

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

STATE OF OHIO, :
 :
 Plaintiff-Appellee, : CASE NO. CA2011-06-114
 :
 - vs - : DECISION
 : 4/9/2012
 :
 CHARLES M. GEISER, :
 :
 Defendant-Appellant. :

CRIMINAL APPEAL FROM BUTLER COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
Case No. CR2010-12-2055

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

Ronald B. James, 526 Nilles Road, Suite 9, Fairfield, Ohio 45014, for defendant-appellant

Charles M. Geiser, #A610782, Chillicothe Correctional Institution, P.O. Box 5500, Chillicothe, Ohio 45601, defendant-appellant, pro se

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 Butler County Court of Common Pleas, upon a brief filed by appellant's counsel on September 16, 2011; a supplemental brief filed by appellant's counsel on December 14, 2011; a pro se brief filed by appellant on October 20, 2011; and a brief filed by counsel for appellee on February 23, 2012.

{¶ 2} Counsel for defendant-appellant, Charles Geiser, 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 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) 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 eight "reasons for his appeal" which the court considered as assignments of error.

{¶ 4} We have examined the record, the potential assignment of error presented in counsel's brief, and the assignments of error in appellant's 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.

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