to attach, as a debt, the defense and indemnity obligations of an insurance policy covering the defendant tortfeasor. *Howard* does not speak to whether the Travelers insurance policies protective of Payne & Keller are property within South Carolina for the purposes of the receivership statute.

Travelers also argues that the Receiver lacks standing to bring the third-party claims on behalf of Payne & Keller because, as a Texas corporation that dissolved in 1986, Payne & Keller is no longer able to sue or be sued under Texas law. Travelers relies on Section 11.359(a) of the Texas Business Organizations Code, which provides that a “claim by or against a terminated filing entity is extinguished unless an action or proceeding is brought on the claim not later than the third anniversary of the date of termination of the entity.” However, that statute further provides, “Notwithstanding Subsections (a) and (b), the extinguishment of an existing claim with respect to a terminated filing entity as provided by this section is nullified if . . . the filing entity’s termination is revoked with retroactive effect under Section 11.153 . . .” § 11.359(c). And section 11.153 of the Texas Business Organizations Code allows a court to “order the revocation of termination of an entity’s existence that was terminated as a result of actual or constructive fraud.” § 11.153(a); *see also* § 11.153(b) (“If the termination of an entity’s existence is revoked under Subsection (a): (1) the revocation relates back to the effective date of the termination and takes effect as of that date; and (2) the entity’s status as an entity continues in effect as if the termination of the entity’s existence had never occurred.”).

Here, the Receiver has presented sufficient evidence at the pleading stage to support a claim that Payne and Keller’s 1986 dissolution was the result of, at least, constructive fraud. *See Resp.*

in Opp'n, 8–13. Specifically, the Receiver asserts that Payne & Keller “terminated its corporate existence to avoid liability for both current and future toxic tort, silica, and asbestos personal liability claims, and Payne & Keller was keenly aware of those claims when the decision to dissolve Payne & Keller was made.” *Id.* at 9. In support of this contention, the Receiver submitted evidence that, prior to its dissolution: Payne & Keller was exposed to significant potential liability resulting from its construction work at a time when the use of asbestos-containing products was prevalent, its insurers began to exclude coverage for asbestos-related claims, and it contracted to indemnify companies with which it did business for personal injury claims arising out of its work. *Id.* at 9–10. Further evidence indicates that Payne & Keller began the dissolution process in response to demands for indemnification by an oil company in bankruptcy concerning over a thousand personal injury claims arising out of exposure to dioxin, and Payne and Keller dissolved without taking the steps necessary to ensure those claims, and others it reasonably expected to face absent dissolution, would be paid. *Id.* at 11–12.

Travelers has not disputed the Receiver’s evidence or submitted any countervailing evidence regarding the circumstances surrounding its dissolution. Accordingly, this Court finds the Receiver has made a prima facie showing that Payne & Keller “was terminated as a result of actual or constructive fraud,” § 11.153(a), and dismissal on the basis of the termination is unwarranted. *See Latham v. Burgher*, 320 S.W.3d 602, 610 (Tex. App. 2010) (ruling a company’s dissolution, conducted shortly after receiving notice of an intended lawsuit against it and without setting aside funds to address the liability of the lawsuit, could support a finding of fraud). This Court does not, however, find that fraud has been conclusively proven, nor does the Court order the revocation of Payne & Keller’s termination at this time. Such a determination will be made after the parties have had the opportunity to explore this issue through the discovery process.

Relying on *Robinson v. Crown Cork & Seal Co.*, 335 S.W.3d 126 (Tex. 2010), Travelers argues that applying section 11.153 to Payne & Keller’s dissolution would violate Article I, Section 16 of the Texas Constitution. However, as the *Robinson* court explained, “No bright-line test for unconstitutional retroactivity is possible.” *Id.* at 145. Instead, the court outlined a three-factor analysis that must be conducted. *Id.* Moreover, Travelers’ retroactivity argument as to section 11.153 undercuts its reliance on section 11.359, which was also enacted well after Payne & Keller’s dissolution.³ The Court declines Travelers’ invitation to retroactively apply section 11.359 in Travelers’ favor to dismiss the Receiver’s third-party claims while simultaneously holding the retroactive application of section 11.153 would violate the Texas Constitution, especially given that the Texas legislature added subsection (b) to section 11.153 in response to the Fifth Circuit’s determination that revoking an entity’s dissolution would not revive claims extinguished by section 11.359. *See Boudreaux v. C J R Framing*, 744 F. App’x 208, 211 (5th Cir. 2018).

B. Personal Jurisdiction

Travelers argues that the Receiver’s claims should also be dismissed under Rule 12(b)(2), SCRCF, because this Court lacks personal jurisdiction over Travelers in this case. The Court disagrees and finds the Receiver has made a prima facie showing that personal jurisdiction over Travelers exists. *See Brown v. Inv. Mgmt. & Research*, 323 S.C. 395, 399, 475 S.E.2d 754, 756 (1996) (stating when a defendant seeks dismissal for lack of personal jurisdiction under Rule 12(b)(2), “the plaintiff has the burden of showing jurisdiction is properly asserted; however, the law is well-settled that at the pre-trial stage only a prima facie showing is required”). In addition

³ The Court further notes that a predecessor to the Texas Business Organizations Code—the Texas Business Corporation Act—contained a fraudulent termination provision similar to section 11.153.

to relevant allegations in the Second Amended Complaint, the Receiver has also presented evidence that Travelers contracted with Payne & Keller to insure risks in all states, including South Carolina, and that Payne & Keller was registered to do business in South Carolina and had performed work in South Carolina when Travelers issued its policies. *See* Resp. in Opp'n, at 15–17 & Ex. M–O. Travelers' conduct in issuing such policies to Payne & Keller supports a finding of personal jurisdiction and precludes dismissal on this basis. *See* S.C. Code Ann. § 36-2-803(A) (“A court may exercise personal jurisdiction over a person who acts directly or by an agent as to a cause of action arising from the person’s . . . contracting to insure any person, property, or risk located within this State at the time of contracting”); *McGee v. Int’l Life Ins. Co.*, 355 U.S. 220, 223 (1957) (“It is sufficient for purposes of due process that the suit was based on a contract which had substantial connection with that State.”); *Ross v. Am. Income Life Ins. Co.*, 232 S.C. 433, 438-39, 102 S.E.2d 743, 745 (1958) (holding a single insurance policy mailed to an individual in this state was a sufficient contact to warrant the exercise of jurisdiction without violating Due Process).

C. Rule 14

Rule 14(a), SCRCP, allows a defendant to bring third-party claims against “a person not a party to the action who is or may be liable to him for all or part of the plaintiff’s claim against him.” Here, the Receiver has asserted claims against Travelers, which he alleges issued insurance policies to Payne & Keller that may provide coverage for, and therefore trigger indemnity obligations in relation to, the claims brought by the plaintiff in this action. Accordingly, the third-party claims are appropriate under Rule 14 and Travelers’ arguments for dismissal on this basis are rejected.

D. Rule 12(b)(8)

Finally, Travelers argues that the Receiver's third-party claims should be dismissed under Rule 12(b)(8), SCRCP, because they are duplicative of claims brought against it in *Protopapas as Receiver for Payne & Keller Co. v. Am. Int'l Grp. et al.*, No. 3:21-cv-04086-JMC (D.S.C.). However, as the courts of this state have long observed, "The general rule is that an action may be pleaded in abatement of a second suit only when between the same parties and *in the same jurisdiction* and with the same object." *Poston v. Home Ins. Co. of N.Y.*, 191 S.C. 314, 317–18, 4 S.E.2d 261, 262 (1939) (emphasis added). Because no separate action is pending between the Receiver and Travelers for the same claims in South Carolina state court, Rule 12(b)(8) does not provide a basis for dismissing the Receiver's third-party claims here. *See Hill v. Hill*, 51 S.C. 134, 137, 28 S.E. 309, 310 (1897) ("[I]t is a well established doctrine that the pendency of another suit in a foreign jurisdiction cannot be pleaded in the domestic forum."); *see, e.g., Hauge v. Curran*, No. 2011-UP-264, 2011 S.C. App. Unpub. LEXIS 300, at *4 (Ct. App. June 7, 2011) (reversing the trial court's dismissal under Rule 12(b)(8) because the two similar actions were in different jurisdictions).

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, as well as the arguments presented by the Receiver in his filings and at the January 27 hearing, **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED THAT** Travelers' Motion to Dismiss Third-Party Claims and Dissolve the Payne & Keller Receivership is hereby **DENIED**.⁴ Travelers' November 16, 2022 Motion for Protective Order and to Dissolve Receivership, which relies solely on the standing arguments rejected above, is also **DENIED**.

⁴ The Joining Defendants' motion is also denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

[JUDGE'S E-SIGNATURE PAGE FOLLOWS]



Richland Common Pleas

Case Caption: Lenora Childers , plaintiff, et al vs Davis Mechanical Contractors ,
defendant, et al
Case Number: 2021CP4003484
Type: Order/Other

So Ordered

Jean H. Toal