An unpublished opinion of the North Carolina Court of Appeals does not constitute controlling legal authority. Citation is disfavored, but may be permitted in accordance with the provisions of Rule 30(e)(3) of the North Carolina Rules of Appellate Procedure.

NO. COA14-492
NORTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS

Filed: 21 October 2014

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

v. Wake County
Nos. 12 CRS 222166, 13 CRS 181

WILLIAM OTIS BASS, JR.

Appeal by defendant from judgment entered 9 December 2013 by Judge Paul G. Gessner in Wake County Superior Court. Heard in the Court of Appeals 22 September 2014.

Attorney General Roy Cooper, by Assistant Attorney General Laura E. Parker, for the State.

Appellate Defender Staples S. Hughes, by Assistant Appellate Defender Constance E. Widenhouse, for defendant-appellant.

McCULLOUGH, Judge.

On 9 December 2013, defendant William Otis Bass, Jr., was found guilty by a jury of assault with a deadly weapon inflicting serious injury. Defendant subsequently pled guilty to having attained the status of an habitual felon. The trial court sentenced defendant to a single term of 144 to 185 months imprisonment. Defendant appeals.

Counsel appointed to represent defendant has been unable to identify any issue with sufficient merit to support a meaningful argument for relief on appeal and asks that this Court conduct its own review of the record for possible prejudicial error. Counsel has also shown to the satisfaction of this Court that she has complied with the requirements of *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 18 L. Ed. 2d 493 (1967), and *State v. Kinch*, 314 N.C. 99, 331 S.E.2d 665 (1985), by advising defendant of his right to file written arguments with this Court and providing him with the documents necessary for him to do so.

Defendant has not filed any written arguments on his own behalf with this Court and a reasonable time in which he could have done so has passed. In accordance with *Anders*, we have fully examined the record to determine whether any issues of arguable merit appear therefrom. We have been unable to find any possible prejudicial error and conclude that the appeal is wholly frivolous.

No error.

Judges CALABRIA and ELMORE concur.

Report per Rule 30(e).