

**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**

Unifund CCR, LLC, Respondent,

v.

Shonda L. Wade, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2021-000142

Appeal From Abbeville County
Donald B. Hocker, Circuit Court Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2023-UP-231
Submitted May 1, 2023 – Filed June 7, 2023

AFFIRMED

Shonda L. Wade, of Due West, pro se.

Wesley D. Dail, of Sessoms & Rogers, P.A., of Durham,
North Carolina, for Respondent.

PER CURIAM: Shonda L. Wade appeals an order from the circuit court granting summary judgment to Unifund CCR, LLC (Unifund). On appeal, Wade argues the circuit court erred by (1) not affording her a "fair" hearing or trial, thus triggering the Due Process clauses under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments and (2) granting summary judgment because there existed questions of fact. We affirm pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following authorities: *Wilder Corp. v.*

Wilke, 330 S.C. 71, 76, 497 S.E.2d 731, 733 (1998) ("It is axiomatic that an issue cannot be raised for the first time on appeal, but must have been raised to and ruled upon by the trial judge to be preserved for appellate review."); *I'On, L.L.C. v. Town of Mt. Pleasant*, 338 S.C. 406, 422, 526 S.E.2d 716, 724 (2000) ("The losing party must first try to convince the [circuit] court it [] has ruled wrongly and then, if that effort fails, convince the appellate court that the [circuit] court erred."); *Doe v. Doe*, 370 S.C. 206, 212, 634 S.E.2d 51, 55 (Ct. App. 2006) ("[W]hen an appellant neither raises an issue at trial nor through a Rule 59(e), SCRCF, motion, the issue is not preserved for appellate review."); *Food Mart v. S.C. Dep't of Health & Env't Control*, 322 S.C. 232, 233, 471 S.E.2d 688, 688 (1996) (standing for the proposition that appellate review of an issue is barred when the issue was not raised or ruled on by the circuit court).

AFFIRMED.¹

KONDUROS and VINSON, JJ., and LOCKEMY, A.J., concur.

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