

An unpublished opinion of the North Carolina Court of Appeals does not constitute controlling legal authority.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

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF NORTH CAROLINA

No. COA15-674

Filed: 15 December 2015

Mecklenburg County, Nos. 13 CRS 038173–76, 038179

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

v.

MARKCUS RAEMON HERRERA, Defendant.

Appeal by Defendant from judgments entered 5 September 2014 by Judge William H. Coward in Superior Court, Mecklenburg County. Heard in the Court of Appeals 3 December 2015.

*Attorney General Roy Cooper, by Assistant Attorney General Brian D. Rabinovitz, for the State.*

*Appellate Defender Staples Hughes, by Assistant Appellate Defender Jon H. Hunt, for Defendant–Appellant.*

McGEE, Chief Judge.

Markcus Raemon Herrera (“Defendant”) was charged in true bills of indictment on 23 September 2013 with possession of a firearm by a felon, felonious breaking or entering, felonious larceny, larceny of a firearm, breaking or entering a motor vehicle, and attaining habitual felon status.

A jury found Defendant guilty on 5 September 2014 of possession of a firearm by a felon, felonious breaking or entering, felonious larceny, and breaking or entering

STATE V. HERRERA

*Opinion of the Court*

a motor vehicle. The jury found Defendant not guilty of larceny of a firearm. Defendant entered a plea of guilty to attaining habitual felon status. Thereafter, the trial court consolidated the convictions into two judgments and sentenced Defendant to consecutive terms of imprisonment of sixty-seven to ninety-three months and fifty-nine to eighty-three months. 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 he has complied with the requirements of *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 744–45, 18 L. Ed. 2d 493, 498–99 (1967), and *State v. Kinch*, 314 N.C. 99, 102–03, 331 S.E.2d 665, 666–67 (1985), by advising Defendant of his right to file written arguments with this Court and providing Defendant with the documents necessary for him to do so. Counsel directs our attention to potential issues on appeal, but acknowledges that he detected no reversible error on the part of the trial court.

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 or whether the appeal is wholly frivolous. We conclude the appeal is wholly frivolous. Furthermore, we have examined the

STATE V. HERRERA

*Opinion of the Court*

record for possible prejudicial error and found none.

NO ERROR.

Judges HUNTER, JR. and DILLON concur.

Report per Rule 30(e).