

[Cite as *State v. Perdue*, 2003-Ohio-6904.]

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS FOR MONTGOMERY COUNTY, OHIO

| | | |
|--------------------|---|---|
| STATE OF OHIO | : | |
| | : | |
| Plaintiff-Appellee | : | C.A. CASE NO. 19269, 19270 19271 |
| v. | : | T.C. NO. 2001 CR 2160/2 2001 CR 2111 2001 CR 3833 |
| IVAN LEE PERDUE | : | (Criminal Appeal from Common Pleas Court) |
| | : | Defendant-Appellant |
| | : | |
| | : | |

OPINION

Rendered on the 19th day of December, 2003.

.....
NATALIA S. HARRIS, Atty. Reg. No. 0072431, Assistant Prosecuting Attorney, 301 W. Third Street, 5th Floor, Dayton, Ohio 45422
Attorney for Plaintiff-Appellee

WILLIAM T. DALEY, Atty. Reg. No. 0069300, 120 W. Second Street, Suite 1717, Dayton, Ohio 45402
Attorney for Defendant-Appellant

IVAN LEE PERDUE, #A419-898, Dayton Correctional Institute, P. O. Box 17249, Dayton, Ohio 45417
Defendant-Appellant

.....
WOLFF, J.

{¶1} This opinion combines three appeals. CA 19269 arises out of C.P.C. 01

CR 2160/2, wherein Ivan Perdue pleaded guilty to fifth degree felony trafficking in cocaine and was sentenced six months. CA 19270 arises out of C.P.C. 01 CR 2111, wherein Perdue pleaded guilty to fourth degree felony possession of cocaine and was sentenced to six months. CA 19271 arises out of C.P.C. 01 CR 3833, wherein Perdue pleaded guilty to fourth degree felony possession of cocaine and was sentenced to six months.

{¶2} These sentences were made concurrent with each other and concurrent with the sentences in two other cases which we decided November 21, 2003: *State v. Perdue*, CA 19267, 19268.

{¶3} In appeals numbered CA 19269, CA 19270, and CA 19271, appointed appellate counsel has filed an *Anders* brief pursuant to *Anders v. California* (1976), 386 U.S. 738, wherein he represents to the court that he has been able to discover no arguably meritorious issues to be presented on appeal. On March 27, 2003, we informed Perdue by decision and entry that his counsel had filed an *Anders* brief, and of the significance of an *Anders* brief. We invited Perdue to file a pro se brief within sixty days asserting any errors he might wish the court to review. Perdue has not responded to this decision and entry.

{¶4} Pursuant to our responsibilities imposed by *Anders*, we have conducted an independent review of the record in each of these appeals, and we conclude, as did appointed counsel, that there are no arguably meritorious issues for review, and we, therefore, will affirm the judgments of conviction in each of these cases.

.....

GRADY, J. and YOUNG, J., concur.

Copies mailed to:

Natalia S. Harris
William T. Daley
Ivan Lee Perdue
Hon. Dennis J. Langer