

**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.

Antonio Collins, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2013-002343

Appeal From Beaufort County
J. Ernest Kinard, Jr., Circuit Court Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2017-UP-151
Submitted March 3, 2017 – Filed April 5, 2017

AFFIRMED

M. Rita Metts, of Metts Law Firm, and Chief Appellate
Defender Robert M. Dudek, both of Columbia, for
Appellant.

Attorney General Alan McCrory Wilson and Assistant
Attorney General J. Anthony Mabry, both of Columbia;
and Solicitor Isaac McDuffie Stone, III, of Bluffton, all
for Respondent.

PER CURIAM: Antonio Collins appeals his convictions for murder, burglary in
the first degree, and possession of a weapon during the commission of a violent

crime. Collins argues there was no probable cause for his arrest and the circuit court erred in admitting DNA evidence. We affirm pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following authorities: *State v. Lindsey*, 394 S.C. 354, 363, 714 S.E.2d 554, 558 (Ct. App. 2011) ("An issue is deemed abandoned and will not be considered on appeal if the argument is raised in a brief but not supported by authority."); *State v. Dunbar*, 356 S.C. 138, 142, 587 S.E.2d 691, 693 (2003) ("In order for an issue to be preserved for appellate review, it must have been raised to and ruled upon by the trial [court]."); *State v. Hughes*, 336 S.C. 585, 591, 521 S.E.2d 500, 503 (1999) (holding an in limine ruling is not final and does not preserve an issue for appeal); *State v. Torrence*, 305 S.C. 45, 51, 406 S.E.2d 315, 319 (1991) (holding a contemporaneous objection is required to properly preserve an error for appellate review); *State v. Byers*, 392 S.C. 438, 444, 710 S.E.2d 55, 58 (2011) (holding that for an objection to be timely, it must be made at the time the evidence is presented).

AFFIRMED.¹

LOCKEMY, C.J., and HUFF and THOMAS, JJ., concur.

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