Affirmed and Opinion Filed February 23, 2017



In The Court of Appeals Fifth District of Texas at Dallas

No. 05-16-00766-CR No. 05-16-00767-CR No. 05-16-00768-CR No. 05-16-00769-CR

NOHE ORTIZ, Appellant V. THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

On Appeal from the Criminal District Court No. 2 Dallas County, Texas Trial Court Cause Nos. F16-51443-I, F16-51444-I, F16-51445-I, F16-51528-I

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Before Justices Francis, Lang-Miers, and Whitehill Opinion by Justice Whitehill

Nohe Ortiz waived a jury and pleaded guilty to theft of property valued at more than \$2,500 but less than \$30,000, possession of heroin in an amount of less than one gram, possession of methamphetamine in an amount of one gram or more but less than four grams, and fraudulent use or possession of identifying information in an amount of ten items or more but less than fifty items. The trial court assessed punishment, enhanced by prior felony convictions, at two years' imprisonment for the theft and drug convictions and thirty years' imprisonment for the fraud conviction. On appeal, appellant's attorney filed a brief in which he concludes the appeals are 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. *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).

Appellant filed a pro se response raising several issues After reviewing counsel's brief, appellant's pro se response, and the record, we agree the appeals are frivolous and without merit. *See Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826–27 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005) (explaining appellate court's duty in *Anders* cases). We find nothing in the record that might arguably support the appeals.

We affirm the trial court's judgments.

/Bill Whitehill/ BILL WHITEHILL JUSTICE

Do Not Publish TEX. R. App. P. 47 160766F.U05



Court of Appeals Hifth District of Texas at Dallas

JUDGMENT

NOHE ORTIZ, Appellant

No. 05-16-00766-CR V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

On Appeal from the Criminal District Court No. 2, Dallas County, Texas Trial Court Cause No. F16-51443-I. Opinion delivered by Justice Whitehill. Justices Francis and Lang-Miers participating.

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



Court of Appeals Vifth District of Texas at Dallas

JUDGMENT

NOHE ORTIZ, Appellant

No. 05-16-00767-CR V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

On Appeal from the Criminal District Court No. 2, Dallas County, Texas Trial Court Cause No. F16-51444-I. Opinion delivered by Justice Whitehill. Justices Francis and Lang-Miers participating.

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



Court of Appeals Vifth District of Texas at Dallas

JUDGMENT

NOHE ORTIZ, Appellant

No. 05-16-00768-CR V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

On Appeal from the Criminal District Court No. 2, Dallas County, Texas Trial Court Cause No. F16-51445-I. Opinion delivered by Justice Whitehill. Justices Francis and Lang-Miers participating.

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



Court of Appeals Hifth District of Texas at Dallas

JUDGMENT

NOHE ORTIZ, Appellant

No. 05-16-00769-CR V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

On Appeal from the Criminal District Court No. 2, Dallas County, Texas Trial Court Cause No. F16-51528-I. Opinion delivered by Justice Whitehill. Justices Francis and Lang-Miers participating.

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