

Affirmed and Memorandum Opinion filed May 6, 2010.



In The

**Fourteenth Court of Appeals**

---

NO. 14-09-00847-CR

---

JOSE MEJIA, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

---

On Appeal from the 228th District Court  
Harris County, Texas  
Trial Court Cause No. 1193550

---

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

A jury convicted appellant of possession of less than one gram of cocaine. On October 2, 2009, the trial court sentenced appellant to confinement for two years in the State Jail Division of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, and the sentence was probated for two years. Appellant was ordered to serve 180 days in the Harris County Jail as a condition of his community supervision. Appellant filed a timely notice of appeal.

Appellant's appointed counsel filed a brief in which he concludes the appeal is wholly frivolous and without merit. The brief meets the requirement 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 (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. (Tex. Crim. App.1991). Appellant requested that the record be provided to him, and this court directed the Harris County District Clerk's office to send appellant a copy of the record. The district clerk's office has advised this court that appellant received a copy of the record. More than forty-five days have elapsed, and appellant has not filed a pro se response or a request for an extension of time.

We have carefully reviewed the record and counsel's brief and agree that the appeal is wholly frivolous and without merit. Further, we find no reversible error in the record. 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 Yates and Boyce.

Do Not Publish — Tex.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