

An unpublished opinion of the North Carolina Court of Appeals does not constitute controlling legal authority. Citation is disfavored, but may be permitted in accordance with the provisions of Rule 30(e)(3) of the North Carolina Rules of Appellate Procedure.

NO. COA01-1144

NORTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS

Filed: 4 June 2002

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

v.

Hertford County  
Nos. 00CRS002886, 003636

ALVIN TYRONE HARRELL

Appeal by defendant from judgments entered 13 February 2001 by Judge Frank Brown in Hertford County Superior Court. Heard in the Court of Appeals 28 May 2002.

*Attorney General Roy A. Cooper, III, by Assistant Attorney General Kathleen M. Waylett, for the State.*

*Charles A. Moore for defendant-appellant.*

HUNTER, Judge.

Defendant was convicted of felony conspiracy and accessory after the fact to robbery with a firearm. The trial court sentenced him to consecutive prison terms totaling forty-one to fifty-nine months. Defendant gave timely notice of appeal. We find no error.

Counsel appointed to represent defendant on appeal has filed an *Anders* brief indicating that he is unable to identify an issue with sufficient merit to support a meaningful argument for relief on appeal. He asks that this Court conduct its own review of the

record for possible prejudicial error. Counsel has filed documentation with the Court showing that he has complied with the requirements of *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 18 L. Ed. 2d 493 (1967), and *State v. Kinch*, 314 N.C. 99, 331 S.E.2d 665 (1985), by advising defendant of his right to file written arguments with the Court and providing him with a copy of the documents pertinent to his appeal. Defendant has filed a letter with this Court maintaining his innocence and offering the names of several persons willing to vouch for his good character. We find nothing in defendant's letter that would constitute a cognizable ground for relief on appeal.

In accordance with *Anders*, we have fully examined the record to determine whether any issues of arguable merit appear therefrom and whether the appeal is wholly frivolous. We conclude the appeal is frivolous and find no error.

No error.

Judges MARTIN and BRYANT concur.

Report per Rule 30(e).