

**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.

Joseph C. Sun, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2011-200406

Appeal From Jasper County
Michael G. Nettles, Circuit Court Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2014-UP-029
Submitted October 1, 2013 – Filed January 22, 2014

AFFIRMED

Joseph C. Sun, of Bluffton, pro se.

Solicitor Darrell T. Johnson, Jr., of Hardeeville, for
Respondent.

PER CURIAM: Affirmed pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following
authorities:

1. As to whether the circuit court erred in overlooking Joseph C. Sun's response to the magistrates court's return: *State v. Dunbar*, 356 S.C. 138, 142, 587 S.E.2d 691, 693-94 (2003) (stating the circuit court must rule on an issue in order for it to be

preserved for appellate review); *State v. Policao*, 402 S.C. 547, 556, 741 S.E.2d 774, 778 (Ct. App. 2013) (recognizing an appellate court will not review arguments raised for the first time on appeal); *City of Rock Hill v. Suchenski*, 374 S.C. 12, 16, 646 S.E.2d 879, 880 (2007) (holding when the circuit court did not rule on an issue in its final order and the party did not make a post-judgment motion for a ruling, the issue was unpreserved).

2. As to whether the circuit court erred in determining the magistrates court provided Sun sufficient notice of the bench trial: *Van Blarcum v. City of N. Myrtle Beach*, 337 S.C. 446, 453, 523 S.E.2d 486, 490 (Ct. App. 1999) (stating a reviewing court cannot address an issue on which there is an implicit rather than explicit ruling); *State v. Bruce*, 402 S.C. 621, 625, 741 S.E.2d 590, 592 (Ct. App. 2013) ("Unless the [circuit] court makes sufficiently specific factual findings on the record, this court has no basis on which to review those findings or the [circuit] court's legal conclusions."); *State v. Blackwell-Selim*, 392 S.C. 1, 4, 707 S.E.2d 426, 428 (2011) (holding because the circuit court failed to make specific findings of fact to support its ruling, "there was nothing for the [c]ourt of [a]ppeals to review").

AFFIRMED.¹

FEW, C.J., and PIEPER and KONDUROS, JJ., concur.

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