



COURT OF APPEALS  
EIGHTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
EL PASO, TEXAS

NATHANIEL HOUSTON,	§	No. 08-15-00313-CR
	§	
Appellant,	§	Appeal from the
	§	
V.	§	292nd District Court
	§	
THE STATE OF TEXAS,	§	of Dallas County, Texas
	§	(TC# F11-26764-V)
	§	
Appellee.	§	

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Nathaniel Houston appeals his conviction of aggravated sexual assault of a child. A jury found Appellant guilty and assessed his punishment at imprisonment for a term of twenty-five years. We affirm.

**FRIVOLOUS APPEAL**

Appellant's court-appointed counsel has filed a brief in which she 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 she has delivered a copy of counsel’s brief and the motion to withdraw to Appellant, and she has advised Appellant of his right to file a *pro se* brief. *Kelly v. State*, 436 S.W.3d 313, 318-20 (Tex.Crim.App. 2014)(setting forth duties of counsel). Further, counsel provided Appellant with a complete copy of the appellate record. Appellant has not filed a *pro se* brief.

We have carefully reviewed the record and counsel’s brief, and we agree that the appeal is wholly frivolous and without merit. Further, we find nothing in the record that might arguably support the appeal. The judgment of the trial court is affirmed.

October 19, 2016

YVONNE T. RODRIGUEZ, Justice

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

(Do Not Publish)