

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

STATE OF OHIO,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff-Appellee,	:	CASE NOS. CA2014-03-075
	:	CA2014-04-083
	:	
- vs -	:	<u>DECISION</u>
	:	3/2/2015
	:	
BARRY PIPKIN,	:	
	:	
Defendant-Appellant.	:	

CRIMINAL APPEAL FROM BUTLER COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
Case No. CR2013-07-1140

Michael T. Gmoser, Butler County Prosecuting Attorney, Lina N. Alkamhawi, Government Services Center, 315 High Street, 11th Floor, Hamilton, OH 45011-6057, for plaintiff-appellee

Charles M. Conliff, 5145 Pleasant Avenue, Suite 18, P.O. Box 18424, Fairfield, Ohio 45018-0424, for defendant-appellant

Barry Pipkin, #A698-773, London Correctional Institution, P.O. Box 69, London, Ohio 43140, appellant, pro se

Per Curiam.

{¶ 1} This cause is before the court pursuant to a notice of appeal, the transcript of the docket and journal entries, the transcript of proceedings and original papers from the Butler County Court of Common Pleas, and upon briefs filed by appellant's appointed

counsel, Charles M. Conliff, Esq., a pro se brief filed by appellant, Barry Pipkin, and a responsive brief filed by counsel for the state of Ohio.

{¶ 2} Counsel for defendant-appellant, Barry Pipkin, has filed a brief with this court pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 87 S.Ct. 1396 (1967), 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 23 potential errors "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) 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} Appellant has filed a pro se brief raising seven assignments of error, and counsel for the state of Ohio has filed a brief responding to the assignments of error raised by appellant. The state declined to respond to the *Anders* brief filed by appellant's counsel.

{¶ 4} We have examined the record, the potential assignments of error presented in counsel's brief, and the assignments of error in appellants pro se brief and find no error prejudicial to appellant's rights in the proceedings in the trial court. Therefore, 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.

S. POWELL, P.J., RINGLAND and HENDRICKSON, JJ., concur.