

An unpublished opinion of the North Carolina Court of Appeals does not constitute controlling legal authority.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. COA06-824

NORTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS

Filed: 6 February 2007

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

v.

Guilford County
No. 04 CRS 72391-92

GIFTON ROBINSON

Appeal by defendant from judgment entered 14 October 2005 by Judge Carl R. Fox in Guilford County Superior Court. Heard in the Court of Appeals 22 January 2007.

Attorney General Roy Cooper, by Assistant Attorney General Kelly L. Sandling, for the State.

Appellate Defender Staples Hughes, by Assistant Appellate Defender Anne M. Gomez, for defendant-appellant.

MARTIN, Chief Judge.

Defendant was convicted by a jury of statutory rape of a fourteen-year-old child, taking indecent liberties with a minor, and sexual activity in a parental role. Defendant was acquitted of additional counts of statutory sexual offense, statutory rape, and indecent liberties. The trial court consolidated the convictions for judgment and sentenced defendant from the applicable mitigated range to an active prison term of 185 to 231 months. Defendant gave notice of appeal.

Counsel appointed to represent defendant has been unable to identify any issue with sufficient merit to support a meaningful argument for relief on appeal. She asks that this Court conduct its own review of the record for possible prejudicial error. Counsel has shown to the satisfaction of this Court that she has complied with the requirements of *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 18 L. Ed. 2d 493 (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 the documents necessary to do so. Defendant has not filed any written arguments, 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 appear therefrom. Finding no possible prejudicial error, we affirm the judgment of the trial court.

No error.

Judges McGEE and HUNTER concur.

Report per Rule 30(e).