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.
Billy Leon Alford, Appellant.
Appellate Case No. 2014-001202
Appeal From Horry County Edward B. Cottingham, Circuit Court Judge
Unpublished Opinion No. 2016-UP-364 Submitted May 1, 2016 – Filed July 20, 2016
AFFIRMED

Appellate Defender LaNelle Cantey DuRant, of Columbia, for Appellant.

Attorney General Alan McCrory Wilson and Assistant Attorney General Mark Reynolds Farthing, both of Columbia; and Solicitor Jimmy A. Richardson, II, of Conway, for Respondent.

PER CURIAM: Affirmed pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following authorities: *State v. Warren*, 392 S.C. 235, 237, 708 S.E.2d 234, 235 (Ct. App.

2011) ("In criminal cases, the appellate court reviews only errors of law and is bound by the factual findings of the trial court unless the findings are clearly erroneous."); *State v. Zulfer*, 345 S.C. 258, 261, 547 S.E.2d 885, 886 (Ct. App. 2001) ("A basic rule of statutory construction, which is equally applicable to criminal and civil statutes alike, is that a court must ascertain and give effect to the legislature's intention as expressed in the statute."); *id.* at 261-62, 547 S.E.2d at 886 ("In construing a statute, a court cannot read into the statute something not within the manifest intention of the legislature as gathered from the statute itself."); *State v. Bolin*, 378 S.C. 96, 100, 662 S.E.2d 38, 40 (2008) ("[T]he words must be given their plain and ordinary meaning without resorting to subtle or forced construction which limit or expand the statute's operation." (quoting *Strickland v. Strickland*, 375 S.C. 76, 88-89, 650 S.E.2d 465, 472 (2007))); *In re Ronnie A.*, 355 S.C. 407, 409, 585 S.E.2d 311, 312 (2003) ("The intent of the legislature in enacting the sex offender registry law is to protect the public from those offenders who may reoffend.").

AFFIRMED.¹

LOCKEMY, C.J., and WILLIAMS and MCDONALD, JJ., concur.

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