AFFIRMED; Opinion Filed November 30, 2016



In The Court of Appeals Fifth District of Texas at Dallas

No. 05-16-00103-CR

MIKEY ALBERT LOPEZ, Appellant V. THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

On Appeal from the 265th Judicial District Court Dallas County, Texas Trial Court Cause No. F15-54865-R

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Before Justices Lang, Brown, and Whitehill Opinion by Justice Lang

Mikey Albert Lopez waived a jury and pleaded guilty to aggravated robbery with a deadly weapon. *See* TEX. PENAL CODE ANN. § 29.03(a)(2) (West 2011). After finding appellant guilty, the trial court assessed punishment at ten years' imprisonment. On appeal, appellant's attorney filed a brief in which he concludes the appeal is wholly frivolous and without merit. The brief meets the requirements of *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967). The brief presents a professional evaluation of the record showing why, in effect, there are no arguable grounds to advance. *See High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807, 811–12 (Tex. Crim. App. [Panel Op.] 1978). Counsel delivered a copy of the brief to appellant. We advised appellant of his right to file a pro se response, but he did not file a pro se response. *See Kelly v. State*, 436 S.W.3d 313,

319–21 (Tex. Crim. App. 2014) (identifying duties of appellate courts and counsel in *Anders* cases).

We have reviewed the record and counsel's brief. *See Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826–27 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005) (explaining appellate court's duty in *Anders* cases). We agree the appeal is frivolous and without merit. We find nothing in the record that might arguably support the appeal.

We affirm the trial court's judgment.

<u>/Douglas S. Lang/</u> DOUGLAS S. LANG JUSTICE

Do Not Publish TEX. R. APP. P. 47 160103F.U05



Court of Appeals Fifth District of Texas at Dallas JUDGMENT

MIKEY ALBERT LOPEZ, Appellant

No. 05-16-00103-CR V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

On Appeal from the 265th Judicial District Court, Dallas County, Texas Trial Court Cause No. F15-54865-R. Opinion delivered by Justice Lang. Justices Brown and Whitehill participating.

Based on the Court's opinion of this date, the judgment of the trial court is AFFIRMED.

Judgment entered this 30th day of November, 2016.