

An unpublished opinion of the North Carolina Court of Appeals does not constitute controlling legal authority.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. COA13-903
NORTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS

Filed: 21 January 2014

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

v.

Union County

Nos. 12 CRS 869, 11 CRS 55510

CALIPH KNOTTS

Appeal by defendant from judgments entered 27 February 2013 by Judge Christopher W. Bragg in Union County Superior Court. Heard in the Court of Appeals 30 December 2013.

Attorney General Roy Cooper, by Assistant Attorney General Jonathan D. Shaw, for the State.

Gilda C. Rodriguez for defendant-appellant.

HUNTER, JR., Robert N., Judge.

A jury found defendant guilty of possession of a firearm by a convicted felon and possession of drug paraphernalia. He then pled guilty to attaining habitual felon status and stipulated to additional prior convictions resulting in sixteen prior record points and a corresponding prior record level V. The trial court consolidated defendant's offenses and sentenced him to an

active prison term of 101 to 131 months. From this judgment, defendant appeals.

Counsel appointed to represent defendant is unable to identify any issue with sufficient merit to support a meaningful argument for relief on appeal and asks that this Court conduct its own review of the record for possible prejudicial error. She shows to the satisfaction of this Court that she has complied with the requirements of *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (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 for him to do so.

Defendant has not filed any written arguments on his own behalf with this Court, and a reasonable time for him to do so has expired. In accordance with *Anders*, we have fully examined the record to determine whether any issues of arguable merit appear therefrom. We have been unable to find any possible prejudicial error and conclude that the appeal is meritless.

No error.

Chief Judge MARTIN and Judge DILLON concur.

Report per Rule 30(e).