[Cite as State v. Jordan, 2004-Ohio-1022.]

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS FOR CLARK COUNTY, OHIO

STATE OF OHIO	:		
Plaintiff-Appellee	:	C.A. CASE NO.	2002 CA 104
v.	:	T.C. NO. 02-CR-482	
ANTHONY D. JORDAN	: Defendant-A	(Criminal Appeal from Common Pleas Court) nt-Appellant :	
			:
	:		

<u>O P I N I O N</u>

:

.

Rendered on the <u>5th</u> day of <u>March</u>, 2004.

.

STEPHEN C. COLLINS, 50 E. Columbia Street, Springfield, Ohio 45502 Attorney for Plaintiff-Appellee

- SEAN J. VALLONE, Atty. Reg. No. 0064053, 4612 Salem Avenue, Dayton, Ohio 45416 Attorney for Defendant-Appellant
- ANTHONY D. JORDAN, 5910 Cozean Drive, #306, Trotwood, Ohio 45426 Defendant-Appellant

.

WOLFF, J.

{¶1} On September 25, 2002, Anthony Jordan entered a plea of guilty to

attempted tampering with evidence, a fourth degree felony. This was a negotiated plea wherein the State dismissed a charge of having weapons under disability and reduced a charge of tampering with evidence to attempted tampering with evidence. The court imposed an agreed upon sentence of eight months incarceration.

{¶2} On January 22, 2003, this court permitted Jordan to file a delayed appeal, and on March 7, 2003, this court appointed counsel to pursue Jordan's appeal. On July 2, 2003, appointed appellate counsel filed an *Anders* brief pursuant to *Anders v. California* (1967), 386 U.S. 738, wherein appointed appellate counsel represented to the court that upon examination of the record and consideration of applicable case law, he could discern no arguably meritorious issues to present on appeal.

{**q**3} On December 16, 2003, this court, by decision and entry, notified Jordan that appointed appellate counsel had filed an *Anders* brief and explained the significance of an *Anders* brief. Jordan was accorded sixty days to file a pro se brief assigning errors for review by this court. As of the rendition of this opinion and judgment, Jordan has filed nothing with this court.

{**[4**} Pursuant to our responsibilities under *Anders* to independently examine the record and consider applicable law, we conclude as did appointed appellate counsel that there are no arguably meritorious issues for appellate review and that Jordan's appeal is entirely frivolous.

 $\{\P5\}$ Accordingly, the judgment will be affirmed.

.

BROGAN, J. and GRADY, J., concur.

Copies mailed to:

Stephen C. Collins Sean J. Vallone Anthony D. Jordan Hon. Richard J. O'Neill