

An unpublished opinion of the North Carolina Court of Appeals does not constitute controlling legal authority.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

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF NORTH CAROLINA

No. COA14-1221

Filed: 5 May 2015

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

Guilford County

v.

Nos. 12 CRS 68172-76, 78  
12 CRS 24304, 68166

ALEXANDER MACK

Appeal by defendant from judgment entered 20 March 2014 by Judge Edgar B. Gregory in Guilford County Superior Court. Heard in the Court of Appeals 17 April 2015.

*Attorney General Roy Cooper, by Assistant Attorney General Sherri Horner Lawrence, for the State.*

*William D. Spence for defendant-appellant.*

TYSON, Judge.

Alexander Mack (“Defendant”) appeals from the judgment entered upon his guilty plea to multiple sexual offenses. We affirm.

I. Background

Defendant entered an *Alford* plea to seven counts of first-degree sexual offense with a child and one count each of taking indecent liberties with a child and sex offense while in a parental role on 13 March 2014. The terms of the plea provided

*Opinion of the Court*

that the convictions would be consolidated into one judgment imposing a term of 192 to 240 months in prison.

Numerous other charges were dismissed, including additional first-degree sexual offense charges. The trial court entered a judgment consistent with the terms of the plea. Defendant gave notice of appeal.

II. *Anders v. California*

Counsel appointed to represent Defendant on appeal has been 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.

Counsel has shown to the satisfaction of this Court that he 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 by providing him with the documents necessary for him to do so.

III. Conclusion

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 wholly frivolous. The judgment appealed from is affirmed.

AFFIRMED.

STATE V. MACK

*Opinion of the Court*

Judges BRYANT and DIETZ concur.

Report per Rule 30(e).