

[Cite as *State v. May*, 2004-Ohio-3920.]

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS FOR CLARK COUNTY, OHIO

STATE OF OHIO	:	
	:	
Plaintiff-Appellee	:	C.A. CASE NO. 2003 CA 73
v.	:	T.C. NO. 02 CR 920
	:	
DONALD E. MAY	:	(Criminal Appeal from Common Pleas Court)
	:	Defendant-Appellant
	:	
	:	

**OPINION**

Rendered on the 23<sup>rd</sup> day of July, 2004.

DAVID E. SMITH, Atty. Reg. No. 0020413, Assistant Prosecuting Attorney, 50 East  
Columbia Street, Springfield, Ohio 45501  
Attorney for Plaintiff-Appellee

SUSAN R. BRIDGMAN, Atty. Reg. No. 0047368, 315 W. Hudson Avenue, Dayton, Ohio  
45406  
Attorney for Defendant-Appellant

DONALD E. MAY, #A446-860, 5900 B.I.S. Road, P. O. Box 200, Lancaster, Ohio  
43130-0200  
Defendant-Appellant

WOLFF, J.

{¶1} Donald E. May entered a plea of guilty to aggravated robbery, a first  
degree felony. He was sentenced to an agreed sentence of five years to be served

concurrently with a two-year sentence for burglary. This disposition was the result of a negotiated plea wherein the State dismissed the firearm specification attached to the aggravated robbery charge and an additional charge of obstructing justice, dismissed another indictment, and dismissed the remaining charges in a third indictment.

{¶2} On December 3, 2003, this court, by decision and entry, sustained May’s motions to file a delayed appeal and for the appointment of appellate counsel. On January 23, 2004, appellate counsel was appointed by this court and on April 15, 2004 appointed appellate counsel filed an *Anders* brief with this court pursuant to *Anders v. California* (1967), 367 U.S. 738, wherein appointed appellate counsel advanced four possible appellate arguments but concluded that upon examination of the record she could ascertain no arguably meritorious issues for appeal.

{¶3} By decision and entry of April 23, 2004, we informed May by decision and entry that his appointed appellate counsel had filed an *Anders* brief and of the significance of an *Anders* brief. We invited May to file any pro se assignments of error within sixty days of our decision and entry. May has filed nothing in this court.

{¶4} Pursuant to our responsibilities under *Anders*, we have done a thorough examination of the record and have concluded as did appointed appellate counsel that there are no arguably meritorious issues for review. Accordingly, the judgment of conviction will be affirmed.

.....

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

Copies mailed to:

David E. Smith

Susan R. Bridgman  
Donald E. May  
Hon. Gerald F. Lorig