

**THIS OPINION HAS NO PRECEDENTIAL VALUE. IT SHOULD NOT BE
CITED OR RELIED ON AS PRECEDENT IN ANY PROCEEDING
EXCEPT AS PROVIDED BY RULE 268(d)(2), SCACR.**

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

The State, Respondent,

v.

Markese Christopher Wilson, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2020-001425

Appeal From Lexington County
Eugene C. Griffith, Jr., Circuit Court Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2023-UP-169
Submitted April 1, 2023 – Filed May 3, 2023

AFFIRMED

Appellate Defender Sarah Elizabeth Shipe, of Columbia,
for Appellant.

Attorney General Alan McCrory Wilson, Senior
Assistant Deputy Attorney General William M. Blich,
Jr., both of Columbia; and Solicitor Samuel R. Hubbard,
III, of Lexington, all for Respondent.

PER CURIAM: Markese Christopher Wilson appeals his convictions for first-degree burglary, armed robbery, kidnapping, safecracking, and possession of a weapon during the commission of a violent crime and his aggregate sentence of

thirty-five years' imprisonment. On appeal, Wilson argues the trial court should have declared a mistrial because the State elicited improper character evidence and failed to present competent evidence of his guilt. We affirm pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR.

Although defense counsel immediately moved for a mistrial when a witness disclosed that Wilson was previously incarcerated, counsel accepted the trial court's proposed curative instruction and failed to renew his motion for a mistrial or otherwise object to the instruction when the court issued it to the jury. Therefore, we hold this issue was not preserved for appellate review. *See State v. George*, 323 S.C. 496, 510, 476 S.E.2d 903, 912 (1996) ("No issue is preserved for appellate review if the objecting party accepts the [trial court's] ruling and does not contemporaneously make an additional objection to the sufficiency of the curative charge or move for a mistrial."); *State v. Patterson*, 337 S.C. 215, 226, 522 S.E.2d 845, 850 (Ct. App. 1999) ("Because a trial court's curative instruction is considered to cure any error regarding improper testimony, a party must contemporaneously object to a curative instruction as insufficient *or* move for a mistrial to preserve an issue for review.").

AFFIRMED.¹

THOMAS, MCDONALD, and HEWITT, JJ., concur.

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