

**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.

David Oneil Vincent, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2017-001744

Appeal From Kershaw County
Clifton Newman, Circuit Court Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2020-UP-073
Submitted February 1, 2020 – Filed March 11, 2020

AFFIRMED

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

Attorney General Alan McCrory Wilson, Deputy
Attorney General Donald J. Zelenka, and Heather Savitz
Weiss, all of Columbia, for Respondent.

PER CURIAM: David Oneil Vincent appeals his conviction of assault and battery in the second degree. On appeal, Vincent argues the trial court erred by admitting a statement he made about being at the scene of the alleged crime to law enforcement when he was in custody, but had not yet been advised of his

constitutional rights. However, this issue is not preserved for appellate review because Vincent did not object to the statement being admitted at trial. Accordingly, we affirm pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following authorities: *State v. Thomason*, 355 S.C. 278, 288, 584 S.E.2d 143, 148 (2003) ("For an appellate court to review an issue, a contemporaneous objection at the trial level is required."); *State v. Atieh*, 397 S.C. 641, 646, 725 S.E.2d 730, 733 (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.").

AFFIRMED.¹

WILLIAMS, KONDUROS, and HILL, JJ., concur.

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