

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA )

COUNTY OF YORK )

ROXANNE FALLS, Individually and as )  
Personal Representative of the Estate of )  
CHARLOTTE GAYE SMITH, )

Plaintiffs, )

vs. )

CBS Corporation, et al., )

Defendants. )

---

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA )

COUNTY OF YORK )

TIMOTHY W. HOWE, Individually and as )  
Personal Representative of the Estate of )  
Wayne Ervin Howe, deceased, and Jeanette )  
Howe, )

Plaintiffs, )

vs. )

Air & Liquid Systems Corporation, et al., )

Defendants. )

---

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS )  
FOR THE SIXTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT )  
C/A NO.: 2015-CP-46-02155 )

**ORDER FOR RULE TO SHOW CAUSE )  
HEARING )**

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS )  
FOR THE SIXTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT )  
C/A NO.: 2015-CP-46-03456 )

**ORDER FOR RULE TO SHOW CAUSE )  
HEARING )**

**RECEIVED**  
FEB 07 2020  
SC Court of Appeals

ELECTRONICALLY FILED - 2020 Jan 08 11:39 AM - YORK - COMMON PLEAS - CASE#2015CP4602155



STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA	)	IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
	)	FOR THE FIFTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
COUNTY OF RICHLAND	)	C/A NO.: 2018-CP-40-04940
	)	
DENVER D. TAYLOR and JANICE	)	
TAYLOR,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	<b>ORDER FOR RULE TO SHOW CAUSE</b>
	)	<b>HEARING</b>
vs.	)	
	)	
Air & Liquid Systems Corporation, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	
	)	

This matter comes before this Court by way of a Motion for a Rule to Show Cause initiated by Peter D. Protopapas, as the duly appointed Receiver of Covil Corporation (“Receiver”). The Receiver’s Motion for a Rule to Show Cause against United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company (“USF&G”), Zurich American Insurance Company (“Zurich”), and Sentry Insurance, a Mutual Company (“Sentry”) (collectively “Insurers”) seeks an order holding these Insurers in contempt for violating this Court’s (1) November 2, 2018 Order Appointing a Receiver for Covil Corporation;<sup>1</sup> (2) February 28, 2019 Order requiring Covil’s Insurers to attend mediation;<sup>2</sup> (3) September 19, 2019 Order requiring Covil’s Insurers to respond and produce required documents before September 30, 2019;<sup>3</sup> and (4) October 28, 2019 Order for Rule to Show Cause.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See November 2, 2018, Order Appointing Receiver in *Taylor v. Air & Liquid, et al.* (C/A No. 2018-CP-40-04940).  
<sup>2</sup> See February 28, 2019, Order Granting Plaintiff’s Motion to Compel Attendance at Mediation in *Nolen v. Daniel, et al.* (C/A No. 2016-CP-40-04184); *Greene v. Armstrong, et al.* (C/A No. 2016-CP-40-00173); *Thompson v. Armstrong, et al.* (2016-CP-40-2498); and *Taylor v. Air & Liquid, et al.* (C/A No. 2018-CP-04940).  
<sup>3</sup> See September 19, 2019, Order for Rule to Show Cause in *Hopper v. Air & Liquid, et al.* (C/A/No. 2019-CP-40-00076).  
<sup>4</sup> See October 28, 2019, Order for Rule to Show Cause in *Hopper v. Air & Liquid, et al.* (C/A/No. 2019-CP-40-00076).

The South Carolina Supreme Court appointed the undersigned to serve as the Chief Judge of Administrative Purposes over all asbestosis and asbestos litigation filed within the state court system. The asbestos litigation in South Carolina constitutes a significant number of complex multi-party cases. A typical case will include an injured plaintiff alleging that an asbestos-related cancer was caused by dozens of different defendants.

This Court has worked diligently to manage this docket and to organize this complicated statewide litigation into an orderly process whereby cases are assigned for trial in a predictable fashion. This process is designed to allow the litigants to participate in discovery in an orderly fashion to facilitate the evaluation of litigation positions well before trial, and to try the cases as necessary.

The Supreme Court's charge to this Court includes facilitating meaningful mediations of asbestos cases consistent with the South Carolina Rules of Alternative Dispute Resolution. The Rules mandate attendance at mediation of "a representative of the insurance carrier who is not the carrier's outside counsel and who has full authority to settle the claim" on behalf of any insured party against whom a claim is made. SCRADR 6(b)(4).

Although this Court manages a large asbestos docket involving scores of different defendants, the matters associated with defendant Covil Corporation have required a very significant amount of this Court's time and attention for the reasons explained in more detail below.

From the time of its original formation in or about 1954, Covil Corporation was engaged in the installation and removal of insulation in various industrial facilities across South Carolina. Covil's operations involved the installation, removal and disturbance of insulation materials, typically supplied, required or acquired by other parties. At pertinent times insulation materials contained asbestos and Covil's operations are alleged to have resulted in bodily injury to South Carolina citizens. In 1991, Covil's business failed and it ceased operations. Thereafter, in 1993 the State of South Carolina rescinded Covil's corporate charter for failing to file the appropriate documentation with the Secretary of State.

Despite Covil's failure as a going concern and its subsequent forfeiture of its corporate charter, it continued to be sued in numerous asbestos cases. Through the management of the South Carolina asbestos docket, this Court observed several irregularities in the way that Covil conducted itself in its litigation. In the fall of 2018, Covil inexplicably defaulted on two mesothelioma asbestos cases pending before this Court, and shortly thereafter on November 2, 2018, the undersigned appointed Peter D. Protopapas to serve as a Receiver for Covil Corporation to manage its affairs according to South Carolina law.

During the ensuing months, this Court conducted numerous hearings regarding issues related to Covil. Over time, it became clear to this Court that certain of Covil's primary insurers (USF&G, Zurich, and Sentry) were operating an otherwise defunct Covil for purposes of managing Covil's asbestos litigation and had been doing so for over two decades without any apparent involvement from the insured – Covil Corporation. For over two decades, these primary Insurers pretended to be Covil. The primary insurers never sought the appointment of a receiver to represent Covil's interests in the defense of its asbestos cases. In fact, despite numerous opportunities to do so, at no time did any of Covil's Insurers even disclose to this Court their scheme to operate Covil as an undisclosed alter ego of these insurance companies.

As Covil's Receiver began to undertake his responsibilities, it became evident to this Court that Covil's Insurers would not willingly cooperate with the Receiver.<sup>5</sup> In fact, several of these Insurers went to great lengths to thwart the Receiver's efforts to understand the basic nature and amount of the asbestos insurance coverage available to Covil. As a result of the insurers' refusal to cooperate, the Receiver began to seek this Court's intervention to determine the nature and amount of insurance available to Covil for its asbestos litigation. This information is critical to the Receiver's ability to manage Covil's asbestos

---

<sup>5</sup> The Court's discussion of Covil's Insurers does not apply to TIG Insurance Company, as successor in interest to Fairmont Specialty Company, formerly known as Ranger Insurance Company ("TIG"). Unlike Covil's other insurers, TIG has cooperated with this Court and the Receiver. After producing the requisite materials, TIG acknowledged its responsibilities and reached an amicable settlement with Covil's Receiver. The Court commends TIG and its counsel for their cooperation and professionalism throughout this process. The Court also dissolved its Order to Show Cause as it related to Hartford and notes that Hartford also has reached an agreement to resolve its differences with Covil's Receiver.

litigation and, specifically, to participate meaningfully in mediation sessions scheduled for Covil's asbestos cases as required by the South Carolina Rules of Alternative Dispute Resolution.

Proceedings before this Court on the issue of Covil's participation in mediation exercises have demonstrated a lack of clarity regarding what constitutes "full authority" for claims filed against Covil Corporation. This lack of clarity continually delays settlement, stalls negotiations, and slows the ability of this Court to manage the South Carolina asbestos docket. An inquiry into the insurance coverage of Covil Corporation is warranted to fully determine the amount of authority available for settlement of asbestos personal injury actions filed against Covil Corporation.

Over time, this Court entered a series of escalating orders designed to require the Insurers to produce relevant insurance information to Covil's Receiver and to participate in asbestos mediations as scheduled on the South Carolina docket. Although several asbestos cases have been resolved under this system, except as noted above in note 5, the Insurers have yet to comply with this Court's Orders regarding the full production of the relevant insurance information to Covil's Receiver. These Insurers' defiance of this Court's lawful orders has impeded Covil's Receiver in his work under this Court's mandate, has interrupted this Court's ability to manage the numerous asbestos cases pending on its docket, and has required this Court unnecessarily to expend valuable time and resources in numerous hearings designed to encourage these Insurers to conduct themselves in accordance with the basic tenets of well-established South Carolina law. The Court has experienced problems with these Insurers when they were animating an otherwise defunct Covil and controlling its behavior in asbestos litigation before the appointment of the Receiver. *See* Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion for New Trial in *Crawford v. Ceeleanese Corp.*, C/A No. 2017-CP-42-04429 (where this Court found that Covil's insurers had been improperly operating, controlling, and abusing Covil for many years).

Unfortunately, this Court's persistence and patience have been unsuccessful in causing these Insurers fully to disclose and produce the insurance information or the details concerning their respective insuring relationship with Covil to the Receiver for their insured, Covil. After numerous attempts to achieve

compliance, this Court scheduled a show cause hearing on November 12, 2019, where the Insurers were directed to appear to discuss by policy and annual period (or portion thereof) the original and remaining limits of Covil's insurance policies under all applicable coverage parts, including separately as to the product liability/completed operations coverage part and the operations/premises coverage part and to provide an accounting of the amounts paid in settlement for each claim paid or settled, who authorized payment, under what coverage parts of the policies settlements or judgments were paid, documentation or other evidence supporting the analysis and characterization of claims as products/completed operations or operations/premises claims, method of allocation of settlements or judgments paid among Insurers, policies and policy years and if no payment was made because of a denial of coverage, the stated basis at the time of settlement for such denial. With the exceptions noted above in note 5, the Insurers failed and refused to comply with this order.

In sum, after months of work by this Court and its Receiver, it appears to this Court that these Insurers have refused to provide complete policy limits and settlement authority information to their insured's Receiver, even after this Court ordered the Insurers to provide the information by September 30, 2019, under penalty of perjury, and again in a show cause hearing scheduled on November 12, 2019. Despite their assertions in their memoranda submitted to this Court following the November 12, 2019 hearing, the Court has given the Insurers ample opportunity to respond to Receiver's arguments and explain to the Court why they should not be held in contempt for failing to abide by this Court's September 19, 2019 Order. Despite these Insurers not complying with the clear terms of the September 19, 2019 Order to respond to the areas of inquiry under the penalty of perjury by September 30, 2019, the Court allowed these Insurers to submit additional affidavits and evidence after the November 12, 2019 hearing. However, as the Court noted at the hearing, these Insurers were already in contempt of this Court's order by not providing proper responses under perjury by the September 30, 2019 deadline, and the supplemental submissions, although potentially helpful to the Court in making this ruling, do not necessarily cure the Insurers' contempt. The Court has diligently reviewed and considered the extensive filings submitted by both the

Receiver and these Insurers after the November 12, 2019 hearing. The Court finds the submissions by these Insurers are not relevant to, and do not cure, their contemptuous conduct. Rather, these filings have consumed additional countless hours of this Court's time while these Insurers continue to play games rather than comply with this Court's orders.

The Court is particularly concerned with the fact that these Insurers continue to claim ignorance surrounding their responsibility to their insured and their obligations under this Court's orders. The Court has held multiple hearings wherein the Court has allowed the Receiver and the Insurers to present arguments pertaining to these issues, and the Receiver has been trying to obtain the requested information since his appointment, well over a year ago. These Insurers cannot continue to plead ignorance in order to avoid the consequences of their own conduct and prolong the much-needed resolution of pending asbestos cases. The Insurers have continuously attempted to impede the Receiver's ability to determine the amounts of coverage available to Covil and have violated the South Carolina Alternative Dispute Resolution Rules by refusing to provide the Receiver with the necessary coverage information to fully participate in the mediation of these claims. In fact, because of these Insurers' obstinate refusal to comply with this Court's order and their past conduct, the Receiver has been forced to go to great lengths in order to present evidence to this Court and piece together the secondary evidence of insurance. While the Insurers have produced thousands of pages of documents, the production does not satisfy this Court's order as these Insurers have still not produced full coverage information or policies to the Receiver or fully disclosed the nature and extent of their insuring relationship.

During these hearings, the Court has been presented with evidence in the form of documents and sworn testimony indicating that Covil purchased products liability and completed operations liability insurance from USF&G (now a part of Travelers) from 1954 to 1964. Specifically, Palmer Covil (the founder of Covil Corporation) testified in a deposition in 1977 that Covil purchased USF&G general liability insurance coverage from 1954 to 1964. Moreover, Palmer Covil identified the Goldsmith Agency as the broker responsible for selling USF&G coverage to Covil. Former Lieutenant Governor Nick

Theodore provided an affidavit, as a former employee and partner of this agency, that he recalled selling USF&G insurance to Covil during this time period (until his agency lost the business to an agent selling insurance issued by Sentry). The Court finds this evidence and testimony to be persuasive, credible, and consistent with other known facts in this case.

On the other hand, USF&G reports only that it has been unable to locate these insurance policies. However, the Court has also been presented with evidence that USF&G undertook a systematic corporate program to destroy or discard its historical insurance policies which included policies and other related documentation from the period of time for which policies were issued to Covil as demonstrated by the evidence before this Court. In its arguments before the Court on November 12, 2019, and its memorandum submitted after the hearing, USF&G argues the Court should disregard its historical conduct because past conduct cannot be the basis of a finding of contempt. However, USF&G failed to inform the Court of the systematic destruction of policies until the Receiver brought the matter to the attention of the Court at the most recent hearing. The Court is concerned by the Insurers' failure to fully represent facts to the Court regarding the insurance coverage issued to Covil, especially considering that the Insurers acted as the alter ego of Covil for numerous years. The Court has given the Insurers ample opportunity to inform the Court of the necessary facts surrounding these coverage issues, and the Insurers have continuously refused to provide full information, misrepresented information, and attempted to prevent this Court from ruling on these issues.

The Court is deeply troubled by USF&G's historical behavior, including the widespread destruction of its insureds' insurance policies in an effort to evade liability under these policies. The Court is even more troubled by the fact that USF&G never mentioned, in numerous hearings on this very topic, that its policy destruction "purge" was the reason that USF&G is now unable to produce Covil's policies to the receiver. In this regard, USF&G has flagrantly defied this Court's orders and attempted to make a mockery of this Court's important work. Rarely, if ever, has this Court encountered such a degree of corporate

dishonesty as has been on display from USF&G during these proceedings. USF&G owes this Court a duty of candor, and should have been forthright.

The spoliation of evidence is the intentional, reckless, or negligent withholding, hiding, altering, fabricating, or destroying of evidence relevant to a current or reasonably anticipated legal proceeding. If proven, spoliation may be used to establish that the evidence was unfavorable to the party responsible. *Black's Law Dictionary* (8th Ed. 2004). The theory behind imposing sanctions for spoliation of evidence is that when a party destroys evidence, it is reasonable to infer that the party had “consciousness of guilt” or other motivations to avoid the evidence being heard or introduced to the jury.

A party bringing a motion for sanctions based on spoliation bears the burden of establishing three (3) independent elements before the Court may determine which sanction, if any, is appropriate. These elements are:

- (1) that the party having control over the evidence had a duty to preserve it at the time it was destroyed;
- (2) that the evidence was destroyed with a culpable state of mind; and
- (3) that the destroyed evidence was relevant to the party's claim or defense such that a reasonable trier of fact could find that it would support that claim or defense.

*Hawkins v. College of Charleston*, 2013 WL 6050324, \*2 (4th Cir. 2013) (quoting *Cytec Carbon Fibers, LLC v. Hopkins*, No. 2:11-cv-0217, 2012 WL 6044778 (D.S.C. Oct. 22, 2012)).

As to the first element, USF&G had a duty to preserve this evidence. “A party has a duty to preserve evidence during litigation and at any time ‘before the litigation when a party reasonably should know that evidence may be relevant to anticipated litigation.’” *Id.* at \*3 (quoting *Silvestri v. General Motors Corp.*, 271 F.3d 583, 590 (4th Cir. 2001)). There is a common law duty to preserve evidence, and a party can only be sanctioned for destroying evidence it had a duty to preserve. That duty arises when a party has notice that the party possesses evidence that is relevant to litigation or when a party should have known the evidence may be relevant to future litigation. Pre-litigation discussions or requests to inspect can also trigger a duty to preserve relevant evidence and it can be said that the obligation to preserve evidence

runs first to counsel, who then has an ethical obligation to notify and advise their client on its obligations to safeguard and preserve the evidence relevant to the litigation on a continuing basis.

Covil is unable to identify a specific date on which USF&G's duty to preserve records arose. However, by 1976, USF&G had received correspondence from Covil requesting USF&G to respond to an asbestos case, and by June 1983, USF&G had received correspondence from Covil serving as Covil's final written demand that USF&G afford a defense to Covil in an asbestos case. As a result of this exchange of correspondence, USF&G knew by at least June 1983 that its insurance policies issued to Covil would be highly relevant documents for years to come. Despite this fact, USF&G reports that it has been unable to locate the early policies issued to Covil – policies that it denies having issued – or an actual copy of a later policy that it admits to having issued to Covil.

The evidence demonstrates that USF&G cannot locate the early policies USF&G issued to Covil, or the later policy it admits having issued to Covil, because USF&G destroyed the policies. In 1984, the year after Covil's counsel demanded a defense from USF&G, which was facing a growing number of long-tail claims like the asbestos claims here, USF&G deliberately began purging old policies and policy information, including information on policy limits. To support its contentions regarding the destruction of policies, the Receiver submitted documents from the *Western MacArthur* litigation; most importantly the Pillsbury Report, which USF&G Filed in *Western MacArthur* litigation (*Western MacArthur Company v. General Accident Insurance Company of America*, Case No. 721595-7, In the Superior Court for Alameda County, California).<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> The Pillsbury Report is an 85-page document, filed in *United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company, et al. v. American Re-Insurance Company, et al.* Index No. 604517/2002, in the Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of New York. An expert witness, Philip L. Pillsbury, Jr., of the New York law firm, Pillsbury and Levinson, was retained by the reinsurers of USF&G to evaluate, in the context of California bad faith and insurance practice, the potential exposure for damages, which USF&G faced in a jury trial in 2002. This material was presented by Covil, at the November 12, 2019 hearing to describe the significant corporate misconduct leading to USF&G's contention that it was unable to locate copies of Covil's early insurance policies, which the Receiver found highly probative of the key issues in the proceeding. There was no objection regarding the Court's consideration of the documents, and Defendant

As stated in the Pillsbury report, an April 30, 1984 memorandum from Charles Watson, then a Vice President of USF&G, the new document destruction policy mandated the “purging of *each* file, not just files that can be discarded in entirety,” required that doubts should be resolved “in favor of discarding unless there are legal restraints,” and admonished that “we must be absolutely sure that we have thoroughly cleaned existing files.” Similarly, a March 16, 1984 Department Circular detailing the Records Management Program noted: “All existing departmental files are to be in full compliance including having been completely purged of all obsolete and duplicate material.”

As detailed in the expert report of Philip Pillsbury, which USF&G filed on February 21, 2017 as an exhibit to its opposition to a motion in the *Western MacArthur* reinsurance matter then pending in New York, USF&G’s employees were given just two months to comply with the document destruction. Relying on USF&G’s historical records, Mr. Pillsbury also described the deposition testimony of Randolph Rohrbaugh, the USF&G Vice President of Quality Assurance, who testified that, at a meeting concerning the USF&G document destruction program among USF&G management and attorneys in 1984, “there was a discussion as to whether USF&G should retain its records information about insureds’ policies given that insureds would bear the burden of proof as to those policies.” *See Pillsbury Report at 18.*

In short, the evidence shows that USF&G plainly undertook its purge of policy-related materials in anticipation of litigation. Having destroyed its policy records, USF&G then could require its policyholders to provide copies of their policies to USF&G in order for USF&G to provide coverage. Beginning in the late 1980s, however, USF&G realized that policyholders could prove coverage for long-tail liability claims with secondary evidence, even if USF&G had destroyed the actual historical policy records in its possession. In his report in the reinsurance matter, Mr. Pillsbury describes the USF&G decision to reverse course on the document destruction policy. *See Pillsbury Report at 18–19.* Summarizing the deposition of Kenneth Ford, the USF&G in-house counsel in the Claims Legal Division, Mr. Pillsbury notes that Ford

---

USF&G and others requested the court allow them to submit further documentation. The court has considered the report and the additional insurers’ submissions in drafting this order.

“testified at deposition that USF&G decided to ‘stop the destruction’ after policyholders began to prove coverage for the long-tail claims with ‘partial information concerning a policy,’ and the burden was shifted to the insurer to prove there wasn’t a policy or at least to prove the policy terms, and USF&G was not able to rebut some of that information.” *Id.* at 19. The reversal of course apparently occurred after USF&G destroyed evidence of the coverage it had provided to Covil between 1954 and 1964 and the actual policy it admits to having issued to Covil in the 1976 to 1978 periods.

Recently produced documents from USF&G itself further support that had USF&G not destroyed its historical policies, it would have been able to locate coverage it issued to Covil in the 1950s and 1960s and the actual policy it admits to having issued to Covil in 1976 to 1978. USF&G Claims Register documents<sup>7</sup> produced to the Receiver by USF&G on November 22, 2019, and December 5, 2019, over two months after this Court’s deadline for production, show USF&G paid claims on Covil policies made by third-party business entities such as Daniel Construction, Tennessee Eastman, Raburn Mills, First Baptist Church and Hicks & Ingle Company during the period from 1955 to 1962, further supporting the fact that USF&G issued general liability insurance coverage to Covil during this timeframe and, due to its conduct, has been unable to produce full and complete coverage information. Furthermore, although it claims to have what it calls a “certified” copy of the 1976 to 1978 primary policy it admits having issued to Covil, USF&G has not been transparent with either Covil or the court. This so-called “policy” is a collection of forms, not an actual insurance policy, and there is no competent proof of an aggregate limit for products or completed operations claims. USF&G’s use of the word “certified” is also misleading since the documents have no independent verification of their source or accuracy.

---

<sup>7</sup> The Court understands that USF&G utilized Claims Registers to maintain an index of all paid claims, and specifically that an entry was not placed on a claims register until a clerk had reviewed the relevant insurance policy to ensure that there was coverage for the loss. An April 1947 booklet entitled “Claim Department Clerical Instructions” detailed USF&G’s instructions to clerical staff regarding entry of claims in the claims register: “After the clerk has checked the policy or bond information to determine if there is coverage for the loss, she enters it on the claim register as provided on that form. She assigns the number next in order to the last one used. A separate sheet is used on each class of claims for each month. A carbon copy of the claim register is sent to the Home Office on the first of each month on AL [Automobile Bodily Injury], L [Other Bodily Injury], C [Compensation], and MP [Miscellaneous Property Damage] claims.”

By failing to maintain documents relevant to pending and future asbestos personal injury and insurance litigation, USF&G had a culpable state of mind because it either intentionally or negligently destroyed the evidence. The destruction of the documentary evidence that Covil seeks significantly hampers Covil's Receiver's ability to reconstruct its insurance program and other information relevant to pending and future asbestos personal injury and insurance litigation.

The "culpable" state of mind requirement does not require willful destruction. Rather, the moving party need only show that the evidence was destroyed "knowingly, even without intent [to breach the duty to preserve it], or negligently." *Byrnie v. Town of Cromwell*, 243 F.3d 93, 107–12 (2d Cir. 2001). "[T]he Fourth Circuit requires only a showing of fault, with the degree of fault impacting the severity of the sanctions." *Sampson v. City of Cambridge, Maryland*, 251 F.R.D. 172, 179 (D. Md. 2008) (citing *Silvestri*, 271 F.3d at 590).

Here, the evidence before the Court shows that USF&G's conduct of destroying or losing relevant documents satisfies the required minimum level of culpability needed for spoliation sanctions to be imposed. Because culpability encompasses everything from ordinary negligence to willful conduct, the culpable standard merely requires USF&G to have some degree of fault, which is the case in this matter. Whether the Court finds that USF&G was negligent, grossly negligent, or willful in destroying the evidence, the Court concludes that USF&G had a culpable state of mind when it spoliated the evidence at issue.

The last of the three independent elements, relevance to the party's claims, is also clearly present on these facts. Under Rule 401 of the South Carolina Rules of Evidence, "relevant evidence" means "evidence having any tendency to make the existence of any fact that is of consequence to the determination of the action more probable or less probable that it would be without the evidence." "Evidence is relevant if it tends to establish or make more or less probable some matter at issue upon which it directly or indirectly bears." *State v. Schmidt*, 288 S.C. 301, 303, 342 S.E.2d 401, 403 (1986). Thus, any evidence which assists a jury at arriving at the truth of an issue is relevant. The determination of the relevancy of evidence is largely

within the trial judge's discretion. *Strickland v. Coastal Design Assocs., Inc.*, 294 S.C. 421, 425, 365 S.E.2d 226, 228 (Ct. App. 1987).

Here, Covil has met its burden of showing the spoliated evidence is highly relevant to its case. The fact that USF&G destroyed or lost such evidence is extremely damaging to Covil's ability to reconstruct its insurance policies. As such, USF&G should not profit or benefit from its failure to preserve this evidence. Of course, Covil has no way of knowing precisely what has been destroyed. However, there is reason to believe that the destroyed evidence would have aided Covil's position, which has suffered irreparable prejudice due to USF&G's spoliation. USF&G is hereby ORDERED to produce ALL documents related to these issues, including all transcripts, from the *Western Asbestos* litigation, including the subsequent re-insurance litigation, to Covil's Receiver by January 13, 2020.

By destroying relevant evidence, USF&G has succeeded in hiding significant evidence of its insurance coverage and attempted to deprive Covil of the opportunity to present critical evidence of insurance coverage. Thus, the Court finds that USF&G spoliated relevant evidence and will issue an appropriate sanction to deter such conduct in the future and attempt to re-level the now uneven evidentiary playing field.

When a party loses or destroys evidence, an inference may be drawn that the destroyed or lost evidence would have been adverse to that party. *Gathers ex rel. Hutchinson v. S.C. Elec. & Gas Co.*, 311 S.C. 81, 83, 427 S.E.2d 687, 689 (Ct. App. 1993) (citing *Kershaw Cty. Bd. of Educ. v. United States Gypsum Co.*, 302 S.C. 390, 396 S.E.2d 369 (1990)). Over the years, courts have found numerous sanctions to be appropriate for the spoliation of evidence. Courts have allowed adverse inferences to be drawn from the loss or destruction of relevant evidence, dismissed cases or stricken pleadings, issued fines plus attorney's fees and applied almost every other sanction available for the failure to provide discovery.

Among the tools that judges may use to combat spoliation is the adverse inference jury instruction/presumption. Giving the finder of fact the ability to decide what weight to place on the spoliation is the preferred practice in South Carolina. *Karppi v. Greenville Terrazzo Co.*, 327 S.C. 538, 489 S.E.2d

679 (Ct. App. 1997). The presumption does not arise from the failure to present the evidence, but rather from the role that the spoliating party had in preventing it from being reviewed by the jury or court. When a party loses or destroys evidence, an inference may be drawn that the destroyed or lost evidence would have been adverse to that party. *Gathers v. S.C.E.&G. Co.*, 427 S.E.2d 687, 689 (S.C. Ct. App. 1993) (citing *Kershaw Cty. Bd. of Educ.*, 302 S.C. 390, 396 S.E.2d 369). Based on the evidence established by Covil's Receiver regarding the existence of Covil insurance coverage issued by USF&G, and based on the evidence demonstrating USF&G's spoliation of evidence regarding the existence of the coverage, this Court holds that USF&G's issued general liability insurance coverage to Covil Corporation on an annual basis, including products and completed operations coverage, between 1954 and 1964, without an aggregate limit of liability for damages paid for bodily injury or property damage. The court also makes a similar finding as to the 1976 to 1978 policy, SMP 490049.

Further, necessitated by the Supreme Court's charge to this Court to manage the South Carolina statewide asbestos litigation cases and as a direct result of these Insurers' recalcitrance in refusing to cooperate with this process, this Court and its Receiver are now left to discharge their respective duties by reconstructing the nature and scope of Covil's historical insurance program (without the cooperation of the Insurers) so as to facilitate the management of the South Carolina asbestos docket. In this effort, the Court will apply the following principles of South Carolina insurance law.

1. **“Trigger of Coverage.”** The term “trigger of coverage” describes the necessary events for a liability policy to respond to a suit seeking damage because of bodily injury. The Court rules that the policies at issue respond to suits when bodily injury takes place during the policy period, regardless of when the event causing the injury took place and regardless of when the injury becomes known or knowable. All of an insured's policies in effect from a person's first exposure to asbestos through manifestation of an asbestos disease and, ultimately, to death cover the asbestos cases unless coverage is otherwise excluded. This approach is called a “continuous trigger of coverage” or an “injury in fact trigger of coverage” inasmuch as medical science established long ago that asbestos injuries begin upon first inhalation of

asbestos fibers and continue progressively thereafter. As respects asbestos injury and death suits, the “continuous trigger of coverage” and the “injury in fact trigger of coverage” yield the same result such that the court need not choose between these conceptually similar approaches. *Armstrong World Indus., Inc. v. Aetna Cas. & Sur. Co.*, 45 Cal. App. 4th 1, 45 (1996) (“We find no error in the trial court’s use of an injury-in-fact analysis to apply a continuous trigger.”).

**2. The Distinction Between “Operations” and “Completed Operations.”** The Court finds that the policies at issue contain separate and distinct coverage parts for “operations” and “completed operations.” As a general matter, the policies contain no aggregate limit of liability for the operations coverage part, although the Court has also held that the USF&G policies issued to Covil between 1954 and 1964 also contain no aggregate limit of liability for the products and completed operations coverage part as well. The operations coverage part for each one of the policies at issue in this case responds repeatedly to each and every “occurrence” without a total “cap” on the insurers’ liability to pay, subject only to a “per occurrence” limit of liability. The same is true of products and completed operations claims covered under the 1954 to 1964 USF&G policies. Most of the asbestos contracting claims against Covil invoke the operations coverage part because they did not result from its “completed operations.”

The insurers have conflated the separate “operations” coverage part with the “completed operations” coverage part and have applied their policies in a manner that has not been adopted by the state courts in South Carolina. The Court is aware that the insurers contend that aggregate limits of liability apply to any third party’s claim against Covil involving exposure to asbestos that took place before the *inception date* of their policies. The policies are not written in that manner, however. There is nothing in the definition of “completed operations” that focuses on the inception date of a policy.

This Court is aware that, in seeking to limit their obligations to Covil, the insurers would prefer to rely exclusively on federal decisions attempting to “guess” the view the Maryland Court of Appeals would take if the issue of interpreting the “completed operations” provisions of the policies were presented to it. The insurers take the position that the Fourth Circuit has “spoken” definitively on this issue. However,

this Court finds that federal decisions attempting to predict the interpretation of policy language under Maryland law are not pertinent to the determination of South Carolina law. This Court specifically finds that *In re Wallace & Gale Co.*, 385 F.3d 820 (4th Cir. 2004) is not the law of South Carolina.

This Court finds that the “completed operations hazard” described in the insurers’ policies, and the corresponding aggregate limits of liability in the policies that contain such aggregate limits of liability, apply *only* when a plaintiff is exposed to asbestos *after* Covil completed its installation or removal operations or work at a particular jobsite.

The Court holds that any aggregate limit of liability in the insurers’ policies applies only to suits seeking the recovery of damages for bodily injury where the plaintiff was exposed to asbestos attributed to Covil *after* Covil completed its work at a particular jobsite. No aggregate limits of liability apply to suits seeking the recovery of damages for bodily injury where the plaintiff was exposed to asbestos while Covil was performing work at a particular jobsite.<sup>8</sup> See, e.g., *Travelers Cas. & Sur. Co. v. Gerling Global Reinsurance Corp. of Am.*, 419 F.3d 181, 184 (2d Cir. 2005) (“*Gerling*”) (“Operations” coverage “protected [the insured] from claims for asbestos-related injuries resulting from asbestos exposure on [the insured’s] premises or during its business operations, for example, injuries occurring during the installation or removal of asbestos products”); *Travelers Cas. & Sur. Co. v. Employers Ins. of Wausau*, 130 Cal. App. 4th 99, 114 n.6 (2005) (“Examples of injuries covered under the premises-operations coverage include injuries suffered by a shipyard worker while installing insulation at the insured’s facility and injuries caused by a subcontractor’s negligent construction of a wall that fell on a worker while the job was in progress.”).

---

<sup>8</sup> Covil contends that policies in addition to those issued by USF&G between 1954 and 1964 do not contain any aggregate limits of liability at all. The court has not reached any conclusion as to this contention, except to conclude, in accordance with well-settled South Carolina law, that the burden is on the insurer to prove any limitation on coverage, including a limitation such as an aggregate limit of liability.

3. **Burden Of Proof.** The Insurers bear the burden of proving any exclusion or limitation of coverage, including the application of aggregate limits to particular suits and the “exhaustion” of the aggregate limits of liability in their policies.

The South Carolina Supreme Court has recognized that insurers bear the burden of proving the applicability of a coverage provision that limits their liability to their insured: “Insurance policy exclusions are construed most strongly against the insurance company, which also bears the burden of establishing the exclusion’s applicability.” *Owners Ins. Co. v. Clayton*, 364 S.C. 555, 560 614 S.E.2d 611, 614 (2004) (citing *Boggs v. Aetna Cas. and Sur. Co.*, 272 S.C. 460, 252 S.E.2d 565 (1979)); *see also Auto Owners Ins. Co. v. Benjamin*, 415 S.C. 137, 144–48, 781 S.E.2d 137, 141–44 (2015) (upholding circuit court decision to construe an ambiguous terms in favor of coverage, and noting that “ambiguous terms are to be construed strictly against the insurer”). Courts have held that this basic principle also applies to “limitations” on coverage. *Ins. Co. of N. Am. v. Kayser-Roth Corp.*, 770 A.2d 403 (R.I. 2001) (“[o]nce the insured makes a prima facie showing of coverage, ‘the insurer then bears the burden of proving the applicability of policy exclusions and limitations in order to avoid an adverse judgment.’” (quoting *Gen. Accident Ins. Co. v. Am. Nat’l Fireproofing, Inc.*, 770 A.2d 403, 416 (R.I. 1998))); *Koppers Co. v. Aetna Cas. & Sur. Co.*, 98 F.3d 1440, 1446 (3d Cir. 1996) (“[T]he insurer bears the burden of proving the applicability of any exclusions or limitations on coverage, since disclaiming coverage on the basis of an exclusion is an affirmative defense”).

Consequently, as to any individual asbestos lawsuit, it is the Insurers’ burden to prove that the suit seeks the recovery of damages that are subject to the aggregate limits of liability, if any, applicable to the “completed operations” provisions in their policies, where such aggregate limits have been proven by each particular Insurer as to each specific policy or policy period. By definition, aggregate limits restrict coverage. Accordingly, the insurers bear the burden of demonstrating that aggregate limits in their policies, if any, apply to any particular asbestos suits.

4. **Occurrences.** The policies at issue provide coverage for legal liabilities resulting from an

“occurrence.” An “occurrence” is typically defined as an accident, including exposure to substantially similar conditions, that results in bodily injury during the policy period. Covil faces allegations in numerous lawsuits that multiple asbestos injury and wrongful death “occurrences” have resulted from its asbestos “operations.” Covil is therefore entitled to multiple “per occurrence” limits of liability to resolve each of the asbestos suits.

The asbestos insulation operations suits against Covil are not repetitive products liability suits alleging exposure to asbestos from the same defective product. Instead, these suits allege that Covil’s operations exposed workers and other bystanders to asbestos. Courts have held that the type of asbestos operations claims against Covil resulted from multiple “occurrences” under the standard definition of “occurrence” used during the time of the insurers’ policies. *See, e.g., Gerling*, 419 F.3d at 184 (“[I]f claims arising from multiple occurrences triggered [operations] coverage, then Travelers was exposed to unlimited liability; each occurrence was subject to a \$1 million limit on liability, but there was no cap on total liability. Regardless of how much Travelers had paid for previous non-products occurrences under a single policy, each additional non-products occurrence under that policy subjected Travelers to liability anew.”).

**5. Allocation of Losses to Covil’s Policies.** Exposure to asbestos results in progressive injury spanning many years, thereby triggering coverage under multiple policies. Exposure to asbestos during the conduct of operations that results in bodily injury during the policy period or periods during which the operations were conducted also presents an allocation issue. And, here, Covil is in a Receivership, with no assets other than its insurance policies and proceeds, which also affects any allocation of loss since Covil itself cannot absorb any allocation of loss. Finally, the Court notes that the language of the policies typically requires the insurers to pay “all sums” – meaning everything – for which the insured is legally obligated to pay if a claimant sustains bodily injury during the period of the policy.

The Court is mindful of the South Carolina Supreme Court’s decision in *Crossman Communities of N.C., Inc. v. Harleysville Mut. Ins. Co.*, 395 S.C. 40, 717 S.E.2d 589 (2011), and notes that it speaks generally to allocation of loss in a continuous injury situation such as asbestos-related disease but does not

address the particular circumstances presented by this Receivership, *i.e.*, the applicability of operations coverage and the impracticability of allocation of loss to Covil itself. Therefore, the Court will apply the rule of *Crossman Communities of N.C., Inc.* except in the case of operations claims where the policies in effect during the conduct of the operations will apply on an “all sums” basis. The Court also interprets *Crossman* such that allocation of loss will not be made to policy years when Covil does not have any available or responsive coverage.

Finally, each individual insurer will nevertheless be protected fully against the possibility that it paid too much on a single asbestos claim by its right to seek contribution from any other insurer, but not from Covil, whose policy also was triggered by the asbestos suit. This approach “ensures that [Covil] is indemnified by one [or more] insurer for the full extent of the loss up to the policy’s limits, but apportions liability among all insurers whose policies were triggered by the claimant’s asbestos-related bodily injury.” *Armstrong*, 45 Cal. App. 4th at 55.

This Court further finds that no aggregate limit of liability for product liability or completed operations claims has been or can be proven, and therefore no aggregate limit for product liability or completed operations claims exists, for the following Covil insurance policies:

<u>Policy Period</u>	<u>Insurer</u>	<u>Policy Number</u>
April 21, 1964 – April 21, 1965	Hardware Mutual Casualty Co.	39 04132 02 01
April 21, 1965 – April 1, 1966	Hardware Mutual Casualty Co.	39 04132 02 01
April 21 1966 – March 31, 1967	Hardware Mutual Casualty Co.	39 04132 02
March 31, 1967 – March 31, 1968	Hardware Mutual Casualty Co./Sentry	39 04132 07
March 31, 1968 – March 31, 1969	Hardware Mutual Casualty Co./Sentry	39 04132 07
March 31, 1969 - March 31, 1970	Hardware Mutual Casualty Co./Sentry	39 04132 07
March 31, 1974 – March 31, 1975	Maryland Casualty Company	41-206393
March 31, 1975 – March 31, 1976	Maryland Casualty Company	41-206393

March 31, 1976 – March 31, 1977	USF&G	SMP 490049
March 31, 1977 – March 31, 1978	USF&G	SMP 490049

This Court further orders that this Order be forwarded to the South Carolina Attorney General and to the South Carolina Department of Insurance for their consideration and further action, as they may deem appropriate.

AND IT SO ORDERED this 8 day of January, 2020.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jean H. Toal, Chief Justice of the Supreme  
Court, Retired, acting as Circuit Court Judge

Columbia, South Carolina.



York Common Pleas

**Case Caption:** Charlotte Gaye Smith , plaintiff, et al VS CBS Corporation ,  
defendant, et al  
**Case Number:** 2015CP4602155  
**Type:** Order/Other

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Jean H. Toal #2758