

An unpublished opinion of the North Carolina Court of Appeals does not constitute controlling legal authority.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. COA06-102

NORTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS

Filed: 5 December 2006

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

v.	Mecklenburg County
JATE ANTWAIN CARTER,	Nos. 04 CRS 13398
Defendant.	04 CRS 206017
	04 CRS 209203-06
	04 CRS 209208

Appeal by defendant from judgments entered 3 January 2005 by Judge James E. Lanning in Mecklenburg County Superior Court. Heard in the Court of Appeals 30 October 2006.

Attorney General Roy Cooper, by Assistant Attorney General Christopher W. Brooks, for the State.

Appellate Defender Staples Hughes, by Assistant Appellate Defender Benjamin Dowling-Sendor, for defendant-appellant.

BRYANT, Judge.

A jury found Jate Antwain Carter (defendant) guilty on 14 December 2004 of three counts of robbery with a dangerous weapon, three counts of second degree kidnapping, and one count of felonious entering. On 3 January 2005, the trial court entered, consistent with the jury verdict, judgments imposing four active terms of imprisonment.

Defendant filed the record on appeal in this Court on 20 January 2006. Defendant's appellate counsel has filed a brief pursuant to *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) in which he requests this Court to review the record for possible prejudicial error. Counsel states that he "is unable to identify an issue with sufficient merit to support a meaningful argument for relief on appeal." In the brief, counsel calls this Court's attention to assignments of error which he believes may have the most arguable merit. Counsel explains why he concluded these assignment of errors could not be sustained.

In further compliance with *Anders* and *Kinch*, counsel has attached to the brief a letter he wrote to defendant advising him of his inability to find possible error, of counsel's requesting this Court to conduct its own independent review of the record for possible error, and of defendant's right to file his own written arguments directly with this Court. Defendant has not personally filed any written arguments.

After carefully reviewing the record, we concur with counsel's assessment that possible prejudicial error is not present.

No error.

Judges TYSON and LEVINSON concur.

Report per Rule 30(e).