An unpublished opinion of the North Carolina Court of Appeals does not constitute controlling legal authority.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. COA19-144

Filed: 3 December 2019

New Hanover County, Nos. 18 CRS 1359; 18 CRS 50187

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

v.

RAYQUAN LOVE MCPHAIL

Appeal by Defendant from judgment entered 24 July 2018 by Judge Phyllis M. Gorham in New Hanover County Superior Court. Heard in the Court of Appeals 18 November 2019.

Attorney General Joshua H. Stein, by Special Deputy Attorney General Phillip T. Reynolds, for the State.

Shelly Bibb DeAdder for Defendant-Appellant.

DILLON, Judge.

Defendant Rayquan Love McPhail appeals from a judgment entered upon his guilty plea to possession of a firearm by a felon and two counts of assault on a police officer inflicting physical injury.

On appeal, Defendant's counsel has represented that she is "unable to identify any discernable 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 shown to the satisfaction of this Court that she has complied with the requirements of *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (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, and a reasonable time within which he could have done so has passed.

In accordance with *Anders* and *Kinch*, we have fully examined the record to determine whether any issues of arguable merit appear therefrom, including, but not limited to, the potential issues identified by counsel in Defendant's brief. We agree with counsel that those issues lack merit. We have been unable to find any possible prejudicial error and conclude that the appeal is wholly frivolous. Therefore, we affirm the trial court's judgment.

AFFIRMED.

Judges DIETZ and MURPHY concur.

Report per Rule 30(e).