

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE OF WASHINGTON,	)	
	)	No. 68734-4-I
Respondent,	)	
	)	
v.	)	DIVISION ONE
	)	
RAMONE DEPAR ECHOLS,	)	UNPUBLISHED OPINION
	)	
Appellant.	)	FILED: OCT 7 2013

COURT OF APPEALS  
 STATE OF WASHINGTON  
 2013 OCT -7 AM 8:00

PER CURIAM. Ramone Echols challenges the denial of a CrR 7.8 motion to modify his 1995 judgment and sentence for first degree murder. His court-appointed attorney has filed a motion to withdraw on the ground that there is no basis for a good faith argument on review. Pursuant to State v. Theobald, 78 Wn.2d 184, 470 P.2d 188 (1970), and Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738, 87 S. Ct. 1396, 18 L. Ed. 2d 493 (1967), the motion to withdraw must:

- (1) be accompanied by a brief referring to anything in the record that might arguably support the appeal.
- (2) A copy of counsel's brief should be furnished the indigent and
- (3) time allowed him to raise any points that he chooses;
- (4) the court-not counsel-then proceeds, after a full examination of all the proceedings, to decide whether the case is wholly frivolous.

Theobald, 78 Wn.2d at 185 (quoting Anders, 386 U.S. at 744).

This procedure has been followed. Echols' counsel on appeal filed a brief with the motion to withdraw. Echols was served with a copy of the brief and informed of his right to file a statement of additional grounds for review. Echols did file a supplemental brief.

The material facts are accurately set forth in counsel's brief in support of the motion to withdraw. The court has reviewed the briefs filed in this court and has independently reviewed the entire record. The court specifically considered the following potential issues raised by counsel:

- (1) Did the superior court err in denying Echols' CrR 7.8 motion?
- (2) Should Echols have been provided the opportunity to object when the motion was assigned to: (a) a judge that was not the trial judge, and (b) to the Kent location instead of the Seattle location of the King County Superior Court?
- (3) Did the superior court err when Echols was not transported to the courthouse for his motion?

The court also reviewed Echols' statement of additional grounds, which reiterated the issues raised by counsel.

The issues raised by Echols and his counsel are wholly frivolous. The motion to withdraw is granted and the appeal is dismissed.

For the court:

Cox, J.  
Leach, C. J.  
Spencer, J.