

**Affirmed and Memorandum Opinion filed March 22, 2012.**



**In The**

**Fourteenth Court of Appeals**

---

**NO. 14-11-00295-CR**

---

**CHRISTOPHER MOUTON, Appellant**

**V.**

**THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee**

---

**On Appeal from the 185th District Court  
Harris County, Texas  
Trial Court Cause No. 1269668**

---

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

A jury convicted appellant of aggravated robbery. On March 30, 2011, the trial court sentenced appellant, in accordance with the jury's assessment, to confinement for twenty-five 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 that the 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 (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, 512 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991). On October 7, 2011, appellant filed a motion asking that the appellate record be made available to him. He also requested an extension of time to file a pro se response to counsel's *Anders* brief until thirty days after the record was provided to him. On October 13, 2011, this court granted the motion. The record was forwarded to appellant. Appellant did not initially receive the record, and it was sent again on February 6, 2012, and receipt was confirmed. As of this date, more than thirty days have passed 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. We do not 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 Seymore and Boyce.  
Do Not Publish — Tex. R. App. P. 47.2(b).