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Per curiam - Marshall Wilson appeals from the judgment and sentence entered after a guilty plea of misdemeanor harassment, third degree malicious mischief and misdemeanor violation of a court order in King County Superior Court No. 11-1-02400-4 KNT. Wilson's court-appointed attorney has filed a motion to withdraw on the ground that there is no basis for a good faith argument on review. Pursuant to State v. Theobald, 78 Wn.2d 184, 470 P. $2 d 188$ (1970), and Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738, 87 S. Ct. 1396, 18 L. Ed. 2d 493 (1967), the motion to withdraw must:
[1] be accompanied by a brief referring to anything in the record that might arguably support the appeal. [2] A copy of counsel's brief should be furnished the indigent and [3] time allowed him to raise any points that he chooses; [4] the court--not counsel--then proceeds, after a full examination of all the proceedings, to decide whether the case is wholly frivolous.

Theobald, 78 Wn.2d at 185 (quoting Anders, 386 U.S. at 744).

This procedure has been followed. Wilson's counsel on appeal filed a brief with the motion to withdraw. Wilson was served with a copy of the brief and informed of the right to file a statement of additional grounds for review. Wilson has not filed a statement of additional grounds for review.

The facts are accurately set forth in counsel's brief in support of the motion to withdraw. The court has reviewed the briefs filed in this court and has independently reviewed the entire record. The court specifically considered the following potential issue raised by counsel:

Was Wilson's plea made knowingly, intelligently and voluntarily?
The potential issue is wholly frivolous. Counsel's motion to withdraw is granted and the appeal is dismissed.
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