

**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.

Keith Gadsden, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2012-211729

---

Appeal From Charleston County  
Roger M. Young, Sr., Circuit Court Judge

---

Unpublished Opinion No. 2014-UP-016  
Submitted December 1, 2013 – Filed January 15, 2014

---

**AFFIRMED**

---

Appellate Defender Susan Barber Hackett, of Columbia,  
for Appellant.

Attorney General Alan McCrory Wilson and Assistant  
Attorney General William M. Blich, Jr., both of  
Columbia, for Respondent.

---

**PER CURIAM:** Affirmed pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following  
authorities: *State v. Hoffman*, 312 S.C. 386, 393, 440 S.E.2d 869, 873 (1994) ("A  
contemporaneous objection is required to properly preserve an error for appellate  
review."); *State v. Kromah*, 401 S.C. 340, 353, 737 S.E.2d 490, 496 (2013)

("Generally, a motion *in limine* is not a final determination; a contemporaneous objection must be made when the evidence is introduced."); *id.* at 353, 737 S.E.2d at 497 ("There is an exception to this general rule when a ruling on the motion *in limine* is made immediately prior to the introduction of the evidence in question." (internal quotation marks and citation omitted)); *id.* ("This exception is based on the fact that when the trial court's ruling is not preliminary, but instead is clearly a final ruling, there is no need to renew the objection."); *id.* at 352-53, 737 S.E.2d at 496 (holding an issue concerning the admissibility of an expert's testimony was preserved despite the lack of a contemporaneous objection because the expert's testimony immediately followed the trial court's *in limine* ruling and there was *no intervening testimony* between the ruling and the testimony).

**AFFIRMED.**<sup>1</sup>

**HUFF, GEATHERS, and LOCKEMY, JJ., concur.**

---

<sup>1</sup> We decide this case without oral argument pursuant to Rule 215, SCACR.