

**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.

Kalvin Ropel Brown, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2016-000529

Appeal From York County
Perry H. Gravely, Circuit Court Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2019-UP-014
Submitted November 1, 2018 – Filed January 9, 2019

AFFIRMED

Appellate Defender Taylor Davis Gilliam, of Columbia,
for Appellant.

Attorney General Alan McCrory Wilson and Assistant
Attorney General William Frederick Schumacher, IV,
both of Columbia; and Solicitor Kevin Scott Brackett, of
York, all for Respondent.

PER CURIAM: Affirmed pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following
authorities: *State v. Govan*, 372 S.C. 552, 557, 643 S.E.2d 92, 94 (Ct. App. 2007)
("[A] motion *in limine* to exclude evidence made at the beginning of trial does not

preserve the issue for appellate review because a motion *in limine* is not a final determination."); *State v. Atieh*, 397 S.C. 641, 646, 725 S.E.2d 730, 733 (Ct. App. 2012) ("A ruling in limine is not final; unless an objection is made at the time the evidence is offered and a final ruling procured, the issue is not preserved for review."); *State v. Dicapua*, 373 S.C. 452, 455, 646 S.E.2d 150, 152 (Ct. App. 2007) (holding counsel's statement to the trial court that he had "no objection" to the introduction of evidence, even though he previously made a motion to exclude the evidence, waived any issue with admission of that evidence).

AFFIRMED.¹

LOCKEMY, C.J., and THOMAS and GEATHERS, JJ., concur.

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