

Affirmed and Memorandum Opinion filed February 4, 2010.



In The

Fourteenth Court of Appeals

NO. 14-09-00440-CR

MUIRAJCIO ARGUETA, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

**On Appeal from the 248th District Court
Harris County, Texas
Trial Court Cause No. 1209132**

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Appellant Muirajcio Argueta entered a not guilty plea to burglary of a habitation with intent to commit theft. He was convicted by a jury and the trial court sentenced him to confinement for 25 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 he 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 possible issues for appeal. *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). As of this date, more than 60 days have elapsed 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 Justices Yates, Seymore, and Brown.

Do Not Publish — Tex. R. App. P. 47.2(b).