



COURT OF APPEALS  
EIGHTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
EL PASO, TEXAS

MIGUEL ESTRADA,	§	No. 08-15-00275-CR
	§	
Appellant,	§	Appeal from the
	§	
v.	§	34th District Court
	§	
THE STATE OF TEXAS,	§	of El Paso County, Texas
	§	(TC# 20140D03119)
	§	
Appellee.	§	

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Miguel Estrada appeals his conviction of aggravated assault with a deadly weapon, enhanced by two prior felony convictions. After a jury found Appellant guilty, the trial court found the enhancement paragraphs true and assessed Appellant's punishment at imprisonment for a term of twenty-six years. We affirm.

**FRIVOLOUS APPEAL**

Appellant's court-appointed counsel has filed a brief in which he has concluded that the appeal is wholly frivolous and without merit. The brief meets the requirements of *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 87 S.Ct. 1396, 18 L.Ed.2d 493 (1967), by presenting a professional evaluation of the record demonstrating why, in effect, there are no arguable grounds to be advanced. See *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403, 406 n.9 (Tex.Crim.App. 2008) ("In Texas, an

Anders brief need not specifically advance ‘arguable’ points of error if counsel finds none, but it must provide record references to the facts and procedural history and set out pertinent legal authorities.”); *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807 (Tex.Crim.App. 1978). Counsel has notified the Court in writing that he has delivered a copy of counsel’s brief and the motion to withdraw to Appellant, and he has advised Appellant of his right to review the record, file a *pro se* brief, and to seek discretionary review. *Kelly v. State*, 436 S.W.3d 313, 318-20 (Tex.Crim.App. 2014)(setting forth duties of counsel). Counsel also provided Appellant with a form motion for access to the appellate record. Appellant has been provided access to the record and he has filed a *pro se* brief.

We have carefully reviewed the record, counsel’s brief, and Appellant’s *pro se* brief. We agree that the appeal is wholly frivolous and without merit, and we find nothing in the record that might arguably support the appeal. A further discussion of the issues advanced in Appellant’s *pro se* brief would add nothing to the jurisprudence of the state. The judgment of the trial court is affirmed.

STEVEN L. HUGHES, Justice

September 14, 2016

Before McClure, C.J., Rodriguez, and Hughes, JJ.

(Do Not Publish)