

An unpublished opinion of the North Carolina Court of Appeals does not constitute controlling legal authority.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. COA22-915

Filed 4 June 2024

Chowan County, Nos. 19 CRS 208-209

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

v.

JAMES E. PRICE, Defendant.

Appeal by Defendant from judgment entered 27 July 2021 by Judge Eula E. Reid in Chowan County Superior Court. Heard in the Court of Appeals 21 March 2023.

*Attorney General Joshua H. Stein, by Special Deputy Attorney General Arneatha James, for the State.*

*Appellate Defender Glenn Gerding, by Assistant Appellate Defender Emily Holmes Davis, for defendant-appellant.*

MURPHY, Judge.

Defendant James Price was convicted of Statutory Sex Offense with Child by an Adult, a Class B1 Felony in violation of N.C.G.S § 14-27.28, and Indecent Liberties with a Child, a Class F Felony in violation of N.C.G.S § 14-202.1. The trial court sentenced Defendant as a Prior Record Level V in the presumptive range for a term of 339 to 467 months imprisonment for his Statutory Sex Offense with Child by an

STATE V. PRICE

*Opinion of the Court*

Adult conviction followed by a term of 28 to 43 months imprisonment for his Indecent Liberties with a Child conviction. Defendant gave notice of appeal in open court and was appointed appellate counsel.

On appeal, counsel has filed a no-merit brief in accordance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and *State v. Kinch*, 314 N.C. 99 (1985), asking this Court to “conduct a full examination of the record for any prejudicial error and to determine if any issue has been overlooked.” Counsel mailed a copy of the brief, record on appeal, and transcript to Defendant on 30 November 2022. Counsel also advised Defendant of his right to file his own arguments. On 19 December 2022, Defendant filed a pro se supplemental brief with this Court in support of his appeal.

We are satisfied that counsel has fulfilled all of its obligations under *Anders* and *Kinch*. We have conducted a full review of the record, transcript, and Defendant’s pro se supplemental brief and hold that there was no prejudicial error.

NO ERROR.

Judges ARROWOOD and CARPENTER concur.

Report per Rule 30(e).