

An unpublished opinion of the North Carolina Court of Appeals does not constitute controlling legal authority.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. COA16-315

Filed: 4 October 2016

Guilford County, Nos. 12 CRS 66358, 23050

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

v.

TORREY ARLEACE MAYS, Defendant.

Appeal by defendant from judgment entered 13 November 2015 by Judge Anderson D. Cromer in Superior Court, Guilford County. Heard in the Court of Appeals 19 September 2016.

*Attorney General Roy A. Cooper III, by Assistant Attorney General Marc X. Sneed, for the State.*

*Leslie Rawls for defendant-appellant.*

STROUD, Judge.

On 19 March 2012, defendant was charged by bills of indictment with possession with intent to sell and deliver cocaine and attaining habitual felon status. On 12 November 2015, a jury found defendant guilty as charged. The trial court sentenced defendant to a term of imprisonment for 84 to 110 months. Defendant appeals.

STATE V. MAYS

*Opinion of the Court*

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 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 his right to file written arguments with this Court and providing him with the documents necessary for him to do so. Counsel directs our attention to potential issues on appeal, but acknowledges that she is unable to identify an issue with sufficient merit to support a meaningful argument for relief.

Defendant has not filed any written arguments on his own behalf with this Court and a reasonable time in which he 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 or whether the appeal is wholly frivolous. We conclude the appeal is wholly frivolous. Furthermore, we have examined the record for possible prejudicial error and found none.

NO ERROR.

Judges TYSON and INMAN concur.

Report per Rule 30(e).