

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF LYCOMING COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,	:
	:
vs.	: NO. 1707-2005
	:
TYRONE WILLIAMS,	:
	:
Defendant	: 1925(a) OPINION

Date: December 11, 2006

**OPINION IN SUPPORT OF THE ORDER OF OCTOBER 17, 2006 IN COMPLIANCE WITH RULE 1925(a) OF THE RULES OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE**

Defendant Tyrone Williams (hereafter “Williams”) has appealed from the judgment of sentence entered on October 17, 2006. Williams’s appeal should be denied because of his failure to file a concise statement of matters complained of on appeal.

On October 17, 2006, this court sentenced Williams as follows: Count 1 Aggravated Assault, 18 Pa.C.S.A. § 2702(a)(1), to confinement at a state correctional institution for a minimum term of seventy-two months and a maximum term of fifteen years; Count 3, Robbery, 18 Pa.C.S.A. § 3701(a)(1)(ii), to confinement at a state correctional facility for a minimum term of fifty-four months and a maximum term of fifteen years; Count 6 Possessing Instruments of Crime, 18 Pa.C.S.A. § 907(b), to five years probation; Count 7, Firearms not to be Carried without a License, 18 Pa.C.S.A. § 6106(a)(1), to seven years probation. The sentences under Counts 1 and 3 were to be served concurrently with each other. So to were the sentences under Counts 6 and 7. However, the sentences under Counts 6 and 7 were to be served consecutively with the sentences under Counts 1 and 3.

On November 6, 2006, Williams filed a notice of appeal. On November 13, 2006, this court issued an order in compliance with Pennsylvania Rules of Appellate Procedure Rule 1925(b) directing Williams to file a concise statement of matters complained of on appeal. Williams has failed to file such a statement. This failure prevents the court from preparing a meaningful opinion in compliance with Pennsylvania Rules of Appellate Procedure Rule 1925(a), since the court is unaware of the issues Williams intends to raise on appeal. Furthermore, Williams's failure to file the statement of matters likely waives a number of the issues he intended to raise on appeal. *See, Commonwealth v. Castillo*, 888 A.2d 775 (Pa. 2005); *Commonwealth v. Schofield*, 888 A.2d 771 (Pa. 2005); *Commonwealth v. Lord*, 719 A.2d 306 (Pa. 1998).

Accordingly, Williams's appeal should be denied and the order of October 17, 2006 affirmed.

BY THE COURT,

William S. Kieser, Judge

cc: James Cleland, Esquire  
DA  
Judges  
Christian Kalas, Esquire  
Gary L. Weber, Esquire (Lycoming Reporter)