

An unpublished opinion of the North Carolina Court of Appeals does not constitute controlling legal authority.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. COA01-665

NORTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS

Filed: 19 March 2002

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

v.

Wayne County  
No. 99 CRS 53487

DIDYMUS JAMAR PEARSALL,  
Defendant

Appeal from judgment entered 25 May 2000 by Judge Benjamin G. Alford in Wayne County Superior Court. Heard in the Court of Appeals 18 February 2002.

*Attorney General Roy Cooper, by Assistant Attorney General Donna B. Wojcik, for the State.*

*MacQueen & Turnage, LLP, by Kevin F. MacQueen for defendant-appellant.*

EAGLES, Chief Judge.

At trial the jury returned a verdict finding Didymus Jamar Pearsall ("defendant") guilty of possession of a firearm by a convicted felon. The trial court sentenced defendant in the presumptive range to a minimum term of imprisonment of fourteen months and a maximum term of seventeen months. Defendant appeals.

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, *reh'g denied*, 388 U.S. 924, 18 L. Ed. 2d 1377 (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 this Court and providing him with a copy of the documents pertinent to his appeal. Defendant has filed no additional arguments of his own with this Court and a reasonable time for him to have done so has passed.

In accordance with *Anders*, we have fully examined the record to determine whether any issues of arguable merit exist or whether the appeal is wholly frivolous. We conclude the appeal is frivolous.

Accordingly, we find no error.

No error.

Judges TIMMONS-GOODSON and McCULLOUGH concur.

Report per Rule 30(e).