

# ARKANSAS COURT OF APPEALS

DIVISION III  
No. CR-13-845

IAN PATTERSON

APPELLANT

V.

STATE OF ARKANSAS

APPELLEE

Opinion Delivered June 18, 2014

APPEAL FROM THE CRITTENDEN  
COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT  
[NO. CR-11-567]

HONORABLE JOHN N.  
FOGLEMAN, JUDGE

AFFIRMED; MOTION TO  
WITHDRAW GRANTED

---

## BILL H. WALMSLEY, Judge

Appellant Ian Patterson appeals from the revocation of his probation. Appellant's counsel has filed a no-merit brief and a motion to withdraw alleging that there are no nonfrivolous arguments that would support an appeal. We affirm the revocation and grant the motion to withdraw.

On February 17, 2012, appellant pled guilty to residential burglary and was sentenced to five years' probation. He was also ordered to pay court costs, fines, and fees. On April 24, 2013, the State filed an amended petition for revocation, alleging that appellant had violated the conditions of his probation by (1) failing to pay costs, fines, and fees as directed; (2) failing to report to probation as directed; (3) failing to pay probation fees; (4) failing to notify the sheriff and probation of current address and employment; (5) committing the offense of harassing communications; (6) committing possession of marijuana; (7) departing from his

approved residence without permission; and (8) committing residential burglary and theft of property. Following a revocation hearing, the trial court revoked appellant's probation upon finding that he had failed to report to probation as directed and had committed residential burglary and theft of property. He was sentenced to ten years' imprisonment, and this appeal followed.

Pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and Arkansas Supreme Court Rule 4-3(k)(1) (2013), appellant's counsel submitted a no-merit brief asserting that there are no meritorious grounds to support an appeal. Appellant was given an opportunity to file pro se points but has not done so. Arkansas Supreme Court Rule 4-3(k)(1) provides that counsel's brief "shall contain an argument section that consists of a list of all rulings adverse to the defendant made by the circuit court on all objections, motions and requests made by either party with an explanation as to why each adverse ruling is not a meritorious ground for reversal." Counsel has adequately explained why none of the adverse rulings provides a meritorious ground for reversal.

From our review of the record and the brief presented to us, we find that counsel has complied with Rule 4-3(k) and that the appeal is wholly without merit. We thus affirm the revocation and grant counsel's motion to withdraw.

Affirmed; motion to withdraw granted.

GLOVER and VAUGHT, JJ., agree.

*C. Brian Williams*, for appellant.

No response.