

[Cite as *State v. Hatfield*, 2016-Ohio-3275.]

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF OHIO
SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT
GREENE COUNTY**

STATE OF OHIO

Plaintiff-Appellee

v.

ELIZABETH N. HATFIELD

Defendant-Appellant

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

C.A. CASE NO. 2015-CA-50

T.C. NO. 15CR59

(Criminal appeal from
Common Pleas Court)

.....

OPINION

Rendered on the 3rd day of June, 2016.

.....

ELIZABETH A. ELLIS, Atty. Reg. No. 0074332, Assistant Prosecuting Attorney, 55
Greene Street, Xenia, Ohio 45385
Attorney for Plaintiff-Appellee

THOMAS B. SCOTT, Atty. Reg. No. 0075341, 130 West Second Street, Suite 2103,
Dayton, Ohio 45402
Attorney for Defendant-Appellant

.....

DONOVAN, P.J.

{¶ 1} Elizabeth Hatfield was originally charged by indictment with one count of
Illegal Assembly or Possession of Chemicals for the Manufacture of Drugs, a felony of
the third degree in violation of R.C. 2925.041. A second count in the indictment set forth
a charge of Aggravated Possession of Drugs, a felony of the second degree in violation

of R.C. 2925.11(A).

{¶ 2} On June 9, 2015, Hatfield plead guilty to count one, Illegal Assembly or Possession of Chemicals for the Manufacture of Drugs and the second count of Aggravated Possession was dismissed. Prior to accepting Hatfield's plea, the court engaged in a thorough Crim.R. 11 colloquy. The plea transcript reflects the prosecutor's recitation of the facts supporting the indictment and the trial court's finding that the plea was knowingly, intelligently and voluntarily entered. The trial court ordered a pre-sentence investigation and scheduled the disposition for July 23, 2015.

{¶ 3} On July 23, Hatfield appeared for sentencing. The trial court sentenced Hatfield to 18 months in prison. The trial court noted the seriousness and recidivism factors that applied to the case and its findings are reflected in Hatfield's judgment entry of conviction. See *State v. Bonnell*, 140 Ohio St.3d 209, 2014-Ohio-3177, 16 N.E. 3d 659. Hatfield, we note, had several prior misdemeanor convictions, as well as prior unsuccessful community control supervision.

{¶ 4} Hatfield filed a notice of appeal on August 21, 2015. On January 7, 2016, appointed counsel filed an *Anders* brief pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 87 S.Ct. 1396, 18 L.Ed.2d 493 (1967) in which he represented to us that after review of the record he could find no arguably meritorious issues to present on appeal. By magistrate's order on January 14, 2016, we informed Hatfield that her counsel had filed an *Anders* brief and the significance of an *Anders* brief. We invited Hatfield to file a pro se brief within 60 days from January 14, 2016. Hatfield has not filed anything with this court.

{¶ 5} Pursuant to our responsibilities under *Anders*, we have conducted an

independent review of the entire record, including the pre-sentence report. Having done so, we agree with the assessment of appointed counsel that there are no arguably meritorious issues to present on appeal.

{¶ 6} Accordingly, the judgment appealed from is affirmed.

.

FAIN, J. and HALL, J., concur.

Copies mailed to:

Elizabeth A. Ellis
Thomas B. Scott
Elizabeth Hatfield
Hon. Michael A. Buckwalter