

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

KADARELL BARRETT,	§
	§ No. 535, 2015
Defendant Below,	§
Appellant,	§
v.	§ Court Below—Superior Court
	§ of the State of Delaware
	§
STATE OF DELAWARE,	§ Cr. ID No. 1412003524
	§
Plaintiff Below,	§
Appellee.	§

Submitted: June 2, 2016
Decided: June 29, 2016

Before **STRINE**, Chief Justice; **VAUGHN**, and **SEITZ**, Justices.

ORDER

This 29th day of June 2016, upon consideration of the appellant’s Supreme Court Rule 26(c) brief, the State’s response, and the record below, it appears to the Court that:

(1) On September 4, 2015, a Superior Court jury found the appellant, Kadarell Barrett, guilty of Theft Over \$1,500. Barrett was sentenced to two years of Level V incarceration, suspended for one year of Level II probation. This is Barrett’s direct appeal.

(2) On appeal, Barrett’s counsel (“Counsel”) filed a brief and a motion to withdraw under Supreme Court Rule 26(c) (“Rule 26(c”). Counsel asserts that, based upon a complete and careful examination of the record, there are no arguably

appealable issues. Counsel informed Barrett of the provisions of Rule 26(c) and provided Barrett with a copy of the motion to withdraw and the accompanying brief.

(3) Counsel also informed Barrett of his right to identify any points he wished this Court to consider on appeal. Barrett has not raised any issues for this Court's consideration. The State has responded to the Rule 26(c) brief and has moved to affirm the Superior Court's judgment.

(4) When reviewing a motion to withdraw and an accompanying brief under Rule 26(c), this Court must: (i) be satisfied that defense counsel has made a conscientious examination of the record and the law for arguable claims; and (ii) conduct its own review of the record and determine whether the appeal is so totally devoid of at least arguably appealable issues that it can be decided without an adversary presentation.¹

(5) This Court has reviewed the record carefully and has concluded that Barrett's appeal is wholly without merit and devoid of any arguably appealable issue. We also are satisfied that Barrett's counsel has made a conscientious effort to examine the record and the law and has properly determined that Barrett could not raise a meritorious claim in this appeal.

¹ *Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 83 (1988); *Leacock v. State*, 690 A.2d 926, 927-28 (Del. 1996).

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the judgment of the Superior Court is AFFIRMED. The motion to withdraw is moot.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Collins J. Seitz, Jr.
Justice