

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

JEFFREY BRANNON,	§
	§
Defendant Below-	§ No. 495, 2004
Appellant,	§
	§
v.	§ Court Below—Superior Court
	§ of the State of Delaware,
STATE OF DELAWARE,	§ in and for New Castle County
	§ Cr. ID 0303004118
Plaintiff Below-	§
Appellee.	§

Submitted: June 2, 2005
Decided: June 14, 2005

Before **STEELE**, Chief Justice, **HOLLAND** and **BERGER**, Justices.

ORDER

This 14th day of June 2005, upon consideration of the appellant's Supreme Court Rule 26(c) brief, his attorney's motion to withdraw, and the State's response thereto, it appears to the Court that:

(1) The defendant-appellant, Jeffrey Brannon, was convicted by a Superior Court judge of one misdemeanor charge of theft of services. The Superior Court sentenced Brannon immediately to one year at Level V imprisonment suspended entirely for one year of probation and a \$200 fine. This is Brannon's direct appeal.

(2) Brannon's counsel on appeal has filed a brief and a motion to withdraw pursuant to Rule 26(c). Brannon's counsel asserts that, based upon a complete and careful examination of the record, there are no arguably appealable issues. By letter, Brannon's attorney informed him of the provisions of Rule 26(c) and provided Brannon with a copy of the motion to withdraw and the accompanying brief. Brannon also was informed of his right to supplement his attorney's presentation. Brannon has not raised any issues for this Court's consideration. The State has responded to the position taken by Brannon's counsel and has moved to affirm the Superior Court's judgment.

(3) The standard and scope of review applicable to the consideration of a motion to withdraw and an accompanying brief under Rule 26(c) is twofold: (a) this Court must be satisfied that defense counsel has made a conscientious examination of the record and the law for arguable claims; and (b) this Court must conduct its own review of the record and determine whether the appeal is so totally devoid of at least arguably appealable issues that it can be decided without an adversary presentation.*

* *Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 83 (1988); *McCoy v. Court of Appeals of Wisconsin*, 486 U.S. 429, 442 (1988); *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 744 (1967).

(4) This Court has reviewed the record carefully and has concluded that Brannon's appeal is wholly without merit and devoid of any arguably appealable issue. We also are satisfied that Brannon's counsel has made a conscientious effort to examine the record and the law and has properly determined that Brannon could not raise a meritorious claim in this appeal.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the State's motion to affirm is GRANTED. The judgment of the Superior Court is AFFIRMED. The motion to withdraw is moot.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Randy J. Holland
Justice