

2013 AUG -5 AM 9:47

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE OF WASHINGTON,)	
)	No. 68379-9-1
Respondent,)	
)	
v.)	DIVISION ONE
)	
THOMAS WILLIAMS,)	UNPUBLISHED OPINION
)	
Appellant.)	FILED: AUG 5 2013

PER CURIAM. Thomas Williams appeals the trial court's order imposing substance abuse treatment as a condition of sentence and denying his motion to appoint new counsel. Williams's court-appointed attorney has filed a motion to withdraw on the ground that there is no basis for a good faith argument on review. Pursuant to State v. Theobald, 78 Wn.2d 184, 470 P.2d 188 (1970), and Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738, 87 S. Ct. 1396, 18 L. Ed. 2d 493 (1967), the motion to withdraw must:

[1] be accompanied by a brief referring to anything in the record that might arguably support the appeal. [2] A copy of counsel's brief should be furnished the indigent and [3] time allowed him to raise any points that he chooses; [4] the court--not counsel--then proceeds, after a full examination of all the proceedings, to decide whether the case is wholly frivolous.

State v. Theobald, 78 Wn.2d at 185 (quoting Anders v. California, 386 U.S. at 744).

This procedure has been followed. Williams's counsel on appeal filed a brief with the motion to withdraw. Williams was served with a copy of the brief and

No. 68379-9-1/2

informed of the right to file a statement of additional grounds for review. Williams filed a statement of additional grounds for review.

The facts are accurately set forth in counsel's brief in support of the motion to withdraw. The court has reviewed the briefs filed in this court and has independently reviewed the entire record. The court specifically considered the following potential issue raised by counsel:

Whether sufficient evidence supports the sentencing court's finding that chemical dependency contributed to the crime?

The court also raised and considered the following potential issue:


Whether the trial court abused its discretion in denying Williams' motion to appoint new counsel?


Williams, pro se, also raised following potential issue:

Whether there was a breach of Williams' plea agreement?

The potential issues are wholly frivolous. Counsel's motion to withdraw is granted and the appeal is dismissed.

For the court:





COX, J.
