

**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.

Keith Gadsden, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2012-211729

Appeal From Charleston County
Roger M. Young, Sr., Circuit Court Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2014-UP-016
Submitted December 1, 2013 – Filed January 15, 2014

AFFIRMED

Appellate Defender Susan Barber Hackett, of Columbia,
for Appellant.

Attorney General Alan McCrory Wilson and Assistant
Attorney General William M. Blicht, Jr., both of
Columbia, for Respondent.

PER CURIAM: Affirmed pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following
authorities: *State v. Hoffman*, 312 S.C. 386, 393, 440 S.E.2d 869, 873 (1994) ("A
contemporaneous objection is required to properly preserve an error for appellate

review."); *State v. Kromah*, 401 S.C. 340, 353, 737 S.E.2d 490, 496 (2013) ("Generally, a motion *in limine* is not a final determination; a contemporaneous objection must be made when the evidence is introduced."); *id.* at 353, 737 S.E.2d at 497 ("There is an exception to this general rule when a ruling on the motion *in limine* is made immediately prior to the introduction of the evidence in question." (internal quotation marks and citation omitted)); *id.* ("This exception is based on the fact that when the trial court's ruling is not preliminary, but instead is clearly a final ruling, there is no need to renew the objection."); *id.* at 352-53, 737 S.E.2d at 496 (holding an issue concerning the admissibility of an expert's testimony was preserved despite the lack of a contemporaneous objection because the expert's testimony immediately followed the trial court's *in limine* ruling and there was *no intervening testimony* between the ruling and the testimony).

AFFIRMED.¹

HUFF, GEATHERS, and LOCKEMY, JJ., concur.

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