

**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.

Nathaniel Glenn, Jr., Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2013-000919

Appeal From Greenville County
Letitia H. Verdin, Circuit Court Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2015-UP-105
Submitted January 1, 2015 – Filed March 4, 2015

AFFIRMED

Nathaniel Glenn, Jr., pro se.

Attorney General Alan McCrory Wilson and Assistant
Attorney General Christina Catoe Bigelow, both of
Columbia, for Respondent.

PER CURIAM: Glenn appeals the trial court's denial of his Rule 29(b),
SCRCrimP, motion for a new trial, arguing the trial court erred in (1) denying his

motion without holding an evidentiary hearing and (2) not granting a new trial based upon after-discovered evidence and a *Brady*¹ violation. We affirm.

1. The trial court did not err in denying Glenn's motion without holding an evidentiary hearing. *See* Rule 29(a), SCRCrimP (providing the trial court may, in its discretion, determine a motion for a new trial on the briefs of the parties without oral argument).

2. Because the issues of whether the trial court erred in not granting a new trial based upon after-discovered evidence and a *Brady* violation were not raised in Glenn's amended motion, these issues are not preserved. *See Miller v. State*, 388 S.C. 347, 347, 697 S.E.2d 527, 527 (2010) ("Since there is no right to 'hybrid representation' that is partially *pro se* and partially by counsel, substantive documents, with the exception of motions to relieve counsel, filed *pro se* by a person represented by counsel are not to be accepted unless submitted by counsel."); *State v. Dunbar*, 356 S.C. 138, 142, 587 S.E.2d 691, 693-94 (2003) ("In order for an issue to be preserved for appellate review, it must have been raised to and ruled upon by the trial judge. Issues not raised and ruled upon in the trial court will not be considered on appeal.").

AFFIRMED.²

HUFF, SHORT, and KONDUROS, JJ., concur.

¹ *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83 (1963).

² We decide this case without oral argument pursuant to Rule 215, SCACR.