

Affirmed and Memorandum Opinion filed February 4, 2010.



In The

Fourteenth Court of Appeals

NO. 14-09-00415-CR

THOMAS MUTYEVITA MULWA, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

**On Appeal from the 178th District Court
Harris County, Texas
Trial Court Cause No. 1118924**

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Appellant entered a guilty plea to assault on a family member. On March 11, 2008, the trial court deferred a finding of guilt and placed appellant on community supervision for two years. The State subsequently filed a motion to adjudicate appellant's guilt, alleging appellant violated the conditions of his community supervision. After a hearing, the trial court found the allegations in the motion to adjudicate true. On April 23, 2009, the trial court sentenced appellant to confinement for two years in the Institutional Division of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice. Appellant filed a timely notice of appeal.

Appellant's appointed counsel filed a brief in which she concludes this appeal is wholly frivolous and without merit. The brief meets the requirements of *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 87 S.Ct. 1396 (1967), by presenting a professional evaluation of the record and demonstrating why there are no arguable grounds to be advanced. *See High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807, 811–12 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978).

A copy of counsel's brief was delivered to appellant. Appellant was advised of the right to examine the appellate record and file a pro se response. *See Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 510 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991). A copy of the record was provided to appellant. As of this date, more than forty-five days have elapsed since appellant received the record and no pro se response has been filed.

We have carefully reviewed the record and counsel's brief and agree the appeal is wholly frivolous and without merit. Further, we find no reversible error in the record. A discussion of the brief would add nothing to the jurisprudence of the state. We are not to address the merits of each claim raised in an *Anders* brief or a pro se response when we have determined there are no arguable grounds for review. *See Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 827–28 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005).

Accordingly, the judgment of the trial court is affirmed.

PER CURIAM

Panel consists of Chief Justice Hedges and Justices Anderson and Christopher.
Do Not Publish — Tex. R. App. P. 47.2(b).