

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

KEVIN J. ROBERTS,	§
	§
Defendant Below-	§ No. 229, 2006
Appellant,	§
	§
v.	§ Court Below—Superior Court
	§ of the State of Delaware,
STATE OF DELAWARE,	§ in and for New Castle County
	§ Cr. ID 0511010359
Plaintiff Below-	§
Appellee.	§

Submitted: September 25, 2006

Decided: October 2, 2006

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

ORDER

This second day of October 2006, 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, Kevin J. Roberts (Roberts), was convicted, following a bench trial, of one count of second degree forgery and one count of theft. The Superior Court sentenced Roberts to a total period of two years at Level V incarceration to be suspended immediately for concurrent periods of probation. This is Roberts' direct appeal.

(2) Roberts' counsel on appeal has filed a brief and a motion to withdraw pursuant to Rule 26(c). Roberts' counsel asserts that, based upon

a complete and careful examination of the record, there are no arguably appealable issues. By letter, Roberts' attorney informed him of the provisions of Rule 26(c) and provided Roberts with a copy of the motion to withdraw and the accompanying brief. Roberts also was informed of his right to supplement his attorney's presentation. Roberts has not raised any issues for this Court's consideration. The State has responded to the position taken by Roberts' 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.*

(4) This Court has reviewed the record carefully and has concluded that Roberts' appeal is wholly without merit and devoid of any arguably appealable issue. We also are satisfied that Roberts' counsel has made a

**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).

conscientious effort to examine the record and the law and has properly determined that Roberts 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