

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
TWELFTH APPELLATE DISTRICT OF OHIO
FAYETTE COUNTY

CITY OF WASHINGTON COURT HOUSE, :

Plaintiff-Appellee, :

CASE NO. CA2006-06-023

- vs -

: DECISION
12/4/2006

TIFFANY G. WATSON, :

Defendant-Appellant. :

CRIMINAL APPEAL FROM WASHINGTON C.H. MUNICIPAL COURT
Case No. TRD0600412

Mark J. Pitstick, Pitstick Law Office, 224 North Fayette Street, Washington C.H., OH 43140,
for plaintiff-appellee

John H. Roszmann, 321 East Court Street, Washington C.H., OH 43160, for defendant-
appellant

Per Curiam

{¶1} This cause came on to be considered upon a notice of appeal, the transcript of the docket and journal entries, the transcript of proceedings and original papers from the Washington Court House Municipal Court, and upon the briefs, oral argument having been waived.

{¶2} Counsel for defendant-appellant, Tiffany G. Watson, filed a brief with this court pursuant to *Anders v. California* (1967), 386 U.S. 738, 87 S.Ct. 1396, which (1) indicates that

a careful review of the record from the proceedings below fails to disclose any errors by the trial court prejudicial to the rights of appellant upon which an assignment of error may be predicated; (2) lists one potential error "that might arguably support the appeal," *Anders*, at 744, 87 S.Ct. at 1400; (3) requests that this court review the record independently to determine whether the proceedings are free from prejudicial error and without infringement of appellant's constitutional rights; (4) in a separate motion requests permission to withdraw as counsel for appellant on the basis that the appeal is wholly frivolous; and (5) certifies that a copy of both the brief and motion to withdraw have been served upon appellant.

{¶3} Having allowed appellant sufficient time to respond, and no response having been received, we have accordingly examined the record and find no error prejudicial to appellant's rights in the proceedings in the trial court. The motion of counsel for appellant requesting to withdraw as counsel is granted, and this appeal is dismissed for the reason that it is wholly frivolous.

POWELL, P.J., YOUNG and BRESSLER, JJ., concur.

[Cite as *Washington Court House v. Watson*, 2006-Ohio-6357.]