

An unpublished opinion of the North Carolina Court of Appeals does not constitute controlling legal authority.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. COA15-821

Filed: 5 January 2016

Guilford County, No. 13 CRS 74273

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

v.

DANIELLE LEIGH MITCHELL

Appeal by defendant from judgments entered 10 April 2014 by Judge Susan E. Bray in Guilford County Superior Court. Heard in the Court of Appeals 28 December 2015.

*Attorney General Roy Cooper, by Assistant Attorney General Richard A. Graham, for the State.*

*Marie H. Mobley for defendant-appellant.*

BRYANT, Judge.

On 10 April 2014, defendant Danielle Leigh Mitchell pled guilty pursuant to a plea agreement to possession of drug paraphernalia and misdemeanor possession of marijuana. The trial court sentenced defendant to consecutive terms of forty-five days imprisonment, suspended the sentences, and placed defendant on supervised probation for twelve months. Defendant appeals.

Counsel appointed to represent defendant has been unable to identify any issue with sufficient merit to support a meaningful argument for relief on appeal and

STATE V. MITCHELL

*Opinion of the Court*

asks that this Court conduct its own review of the record for possible prejudicial error. Counsel has also 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 her right to file written arguments with this Court and providing her with the documents necessary for her to do so.

Defendant has not filed any written arguments on her own behalf with this Court and a reasonable time in which she could 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. We have been unable to find any possible prejudicial error and conclude that the appeal is wholly frivolous.

NO ERROR.

Judges CALABRIA and STEPHENS concur.

Report per Rule 30(e).