[Cite as *State v. Owens*, 2003-Ohio-2210.]

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS FOR MONTGOMERY COUNTY, OHIO

STATE OF OHIO	:	
Plaintiff-Appellee	:	C.A. Case Nos. 19646 & 19647
v.	:	T.C. Case Nos. 2002-CR-02446/ 2002-CR-3245
ADRIAN OWENS	:	(Criminal Appeals from Common Pleas Court)
Defendant-Appellant	:	

. . . . . .

O P I N I O N

Rendered on the 2nd day of May, 2003.

. . . . . .

MATHIAS H. HECK, JR., Prosecuting Attorney, By: CARLEY J. INGRAM, Assistant Prosecuting Attorney, Atty. Reg. #0020084, Appellate Division, P.O. Box 972, 301 W. Third Street, Suite 500, Dayton, Ohio 45422
Attorneys for Plaintiff-Appellee

D. K. WEHNER, Atty. Reg. #0016080, 130 West Second Street, Suite 201, Dayton, Ohio 45402
Attorney for Defendant-Appellant

ADRIAN OWENS, #436-828, London Correctional Institution, P.O. Box 69, London, Ohio 43140-0069
Defendant-Appellant, Pro Se

. . . . . .

FAIN, P.J.

{¶1} Defendant-appellant Adrian Owens appeals from his conviction and sentence, following a guilty plea, upon one count of Burglary and one count of

Possession of Cocaine. The offenses were the subject of separate indictments, but Owens was sentenced in one proceeding. His appeals in these two cases have been consolidated.

{¶2} Owens' assigned counsel has filed a brief pursuant to *Anders v. California* (1976), 386 U.S. 738, indicating that no potential assignments of error have been found having arguable merit.

{¶3} Owens was notified that his counsel had filed an *Anders* brief, and was allowed 60 days within which to file his own, pro se brief. He has not done so.

{¶4} This court has performed its duty, under *Anders v. California, supra,* independently to review the record, including the pre-sentence investigation report. We have found no potential assignments of error having arguable merit.

{¶5} The trial court reviewed with Owens each of the constitutional rights that he would be waiving by pleading guilty, and ascertained that he understood them. The trial court also ascertained that Owens understood the charges against him, and the maximum penalties that could be imposed. The trial court also ascertained that Owens had not been promised anything in exchange for his plea.

{¶6} The trial court imposed a minimum sentence of six months for the offense of Possession of Cocaine, and a minimum sentence of two years for the offense of Burglary, the two sentences to be served concurrently. We find nothing in the record to suggest that the trial court abused its discretion by imposing this sentence, or otherwise erred in its imposition of sentence.

{¶7} In short, we conclude, based upon our independent review of the record, that there are no potential assignments of error having arguable merit, and

that this appeal is wholly frivolous. Accordingly, the judgment of the trial court is Affirmed.

. . . . . .

BROGAN and GRADY, JJ., concur.

Copies mailed to:

Carley J. Ingram
D.K. Wehner
Adrian Owens
Hon. Dennis Langer