



The Supreme Court of South Carolina

DANIEL E. SHEAROUSE
CLERK OF COURT

BRENDA F. SHEALY
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

POST OFFICE BOX 11330
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA
29211

1231 GERVAIS STREET
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29201

TELEPHONE: (803) 734-1080

FAX: (803) 734-1499

www.sccourts.org

January 31, 2014

The Honorable M. Hope Blackley
Clerk of Court
PO Box 3483
Spartanburg SC 29304-3483

REMITTITUR

Re: White Oak Manor v. Lexington Ins. Co.
Lower Court Case No. 2005CP4201239
Appellate Case No. 2011-201666

Dear Clerk of Court:

The above referenced matter is hereby remitted to the lower court or tribunal. A copy of the judgment of this Court along with the earlier decision of the South Carolina Court of Appeals is enclosed.

Very truly yours,

CLERK

cc: Amy Lynn Neuschafer, Esquire
Peter H. Dworjanyn, Esquire
Christian Stegmaier, Esquire
Matthew A. Henderson, Esquire
Joshua Matthew Henderson, Esquire

**THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Supreme Court**

White Oak Manor, Inc. and White Oak Manor - York,
Inc., Petitioners,

v.

Lexington Insurance Company, Caronia Corporation, and
Certain Underwriters at Lloyd's London, subscribing to
Certificate No. UP02US382030, Defendants,

of whom Lexington Insurance Company is the
Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2011-201666

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE COURT OF APPEALS

Appeal from Spartanburg County
J. Derham Cole, Circuit Court Judge
Roger L. Couch, Circuit Court Judge

Opinion No. 27351
Heard September 17, 2013 – Filed January 15, 2014

REVERSED

Matthew A. Henderson and Joshua M. Henderson, both
of Henderson, Brandt & Vieth, PA, of Spartanburg, for
Petitioners.

Peter H. Dworjanyn and Christian Stegmaier, both of Columbia, Amy Lynn Neuschafer, of Murrells Inlet, all of Collins & Lacy, PC, for Respondent.

JUSTICE HEARN: This case requires us to determine the validity of a service-of-suit clause in an insurance policy in light of Section 15-9-270 of the South Carolina Code (2005) which provides for service of process on an insurer through the Director of the Department of Insurance. The circuit court upheld the service-of-suit clause and refused to relieve the insurer from default judgment. The court of appeals reversed, holding section 15-9-270 provides the exclusive method for serving an insurance company. *White Oak Manor, Inc. v. Lexington Ins. Co.*, 394 S.C. 375, 382, 715 S.E.2d 383, 387 (Ct. App. 2011). We disagree that section 15-9-270 provides the exclusive means of service on an insurer and hold that insurance policy provisions creating alternative methods of service are valid and binding on insurers. Accordingly, we reverse the court of appeals.

FACTUAL/PROCEDURAL HISTORY

White Oak Manor, Inc. owns and operates a nursing home in York, South Carolina. After sustaining injuries from the improper replacement of a feeding tube, a White Oak resident filed a lawsuit against the nursing home. White Oak ultimately settled the lawsuit without the involvement of its insurer, Lexington Insurance Company.

White Oak subsequently filed this declaratory judgment action against Lexington to determine coverage for the malpractice claim. The policies between White Oak and Lexington contained a service-of-suit clause which provided:

It is further agreed that service of process in such suit may be made upon Counsel, Legal Department, Lexington Insurance Company, 200 State Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02109 or his or her representative, and that in any suit instituted against us upon this Policy, we will abide by the final decision of such court or of any appellate court in the event of any appeal.

In compliance with the policy provision, White Oak served Lexington by mailing the summons and complaint by certified mail, return receipt requested, to "Lexington Insurance Company, 200 State Street, Boston, MA 02109, ATTN: LEGAL DEPARTMENT." According to the return receipt, service was accepted

May 20, 2005, and signed for by a Thomas W. Dinam. After Lexington failed to respond within thirty days, a default judgment was entered against Lexington on July 15, 2005. Approximately two months later, White Oak amended its complaint, alleging Lexington was in default and moving for damages. It again served the amended summons and complaint on Lexington by mail.

Thereafter, Lexington filed an answer and counterclaim as well as a motion to set aside the entry of default, alleging insufficient service of process. At the hearing, Lexington offered three alternative arguments in support of its motion. Initially, Lexington argued service on an insurance company could only be effectuated pursuant to section 15-9-270, which requires service of process be through the Director of the Department of Insurance, and any contrary contractual provisions were invalid. Additionally, Lexington argued that even if White Oak legally served it pursuant to the contract, service was nevertheless ineffective because White Oak did not substantially comply with the contractual provisions. In particular, Lexington noted that although it had documentation that it received the summons and complaint, it had no record of an employee named Thomas W. Dinam, and he was neither counsel nor counsel's "representative." Furthermore, Lexington argued good cause existed to set aside the default.

The circuit court denied the motion, holding Lexington and White Oak agreed contractually to another means of service and therefore, service through the Director was not required. It further held White Oak substantially complied with the service-of-suit clause in the policy and noted Lexington in fact received the original summons and complaint, but lost them. The court also found Lexington failed to demonstrate good cause for setting aside the default, citing caselaw providing that losing a complaint is not a basis to set aside default. Thereafter, the circuit court considered White Oak's motion for damages and entered a judgment against Lexington for \$153,266.

The court of appeals reversed, holding the "service of suit clause did not absolve White Oak of the responsibility to comply with the requirement in section 15-9-270 that it deliver two copies of its summons and complaint to the Director of the Department of Insurance in order to serve process on Lexington." *White Oak*, 394 S.C. at 382, 715 S.E.2d at 387. Specifically, it noted that service on the Director was "a right granted to the Department to enable it to fulfill the responsibilities with which it has been charged" and Lexington's policy could not waive the Department's right. *Id.* at 382, 715 S.E.2d at 386.

ISSUES PRESENTED

- I. Did the court of appeals err in holding service on an insurance company can only be accomplished by compliance with section 15-9-270?
- II. Did the circuit court err in failing to set aside the entry of default?

LAW/ANALYSIS

I. SOUTH CAROLINA CODE SECTION 15-9-270

White Oak argues the court of appeals erred in holding service pursuant to section 15-9-270 was the only legally sufficient manner of service on an insurance company. We agree.

The cardinal rule of statutory construction is to ascertain and effectuate the intent of the legislature, and the text of a statute is considered the best evidence of legislative intent. *Hodges v. Rainey*, 341 S.C. 79, 85, 533 S.E.2d 578, 581 (2000). Statutory language "must be construed in context and in light of the intended purpose of the statute in a manner which harmonizes with its subject matter and accords with its general purpose." *Cabiness v. Town of James Island*, 393 S.C. 176, 192, 712 S.E.2d 416, 425 (2011) (internal quotations omitted). Where a statute's language is plain and unambiguous, the Court has no right to impose another meaning. *Hodges*, 341 S.C. at 85, 533 S.E.2d at 581. Nevertheless, "[h]owever plain the ordinary meaning of the words used in a statute may be, the courts will reject that meaning when to accept it would lead to a result so plainly absurd that it could not possibly have been intended by the Legislature or would defeat the plain legislative intention." *Kiriakides v. United Artists Commc'ns, Inc.*, 312 S.C. 271, 275, 440 S.E.2d 364, 366 (1994).

Section 15-9-270 states:

The summons and any other legal process in any action or proceeding against it must be served on an insurance company . . . by delivering two copies of the summons or any other legal process to the Director of the Department of Insurance A company shall appoint the director as its attorney pursuant to the provisions of Section 38-5-70. This service is considered sufficient service upon the company. When legal process against any company with the fee provided in this section is served upon the director, he shall immediately forward by

registered or certified mail one of the duplicate copies prepaid directed toward the company at its home office

Additionally, Section 38-5-70 of the South Carolina Code (2002) provides: "Every insurer shall, before being licensed, appoint in writing the director and his successors in office to be its true and lawful attorney upon whom all legal process in any action or proceeding against it must be served"

The court of appeals found the above quoted language mandated that any process served on an insurance company must be made through the Director. Specifically, the court found section 15-9-270 provides the Director with the right to receive copies of any pleadings served on an insurance company and Lexington could not waive a right it did not possess. In so concluding, the court noted the Director was responsible to

(1) "see that all laws of this State governing insurers or relating to the business of insurance are faithfully executed[.]" (2) "report to the Attorney General or other appropriate law enforcement officials criminal violations of the laws relative to the business of insurance or the provisions of this title which he considers necessary to report[.]" and (3) institute civil actions when appropriate.

White Oak, 394 S.C. at 381, 715 S.E.2d at 386 (quoting S.C. Code Ann. § 38-3-110 (2002) (alterations in original)). Accordingly, the court reasoned "the Director needs to be informed when an insurer's misconduct is alleged to be sufficiently serious to warrant litigation" and requiring service on "the Director as a prerequisite to acquiring jurisdiction over the insurer is a reasonable and efficient way to achieve this objective." *Id.* at 381–82, 715 S.E.2d at 386.

White Oak argues the court of appeals' holding ignores the settled principle that parties are free to agree to alternative methods of service, just as they may waive service altogether. Furthermore, White Oak contends the conclusion that the Director has a right to receive copies of the pleadings is not supported by any evidence or legislative history. We agree on both points.

"The purpose of the summons is to acquire jurisdiction of the person of the defendant and to give him notice of the action and an opportunity to appear and defend." *State v. Sanders*, 118 S.C. 498, 502–03, 110 S.E. 808, 810 (1920). Consistent with this purpose, parties are generally permitted to agree to particular methods of service or waiving service altogether. *See Fin. Fed. Credit Inc. v.*

Brown, 384 S.C. 555, 565, 683 S.E.2d 486, 491 (2009) ("[W]here service is accomplished in a manner consented to by the defendant, service of process is valid and a court has jurisdiction over the defendant for purposes of entering judgment."); *Myrtle Beach Lumber Co. v. Globe Int'l Corp.*, 281 S.C. 290, 292, 315 S.E.2d 142, 143 (Ct. App. 1984) ("[A] defendant may waive personal service by consent or by designating an agent to receive service of process."). Furthermore, allowing for the waiver of service is consistent with the principle that a defendant can waive personal jurisdiction. See *Bakala v. Bakala*, 352 S.C. 612, 629, 576 S.E.2d 156, 165 (2003) ("Objections to personal jurisdiction, unlike subject matter jurisdiction, are waived unless raised."); see also Rule 4(d), SCRPC ("Voluntary appearance by defendant is equivalent to personal service . . .").

We therefore cannot agree it was the intent of the legislature to circumvent the long-standing rule that service can be consented to by the parties or waived entirely. Service of process is intended to provide notice and obtain personal jurisdiction, and Lexington designated in its policy a method for an insured to accomplish both those goals. We hold Lexington is bound by its own policy's terms. We reject the notion that the statute is intended to allow an insurance company to prescribe a method of service in its policy and then declare its *own* provision invalid under section 15-9-270. We have previously interpreted insurance service statutes as "designed by the legislature to provide a simple and easy method of obtaining jurisdiction over a foreign insurance company." *Equilease Corp. v. Weathers*, 275 S.C. 478, 483, 272 S.E.2d 789, 791 (1980). Thus, their purpose is to provide an insured with a method to obtain service of process on insurance companies; it is not to serve as a shield for insurance companies, protecting them from their own policy terms.

Furthermore, we find no support for the court of appeals' holding that service on the Director is a requirement that cannot be waived because the Director has a right to receive this information. Although the receipt of any legal process involving insurance companies might be helpful to the Director in carrying out his duties, we disagree that the plain language of the statute dictates personal jurisdiction is contingent upon the Director's receipt of the pleadings. That holding would lead to the absurd result that an insurance company could never waive a claim of defective service, even by a voluntary appearance, because to do so would abridge the Director's right to be served.

Accordingly, we reverse the court of appeals and hold section 15-9-270 does not provide the exclusive method of service on an insurance company.

II. FAILURE TO SET ASIDE THE ENTRY OF DEFAULT

Lexington contends even if the service-of-suit clause is valid, the entry of default should be set aside on other grounds. We disagree.

Determining whether to set aside an entry of default lies solely within the sound discretion of the circuit court and that decision will not be overturned absent a clear showing of an abuse of discretion. *Richardson v. P.V., Inc.*, 383 S.C. 610, 614, 682 S.E.2d 263, 265 (2009). The Court has never required exacting compliance with the rules to effect service of process, but instead looks to whether the plaintiff substantially complied with the rules such that the court has personal jurisdiction over the defendant and the defendant has notice of the proceedings. *Roche v. Young Bros., Inc. of Florence*, 318 S.C. 207, 209–10, 456 S.E.2d 897, 899 (1995).

A. Compliance with the Service-of-Suit Clause

Lexington argues White Oak did not comply with the terms of the service-of-suit clause. Specifically, Lexington asserts the provision required service be directed to "Counsel . . . or his or her representative" whereas White Oak addressed the pleadings to "Attn: LEGAL DEPARTMENT." Lexington also contends the person who signed the return receipt was not authorized to receive service as required by Rule 4(d)(8). We disagree.

The circuit court determined White Oak substantially complied with the service-of-suit clause set forth in the insurance policy. The court found that although the pleadings were not addressed to "Counsel," because the clause allowed for service on counsel's "representative," White Oak addressing the pleadings to the legal department constituted substantial compliance. The court also found it significant that Lexington acknowledged the complaint was received by its claims counsel.

We find the circuit court did not abuse its discretion in holding White Oak substantially complied with the service-of-suit clause. The communication was directed to the legal department, and the mere omission of the word "Counsel" in the address did not render service ineffective.

B. Good Cause

Lexington also argues the circuit court erred in failing to set aside the default because it has shown good cause to grant relief under Rule 55(c). We disagree.

The standard for granting relief from an entry of default under Rule 55(c) is mere "good cause." Rule 55(c), SCRCP. "This standard requires a party seeking relief from an entry of default under Rule 55(c) to provide an explanation for the default and give reasons why vacation of the default entry would serve the interests of justice." *Sundown Operating Co. v. Intedge Indus., Inc.*, 383 S.C. 601, 607, 681 S.E.2d 885, 888 (2009). "Once a party has put forth a satisfactory explanation for the default, the trial court must also consider: (1) the timing of the motion for relief; (2) whether the defendant has a meritorious defense; and (3) the degree of prejudice to the plaintiff if relief is granted." *Id.* at 607–08, 681 S.E.2d at 888.

Lexington asserts it replied promptly after discovering the default, it presented evidence of a meritorious defense, and White Oak would suffer no prejudice if the relief was granted. The circuit court held Lexington provided no reasonable explanation for why it failed to respond to the initial complaint. The court found the only excuse offered was that Lexington lost the pleadings and concluding that ground was insufficient, denied the motion.

Lexington argues the circuit court erred in relying on this Court's holding in *Roche* that losing a summons and complaint is never a ground to set aside a default judgment. It notes the standard for reviewing a motion for relief from default under Rule 55(c) and a motion for relief from a default judgment under 60(b) are distinct. Although we acknowledge the standard under Rule 60(b) is more rigorous than "good cause" under Rule 55(c), we find no error in the court's holding that losing the complaint was not "good cause." The circuit court acted within its discretion in concluding that losing a complaint was not a satisfactory explanation for failing to timely respond.

C. Other Equitable Considerations

Lexington finally argues the Court should set aside the entry of default because White Oak failed to serve a courtesy copy of the complaint on Lexington's attorney. We disagree.

As Lexington acknowledges, nothing in the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure requires the service of a courtesy copy of the summons and complaint on opposing counsel. Furthermore, we find no inequity in White Oak's actions. We fail to see how serving an insurance company in accordance with its own

service-of-suit clause can be characterized as unfair or an attempt to take advantage of the attorney. Instead, we find it would be inequitable to fault White Oak for not serving an additional courtesy copy in case the insurance company lost the pleadings.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, we reverse the court of appeals' opinion and affirm the circuit court's order.

TOAL, C.J., BEATTY and KITTREDGE, JJ., concur. PLEICONES, J., dissenting in a separate opinion.

JUSTICE PLEICONES: I respectfully dissent and would affirm the decision of the Court of Appeals. First, the statutes and case law are clear: the exclusive method for service of process on a foreign insurance company is by service on the Director of the Department of Insurance. Pursuant to S.C. Code Ann. § 38-5-70 (2002), every foreign insurer appoints the director as its agent for service of process. Substituted service upon the director "is [the] exclusive [method], and service made in any other way upon such corporations is invalid." *Murray v. Sovereign Camp, W.O.W.*, 192 S.C. 101, 108, 5 S.E.2d 560, 562 (1939) (construing predecessor to § 38-5-70). Further, S.C. Code Ann. §15-9-270 (2005) provides, "The summons and any other legal process in any action or proceeding against [an insurance company] must be served on an insurance company . . . by delivering two copies . . . to the Director . . ." Compliance with this statute "is the proper and exclusive method of obtaining jurisdiction over the insurance company." *Equilease Corp. v. Weathers*, 275 S.C. 478, 484, 272 S.E.2d 789, 792 (1980). An action is not commenced unless these statutory mandates are met, and all parties agree they were not complied with here. *See also Couch on Insurance § 3:30 (3rd ed. 2013)* (recognizing South Carolina as a jurisdiction where service on statutory agent is exclusive). The trial court erred in refusing to set aside entry of default.

I also agree with the Court of Appeals that the policy underlying these statutes is to protect the public by informing the Director of allegations of insurer misconduct. *See* S.C. Code Ann. § 38-3-110(2002). I therefore conclude it would violate public policy to permit an insurance company to contract out of these mandatory substituted service statutes.

While it is unfortunate that an insurance company that received actual notice of the petitioners' suit is taking advantage of these substituted service statutes, this result is compelled by our precedents and by the public policy that the statutes serve. For the reasons given above, I would affirm the decision of the Court of Appeals.

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

White Oak Manor, Inc. and White Oak Manor-
York, Inc., Respondents,

v.

Lexington Insurance Company, Caronia
Corporation, and Certain Underwriters at Lloyd's
London, subscribing to Certificate No.
UP02US382030, Defendants,

of whom Lexington Insurance Company is the
Appellant.

Appeal From Spartanburg County
Roger L. Couch, Circuit Court Judge

Opinion No. 4863
Submitted November 1, 2010 – Filed August 10, 2011

REVERSED AND REMANDED

Peter H. Dworjanyn, Christian Stegmaier, and
Amy L. Neuschafer, all of Columbia, for
Appellant.

Joshua Matthew Henderson, of Spartanburg, for
Respondents.

THOMAS, J.: Respondent White Oak Manor, Inc. (White Oak) owns and operates a nursing home in York County. In 2005, White Oak filed a declaratory judgment action against its insurer, Appellant Lexington Insurance Company (Lexington), to adjudicate the contractual obligations between the two. Lexington did not answer within thirty days and was declared to be in default. The trial court denied Lexington's motion to set aside the entry of default, and Lexington appeals. We reverse and remand.^[1]

FACTS AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Lexington is a corporation licensed to do business in South Carolina and organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware. In 2001, Lexington issued an insurance

policy to White Oak, providing coverage from September 30, 2001, until May 13, 2002. From May 13, 2002, until March 31, 2003, there was a gap in coverage with Lexington, during which White Oak was insured by another carrier. Lexington resumed coverage from March 31, 2003, until March 31, 2004.

On November 3, 2001, a White Oak resident sustained an injury from the improper application of a feeding tube by a White Oak employee. On January 10, 2002, White Oak notified Caronia Corporation (Caronia), the third-party administrator approved by Lexington to receive notice, of the incident. On March 27, 2003, a malpractice lawsuit on behalf of the injured resident was filed against White Oak.

A mediation in the malpractice action was planned for August 2004. In anticipation of this mediation, counsel for White Oak sent a letter to Lexington's attorneys informing them of the scheduled mediation. In response, on August 5, 2004, Lexington's counsel sent a letter to White Oak's counsel asking whether White Oak was seeking coverage, the date and form of the first demand against White Oak, and the date and form of any notice White Oak sent to any other insurers. During the following two months, attorneys for White Oak had two conversations with counsel for Lexington regarding this letter.

In December of 2004, counsel for Lexington again sent a letter to White Oak's attorneys discussing coverage issues. White Oak replied, and subsequently White Oak and Lexington had a telephone conversation regarding notice to Caronia of the claim against White Oak. White Oak later settled the malpractice action.

On April 22, 2005, White Oak instituted the current action. The policy in question contains a "service of suit clause" that reads: "It is further agreed that service of process in such a suit may be made upon Counsel, Legal Department, Lexington Insurance Company, 200 State Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02109 or his or her representative."

On May 16, 2005, White Oak mailed the summons and complaint, return receipt requested, with delivery restricted to the addressee, to "Lexington Insurance Company, 200 State St., Boston, MA 02109, ATTN: LEGAL DEPARTMENT." The return receipt was dated May 20, 2005. The signature on the return receipt appeared to be from an individual unknown to Lexington. According to Lexington's internal mail log, however, the pleadings were received on May 20, 2005, and personally delivered to Lexington's claim counselor on May 27, 2005; however, according to Lexington, neither the claim counselor nor the individual to whom the claim counselor was to pass such information recalled receiving the pleadings.

On July 7, 2005, White Oak filed an affidavit of default. In an order dated July 15, 2005, the trial court held Lexington in default. On August 11, 2005, White Oak filed a notice of motion and motion for damages pursuant to Rule 55(b), SCRCP. On September 14, 2005, White Oak filed an amended complaint substituting certain defendants who are not parties to this appeal, which it served on Lexington by mail the same day. Attached as an exhibit to this amended complaint was the order of default. Lexington answered the amended complaint on September 26, 2005, and contemporaneously filed a motion to set aside the entry of default pursuant to Rule 55(c), SCRCP.^[2] The trial court denied the motion and Lexington's subsequent motion to alter or amend.

On November 17, 2008, the trial court held a hearing on White Oak's motion for damages. On November 21, 2008, the court filed an order in which it awarded White Oak judgment against

Lexington in the amount of \$153,266. Lexington then filed this appeal.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

"The decision whether to set aside an entry of default or a default judgment lies solely within the sound discretion of the trial judge." Sundown Operating Co. v. Intedger Indus., 383 S.C. 601, 606, 681 S.E.2d 885, 888 (2009). "The trial court's decision will not be disturbed on appeal absent a clear showing of an abuse of that discretion." Id. "An abuse of discretion occurs when the judge issuing the order was controlled by some error of law or when the order, based upon factual, as distinguished from legal conclusions, is without evidentiary support." Id. at 607, 681 S.E.2d at 888.

LAW/ANALYSIS

Lexington argues that the South Carolina Code provides for the exclusive method of service upon a foreign insurance company and that White Oak was therefore required to serve notice pursuant to statute regardless of the service of suit clause. We agree.

Section 38-5-70 of the South Carolina Code (2002) provides in pertinent part as follows:

Every insurer shall, before being licensed, appoint in writing the director and his successors in office to be its true and lawful attorney upon whom all legal process in any action or proceeding against it must be served and in this writing shall agree that any lawful process against it which is served upon this attorney is of the same legal force and validity as if served upon the insurer and that the authority continues in force so long as any liability remains outstanding in the State.

In addition, the legislature has imposed the following requirement regarding service on insurance companies:

The summons and any other legal process in any action or proceeding against it must be served on an insurance company . . . by delivering two copies of the summons or any other legal process to the Director of the Department of Insurance, as attorney of the company A company shall appoint the director as its attorney pursuant to the provisions of section 38-5-70. This service is considered sufficient service upon the company.

S.C. Code Ann. § 15-9-270 (2005) (emphasis added).

In response to Lexington's argument that valid service requires delivery of copies of the summons and complaint to the Director of the Department of Insurance, the trial court held that the parties were free to agree to another form of service and that Lexington, through the inclusion of the service of suit clause in its policy, waived its right to insist on service pursuant to section 15-9-270. We hold this ruling was based on an error of law.

According to section 15-9-270, the service of pleadings in a lawsuit against an insurance company "must" be accomplished by delivering two copies of the pleadings to the Director of the South Carolina Department of Insurance. See Equilease Corp. v. Weathers, 275 S.C. 478, 484, 272 S.E.2d 789, 792 (1980) ("Clearly, in such a case where jurisdiction has not yet been acquired over an insurance company, service under the applicable substituted service statute

is the proper and exclusive method of obtaining jurisdiction over the insurance company.").

Whereas statutes prescribing methods of service on other legal entities include a proviso that the prescribed manner of service is not the only means or even the required means of service, section 15-9-270 does not allow service to be accomplished by other methods.[3] The absence in section 15-9-270 of a provision allowing alternate methods of service on insurers is consistent with the Supreme Court's interpretation of what is now section 38-5-70. See Murray v. Sovereign Camp, WOW, 192 S.C. 101, 108, 5 S.E.2d 560, 562 (1939) (holding that "service on foreign insurance companies as provided for in Section 7964 of the Code of 1932 [now section 38-5-70] is exclusive, and that service made in any other way upon such corporations is invalid").

Service of the pleadings on the Director of the South Carolina Department of Insurance "is considered sufficient service upon the company." S.C. Code Ann. § 15-9-270 (2005). Upon receiving the pleadings, the Director "shall immediately forward by registered or certified mail one of the duplicate copies prepaid directed toward the company at its home office" Id. This is more than a ministerial task. Rather, it is consistent with other statutory responsibilities entrusted to the Director, including duties to (1) "see that all laws of this State governing insurers or relating to the business of insurance are faithfully executed[,]" (2) "report to the Attorney General or other appropriate law enforcement officials criminal violations of the laws relative to the business of insurance or the provisions of this title which he considers necessary to report[,]" and (3) institute civil actions when appropriate. S.C. Code Ann. § 38-3-110 (2002). In order to perform such duties, the Director needs to be informed when an insurer's misconduct is alleged to be sufficiently serious to warrant litigation. Requiring the aggrieved party to serve the Director as a prerequisite to acquiring jurisdiction over the insurer is a reasonable and efficient way to achieve this objective. Based on this reasoning, we hold that service on the Department of Insurance of the pleadings in any lawsuit against an insurance company is a right granted to the Department to enable it to fulfill the responsibilities with which it has been charged. The service of suit clause in Lexington's policy was ineffective to waive a right that was not Lexington's to waive. The trial court therefore erred as a matter of law in holding that the service of suit clause in Lexington's policy operated as a waiver of the right to be served according to section 15-9-270.

CONCLUSION

We hold that the service of suit clause did not absolve White Oak of the responsibility to comply with the requirement in section 15-9-270 that it deliver two copies of its summons and complaint to the Director of the Department of Insurance in order to serve process on Lexington. We therefore reverse the trial court's denial of Lexington's motion to set aside the entry of default, vacate the judgment, and remand the matter to the trial court so that Lexington can file an answer within thirty days once service of process has been accomplished according to section 15-9-270. Because our determination of this issue is dispositive of this appeal, we do not address Lexington's other challenges to the validity of the service of process. See Futch v. McAllister Towing of Georgetown, 335 S.C. 598, 613, 518 S.E.2d 591, 598 (1999) (ruling that because the determination of a particular issue was dispositive of the appeal, the appellate court did not need to review the remaining issues).

REVERSED AND REMANDED.

PIEPER and GEATHERS, JJ., concur.

[1] We decide this case without oral argument pursuant to Rule 215, SCACR.

[2] In its motion to set aside the default, Lexington did not expressly argue that because it filed an answer to the amended complaint only twelve days after the filing of the amended complaint, it was never actually in default. Moreover, in both its motion to alter or amend and its brief to this court, Lexington does not argue that it timely responded to the filing and service of the amended complaint. See Rule 15(a), SCRCP ("A party shall plead in response to an amended pleading within the time remaining for response to the original pleading or within fifteen days after service of the named amended pleading, whichever period may be the longer, unless the court otherwise orders.").

[3] See, e.g., S.C. Code Ann. § 15-9-210(d) (2005) (regarding service of process on domestic corporations); S.C. Code Ann. § 15-9-240(c) (2005) (regarding service of process on foreign corporations authorized to transact business in South Carolina); S.C. Code Ann. § 15-9-245(f) (2005) (regarding service of process on foreign corporations not authorized to do business in South Carolina).

Service of process on unauthorized insurers can be accomplished through service on "the Secretary of State or his successor in office," service on "the Chief Insurance Commissioner or some person in apparent charge of his office," or service on "any person within this State" performing certain activities on the unauthorized insurer's behalf. S.C. Code Ann. §§ 15-9-280 (a), 15-9-285(b), and 15-9-290 (2005). The statutes prescribing these methods do not "abridge[] the right to serve any process, notice, or demand upon any insurer in any other manner permitted by law," but litigants are not explicitly allowed to use alternative methods in lieu of the means set forth in sections 15-9-280, 15-9-285, and 15-9-290. S.C. Code Ann. § 15-9-300 (2005).