

**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.

Stanley Wright, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2013-002090

Appeal From Beaufort County
Maité Murphy, Circuit Court Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2017-UP-224
Submitted March 1, 2017 – Filed May 24, 2017

AFFIRMED

Valerie Vanessa Vie and Sonya R. Chachere-Compton,
both of Douglasville, Georgia; and Calvin Andrew
Carroll, of Carroll Law Firm, LLC, of Charleston, all for
Appellant.

Attorney General Alan McCrory Wilson and Assistant
Attorney General William M. Blicht, Jr., both of
Columbia; and Solicitor Isaac McDuffie Stone, III, of
Bluffton, all for Respondent.

PER CURIAM: Affirmed 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) ("In order for an issue to be preserved for appellate review, it must have been raised to and ruled upon by the trial [court]. Issues not raised and ruled upon in the trial court will not be considered on appeal."); *State v. Schumpert*, 312 S.C. 502, 507, 435 S.E.2d 859, 862 (1993) ("A ruling in limine is not a final ruling on the admissibility of evidence."); *id.* ("Unless an objection is made at the time the evidence is offered and a final ruling made, the issue is not preserved for review."); *State v. Burton*, 326 S.C. 605, 613, 486 S.E.2d 762, 766 (Ct. App. 1997) (holding a ruling made during an in camera hearing to determine the admissibility of the victim's sister's testimony was not sufficient to preserve the issue when, after the in camera hearing, testimony was given by two other witnesses, a break was taken, and then the victim's sister testified without objection).

AFFIRMED.¹

WILLIAMS and KONDUROS, JJ., and LEE, A.J., concur.

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