

**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.

Ray Charles Warren, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2013-002251

---

Appeal From Greenville County  
Robin B. Stilwell, Circuit Court Judge

---

Unpublished Opinion No. 2015-UP-349  
Submitted March 1, 2015 – Filed July 15, 2015

---

**AFFIRMED**

---

Appellate Defender Lara Mary Caudy, of Columbia, for  
Appellant.

Attorney General Alan McCrory Wilson and Assistant  
Attorney General Christina Catoe Bigelow, both of  
Columbia; and Solicitor William Walter Wilkins, III, of  
Greenville, for Respondent.

---

**PER CURIAM:** Affirmed pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following  
authorities: *State v. Forrester*, 343 S.C. 637, 642, 541 S.E.2d 837, 840 (2001) ("In

most cases, [m]aking a motion *in limine* to exclude evidence at the beginning of trial does not preserve an issue for review because a motion *in limine* is not a final determination. The moving party, therefore, must make a contemporaneous objection when the evidence is introduced." (alteration in original) (internal quotation marks omitted)); *State v. Dicapua*, 373 S.C. 452, 455, 646 S.E.2d 150, 152 (Ct. App. 2007) (holding when a party affirmatively states it has no objection to evidence being admitted at trial, it has waived any previous objections made in a pretrial motion), *aff'd*, 383 S.C. 394, 680 S.E.2d 292 (2009); *State v. Norris*, 253 S.C. 31, 40, 168 S.E.2d 564, 568 (1969) (holding an objection "came too late because it was made after the objectionable evidence had been admitted").

**AFFIRMED.**<sup>1</sup>

**FEW, C.J., and HUFF and WILLIAMS, JJ., concur.**

---

<sup>1</sup> We decide this case without oral argument pursuant to Rule 215, SCACR.