

**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.

Roderquiz Rozelle Cook, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2013-000819

Appeal From Lexington County
Lee S. Alford, Circuit Court Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2015-UP-270
Heard April 15, 2015 – Filed June 3, 2015

AFFIRMED

Erica Bedenbaugh McElreath, of Lawton Law Firm,
LLC, of Mount Pleasant, and Chief Appellate Defender
Robert Michael Dudek, of Columbia, both for Appellant.

Attorney General Alan McCrory Wilson, Chief Deputy
Attorney General John W. McIntosh, and Senior
Assistant Deputy Attorney General Donald J. Zelenka;
all of Columbia, and Solicitor Donald V. Myers, of
Lexington, for Respondent.

PER CURIAM: Roderquiz Rozelle Cook appeals his convictions for murder, attempted armed robbery, and conspiracy to commit armed robbery, arguing he was deprived of a fair trial because the State failed to promptly disclose four pieces of evidence in violation of the *Brady v. Maryland*¹ disclosure rule and Rule 5, SCRCrimP. We affirm pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following authorities: *State v. Dunbar*, 356 S.C. 138, 142, 587 S.E.2d 691, 693–94 (2003) ("[F]or an issue to be preserved for appellate review, it must have been raised to and ruled upon by the [circuit court]. Issues not raised and ruled upon in the [circuit] court will not be considered on appeal." (citation omitted)); *State v. Whipple*, 324 S.C. 43, 51, 476 S.E.2d 683, 687 (1996) (finding a defendant "waived any right to complain" of inadequate time to review newly produced materials after the circuit court granted a delay and the defendant sought no further time, expressly conceded he was ready to proceed, and "proceed[ed] to trial without further objection" (citations omitted)).

AFFIRMED.

FEW, C.J., and HUFF and WILLIAMS, JJ., concur.

¹ 371 U.S. 812 (1962).