

An unpublished opinion of the North Carolina Court of Appeals does not constitute controlling legal authority.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. COA22-716

Filed 21 February 2023

Guilford County, Nos. 21 CRS 74073, 80277

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

v.

PATRICK HORATIO JONES, JR.

Appeal by defendant from judgment entered 3 February 2022 by Judge Mark Klass in Guilford County Superior Court. Heard in the Court of Appeals 24 January 2023.

*Attorney General Joshua H. Stein, by Assistant Attorney General Zachary K. Dunn, for the State.*

*Appellate Defender Glenn Gerding, by Assistant Appellate Defender Kathryn L. VandenBerg, for defendant-appellant.*

ZACHARY, Judge.

Defendant Patrick Horatio Jones, Jr., appeals from a judgment entered upon his guilty plea. Counsel for Defendant filed an *Anders* brief on Defendant's behalf. After careful review, we affirm.

On 31 January 2022, Defendant entered into a plea agreement with the State

STATE V. JONES

*Opinion of the Court*

in which he agreed to plead guilty to charges of first-degree forcible rape and first-degree kidnapping, in exchange for dismissal of numerous additional charges. The State also stipulated to two mitigating factors for sentencing purposes, and the parties agreed to a sentence in the mitigated range of 180 to 276 months. The trial court accepted the plea agreement and entered judgment in accordance with its terms, sentencing Defendant to a term of 180 to 276 months in the custody of the North Carolina Division of Adult Correction. The trial court also ordered that Defendant register as a sex offender and enroll in satellite-based monitoring, each for the remainder of his natural life. Defendant timely filed notice of appeal.

Counsel appointed to represent Defendant on appeal has been unable to identify any issue with sufficient merit to support a meaningful argument for relief. Counsel thus 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, *reh'g denied*, 388 U.S. 924, 18 L. Ed. 2d 1377 (1967), and *State v. Kinch*, 314 N.C. 99, 331 S.E.2d 665 (1985), by advising Defendant of his right to file his own written arguments with this Court, and by providing him with the documents necessary 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 his *Anders* brief, Defendant's counsel raises four potential issues for our review, none of which

STATE V. JONES

*Opinion of the Court*

have merit, based on our careful review of the record. Defendant thus is not entitled to relief on these bases.

As required by *Anders* and *Kinch*, we have conducted a full examination of the record for any issue with arguable merit. We have been unable to find any error, and we conclude that this appeal presents no issue that might entitle Defendant to relief. Accordingly, we affirm the judgment entered in this case.

AFFIRMED.

Judges HAMPSON and GRIFFIN concur.

Report per Rule 30(e).