IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

ADRIENNE SAMMONS,	§	
	§	
Defendant Below-Appellant,	§	No. 302, 2013
	§	
	§	
v.	§	Court Below—Superior Court
	§	of the State of Delaware,
STATE OF DELAWARE,	§	in and for New Castle County
	§	Cr. ID 1205024383
Plaintiff Below-Appellee.	§	
	§	

Submitted: October 14, 2013
Decided: October 18, 2013

Before **STEELE**, Chief Justice, **HOLLAND**, and **RIDGELY**, Justices.

O R D E R

This 18th day of October 2013, upon consideration of the appellant's Supreme Court Rule 26(c) brief, her attorney's motion to withdraw, and the State's response thereto, it appears to the Court that:

(1) A Superior Court jury convicted the defendant-appellant, Adrienne Sammons, of one count each of first degree robbery and second degree assault in connection with a purse snatching that left the elderly victim with a broken hip. The Superior Court sentenced Sammons to a total period of thirty-three years at Level V incarceration to be suspended after serving thirteen years for decreasing levels of supervision. This is Sammons' direct appeal.

(2) Sammons' counsel on appeal has filed a brief and a motion to withdraw pursuant to Rule 26(c). Sammons' counsel asserts that, based upon a complete and careful examination of the record, there are no arguably appealable issues. By letter, Sammons' attorney informed her of the provisions of Rule 26(c) and provided Sammons with a copy of the motion to withdraw and the accompanying brief. Sammons also was informed of her right to supplement her attorney's presentation. Sammons has not raised any issues for this Court's consideration. The State has responded to the position taken by Sammons' counsel and has moved to affirm the Superior Court's judgment.

(3) The standard and scope of review applicable to the consideration of a motion to withdraw and an accompanying brief under Rule 26(c) is twofold: (a) this Court must be satisfied that defense counsel has made a conscientious examination of the record and the law for arguable claims; and (b) this Court must 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.[*]

(4) This Court has reviewed the record carefully and has concluded that Sammons' appeal is wholly without merit and devoid of any arguably

[*] *Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 83 (1988); *McCoy v. Court of Appeals of Wisconsin*, 486 U.S. 429, 442 (1988); *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 744 (1967).

appealable issue. We also are satisfied that Sammons' counsel has made a conscientious effort to examine the record and the law and has properly determined that Sammons could not raise a meritorious claim in this appeal.

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

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Myron T. Steele
Chief Justice