

[Cite as *State v. Richardson*, 2003-Ohio-6677.]

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS FOR MONTGOMERY COUNTY, OHIO

STATE OF OHIO	:	
Plaintiff-Appellee	:	C.A. CASE NO. 19866
v.	:	T.C. CASE NO. 2002 CR 2982
RONALD RICHARDSON	:	(Criminal Appeal from Common Pleas Court)
Defendant-Appellant	:	
	:	

.....  
**OPINION**

Rendered on the 12<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2003.

.....  
CARLEY J. INGRAM, Atty. Reg. No. 0020084, Assistant Prosecuting Attorney, 301 W.  
Third Street, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, Dayton, Ohio 45422  
Attorney for Plaintiff-Appellee

PATRICK J. CONBOY II, Atty. Reg. No. 0070073, 5613 Brandt Pike, Huber Heights,  
Ohio 45424  
Attorney for Defendant-Appellant

RONALD RICHARDSON, #446-185, Montgomery Education & Pre-Release Ctr., 1901  
South Gettysburg Ave., P. O. Box 17399, Dayton, Ohio 45417  
Defendant-Appellant

.....  
FREDERICK N. YOUNG, J.

{¶1} Ronald Richardson entered a plea of guilty to possession of crack cocaine  
and tampering with evidence. He was sentenced to a term of twelve months on the

possession charge and three years on the tampering charge, to be served concurrently.

Richardson filed a notice of appeal and, in due course, his appointed appellate counsel filed an extensive *Anders* brief, which thoroughly examined the record and the law and concluded that there were no meritorious issues for appeal.

{¶2} On September 3, 2003, we informed Richardson of the fact that his counsel had filed an *Anders* brief and granted him sixty days from September 3, 2003, to file his pro se brief, if any.

{¶3} No such pro se brief has been filed.

{¶4} We have thoroughly examined the record of the proceedings in this case, and we agree with the assessment of appellate counsel that there are no meritorious issues for appellate review.

{¶5} The judgment appealed from will be affirmed.

. . . . .

FAIN, P.J. and BROGAN, J., concur.

Copies mailed to:

Carley J. Ingram  
Patrick J. Conboy II  
Ronald Richardson  
Hon. Barbara P. Gorman