Affirmed and Memorandum Opinion filed July 29, 2010.



In The

Fourteenth Court of Appeals

NO. 14-09-00913-CR NO. 14-09-00918-CR

MARCUS PURNELL WILHITE, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

On Appeal from the 208th District Court Harris County, Texas Trial Court Cause Nos. 1141857 & 1178148

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Appellant entered pleas of guilty to two separate aggravated robberies without an agreed recommendation on punishment. On September 24, 2009, the trial court sentenced appellant to confinement for fifteen years in the Institutional Division of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice in each case, with the sentences to be served concurrently. 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. Crim. App.1991). More than forty-five days have passed, and appellant has not filed a pro se brief in response.¹

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. 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 Do Not Publish — Tex.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).

¹ Appellant's only response to counsel's brief was a letter stating that a court reporter was present at his sentencing hearing. This court has confirmed that although the court reporter was present, a record of the hearing had been waived.