IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE OF WASHINGTON,) No. 73229-3-1	
Respondent,			
v.)	DIVISION ONE	
WILLIAM LAWSON,)) UNPUBLISHED OPINION)	
Appe) ellant.)	FILED: October 23	3, 2017

PER CURIAM – Williams Lawson appeals from the order setting restitution entered after he pleaded guilty to robbery in the second degree and unlawful imprisonment. Lawson's 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, 18 L. Ed. 2d 493, 87 S. Ct. 1396 (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.

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

This procedure has been followed. Lawson's counsel on appeal filed a brief with the motion to withdraw. Lawson was served with a copy of the brief and informed of the right to file a statement of additional grounds for review. Lawson did not file a statement of additional grounds for review.

The 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. Whether there was a causal link between Lawson's crimes and the victim's injuries?
- 2. Whether the trial court erred in imposing joint and several liability for restitution?
 - 3. Whether appellate costs should be awarded?

The potential issues raised by counsel are wholly frivolous. Counsel's motion to withdraw is granted and the appeal is dismissed.

For the court:

2017 OCT 23 AH 10: OL