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

Billy Wayne McIntosh, Appellant,
V.
State of South Carolina, Respondent.
Appellate Case No. 2020-000741
Appeal From Lexington County Alison Renee Lee, Circuit Court Judge
Unpublished Opinion No. 2022-UP-262 Submitted May 1, 2022 – Filed June 15, 2022
AFFIRMED
Rilly Wayne McIntosh, pro se

Billy Wayne McIntosh, pro se.

Attorney General Alan McCrory Wilson, Chief Deputy Attorney General W. Jeffrey Young, Assistant Attorney General Harley Littleton Kirkland, Assistant Attorney General Leon David Leggett, III, all of Columbia, for Respondent.

PER CURIAM: Billy Wayne McIntosh appeals a circuit court order declaring his 1977 kidnapping conviction required him to register as a sex offender pursuant to

section 23-3-430(C)(15) of the South Carolina Code (Supp. 2021). McIntosh argues the retroactive application of section 23-3-430(C)(15) violated his rights to equal protection and due process of law. We affirm.

The order on appeal included no rulings regarding the effect of the retroactive application of the statute on McIntosh's constitutional rights, and McIntosh did not move to alter or amend the order for rulings on these issues. Therefore, we hold McIntosh failed to preserve these issues for appellate review and affirm the appealed order pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following authorities: *Wilder Corp. v. Wilke*, 330 S.C. 71, 76, 497 S.E.2d 731, 733 (1998) ("It is axiomatic that an issue cannot be raised for the first time on appeal, but must have been raised to and ruled upon by the trial judge to be preserved for appellate review."); *Elam v. S.C. Dep't of Transp.*, 361 S.C. 9, 24, 602 S.E.2d 772, 780 (2004) ("A party *must* file [a motion pursuant to Rule 59(e), SCRCP] when an issue or argument has been raised, but not ruled on, in order to preserve it for appellate review.").

AFFIRMED.¹

THOMAS, MCDONALD, and HEWITT, JJ., concur.

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