

An unpublished opinion of the North Carolina Court of Appeals does not constitute controlling legal authority.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. COA09-685

NORTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS

Filed: 22 December 2009

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

v.

Buncombe County
Nos. 03CRS056381-82

LORENZO MANUEL LIGON,
Defendant.

Appeal by defendant from judgments entered on or about 22 July 2004 by Judge James U. Downs in Superior Court, Buncombe County. Heard in the Court of Appeals 14 December 2009.

Attorney General Roy A. Cooper, III, by Special Deputy Attorney General Neil Dalton, for the State.

Michael E. Casterline, for defendant-appellant.

STROUD, Judge.

Defendant Lorenzo Ligon appeals from judgments entered after a jury found him guilty of driving while impaired, driving while license revoked, and providing fictitious information to an officer. The trial court imposed a term of 24 months imprisonment for the impaired driving conviction and consolidated the remaining convictions into a consecutive term of 120 days imprisonment.

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 he 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 by providing defendant 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 and transcript to determine whether any issues of arguable merit appear therefrom or whether the appeal is wholly frivolous. We conclude that the appeal is wholly frivolous.

No error.

Judges WYNN and CALABRIA concur.

Reported per Rule 30(e).