

[Cite as *State v. Goode*, 2003-Ohio-2960.]

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS FOR MONTGOMERY COUNTY, OHIO

STATE OF OHIO	:	
	:	
Plaintiff-Appellee	:	C.A. CASE NO. 19274
v.	:	T.C. NO. 01 CR 2005
CORWIN M. GOODE	:	(Criminal Appeal from Common Pleas Court)
	:	Defendant-Appellant
	:	
	:	

.....

OPINION

Rendered on the 6th day of June, 2003.

.....

KIRSTEN A. BRANDT, Atty. Reg. No. 0070162, Assistant Prosecuting Attorney, 301 W. Third Street, 5th Floor, Dayton, Ohio 45422
Attorney for Plaintiff-Appellee

JAY A. ADAMS, Atty. Reg. No. 0072135, 2310 Far Hills Ave., Suite 5, Dayton, Ohio 45419
Attorney for Defendant-Appellant

CORWIN M. GOODE, #A428-978, Noble Correctional Institute, P. O. Box 278, Caldwell, Ohio 43724-0278
Defendant-Appellant

.....

WOLFF, J.

{¶1} On March 20, 2002, the trial court sentenced Corwin Michael Goode to a

sentence of six months incarceration, the minimum sentence, upon his plea of guilty to possession of crack cocaine, a fifth degree felony. This sentence was imposed in Montgomery County Court of Common Pleas Case No. 2001 CR 2005. This appeal is confined to the judgment entered in Case No. 2001 CR 2005 on March 21, 2002.

{¶2} At the same time, the trial court sentenced Goode to consecutive sentences totaling seven years in Common Pleas Court Case No. 2001 CR 1042. The judgment in that case is also the subject of a separate appeal in Case No. CA 19273. The six-month sentence imposed in Case No. 2001 CR 2005 was made concurrent with the seven-year aggregate sentence imposed in Case No. 2001 CR 1042.

{¶3} In Case No. 2001 CR 2005, which is the subject of this appeal, Goode entered a plea of guilty to the charge of fifth degree possession of crack cocaine after his motion to suppress was overruled by the trial court. A notice of appeal was filed from the judgment entered in this case and counsel was appointed to represent the appellant.

{¶4} On March 17, 2003, appointed appellate counsel filed an *Anders* brief pursuant to *Anders v. California* (1967), 386 U.S. 738, wherein he represented that after review of the record in this case, he could find no potentially meritorious appellate issues to advance on appeal. On March 19, 2003, we filed a decision and entry, a copy of which was served upon Goode, wherein we indicated that appointed appellate counsel had filed an *Anders* brief and the significance of an *Anders* brief. In that decision and entry, we invited the defendant to file a pro se brief within sixty days assigning any errors for review. We have had no response to this decision and entry.

{¶5} Pursuant to our obligation under *Anders* to independently review the

record in this case, we have made a thorough examination of the record and conclude, as did appointed appellate counsel, that in this case, stemming from Montgomery County Common Pleas Court Case No. 2001 CR 2005, there are no potentially meritorious appellate issues to advance. Accordingly, the judgment in this case will be affirmed.

.....

FAIN, P.J. and YOUNG, J., concur.

Copies mailed to:

- Kirsten A. Brandt
- Jay A. Adams
- Corwin M. Goode
- Hon. Michael T. Hall