

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS  
FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT OF OHIO  
HAMILTON COUNTY, OHIO**

STATE OF OHIO,	:	APPEAL NOS. C-200179
		C-200181
Plaintiff-Appellee,	:	TRIAL NOS. B-1906962
		B-2001160
vs.	:	
		<i>JUDGMENT ENTRY.</i>
DANIEL BRONSON,	:	
Defendant-Appellant.	:	

The court sua sponte removes these appeals from the regular calendar and places them on the court’s accelerated calendar, 1st Dist. Loc.R. 11.1.1(A), and this judgment entry is not an opinion of the court. *See* Rep.Op.R. 3.1; App.R. 11.1(E); 1st Dist. Loc.R. 11.1.1.

Defendant-appellant’s appointed counsel has advised this court that, after a thorough review of the record, he can find nothing that would arguably support appellant’s appeals, and that the appeals are wholly frivolous. *See Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 87 S.Ct. 1396, 18 L.Ed.2d 493 (1967); *see also Freels v. Hills*, 843 F.2d 958 (6th Cir.1988). Counsel, as required by *Anders*, has communicated this conclusion to appellant, and has offered appellant an opportunity to respond and to raise any issues. Counsel has also moved this court in his appellate brief for permission to withdraw as counsel. *See Anders* at 744; *see also* 1st Dist. Loc.R. 16.2(C)(1) and 16.2(D)(2). This court has recognized that “the preferred practice is that counsel file a separate motion to withdraw rather than seeking to withdraw within the body of a 1st

**OHIO FIRST DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS**

---

Dist. Loc.R. 16.2(B) brief.” *State v. Willenbrink*, 1st Dist. Hamilton No. C-190330, 2020-Ohio-6715, ¶ 16. “But the failure to file a separate motion to withdraw is not a barrier to the resolution” of the matter. *Id.*

Counsel now requests that this court independently examine the record to determine whether the appeals are wholly frivolous. *See Anders* at 744. We have done so, and we agree with counsel’s conclusion that the proceedings below were free of error prejudicial to appellant and that no grounds exist to support a meritorious appeal. Therefore, we overrule counsel’s motion to withdraw from his representation of appellant, and affirm the judgments of the trial court.

We hold that these appeals are frivolous under App.R. 23 and without “reasonable cause” under R.C. 2505.35. But we refrain from taxing costs and expenses against appellant because he is indigent.

Further, a certified copy of this judgment entry shall constitute the mandate, which shall be sent to the trial court under App.R. 27.

**MYERS, P.J., WINKLER and HENDON, J.J.**

SYLVIA SIEVE HENDON, retired, from the First Appellate District, sitting by assignment

To the clerk:

Enter upon the journal of the court on May 21, 2021,

per order of the court \_\_\_\_\_.  
Administrative Judge