

In The
Court of Appeals
Ninth District of Texas at Beaumont

NO. 09-09-00346-CR
NO. 09-09-00347-CR
NO. 09-09-00350-CR

ROBERT LLOYD LAUGHLIN, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

On Appeal from the 163rd District Court
Orange County, Texas
Trial Cause Nos. B-090183-R, B-090189-R, and B-090288-R

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Robert Lloyd Laughlin pled guilty to credit card abuse in three separate cases.¹ In each of the cases now before us, the trial court found Laughlin guilty and assessed his punishment at twenty-four months confinement. The trial court stacked Laughlin's sentences.²

¹Laughlin had three other appeals concerning cases in which he had been charged with credit card abuse that we dismissed based on the agreement of the parties. *See Laughlin v. State*, Nos. 09-09-00348-CR, 09-09-00349-CR, 09-09-00351-CR, 2010 Tex. App. LEXIS 2286 (Tex. App.–Beaumont Mar. 31, 2010).

²TEX. CODE CRIM. PROC. ANN. art. 42.08 (Vernon Supp. 2009) (granting trial judge discretion to cumulate a defendant's sentences for two or more convictions).

Laughlin's appellate counsel filed *Anders* briefs in the three cases now before us. *See Anders v. California*, 386 U.S.738, 87 S.Ct. 1396, 18 L.Ed.2d 493 (1967). Counsel's briefs meet the *Anders* requirements by representing a professional evaluation of the records, and the briefs explain why there are no arguable grounds to be advanced in these appeals. *See High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807, 813 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978). Counsel provided Laughlin with copies of the briefs.

Raising identical arguments, Laughlin filed a pro se brief in each case. In his briefs, Laughlin raises various issues, but as we understand Laughlin's arguments, all of his complaints relate to his guilty pleas. We also understand Laughlin's briefs to assert complaints about receiving cumulative sentences and about receiving the ineffective assistance of counsel.

In addressing an *Anders* brief with a pro se response, a court of appeals may only determine (1) that the appeal is wholly frivolous and issue an opinion explaining that the court has reviewed the record and finds no reversible error, or (2) that arguable grounds for appeal exist and remand the cause to the trial court so that new counsel may be appointed to brief the issues. *Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826-27 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005).

Having reviewed the clerk's records, the reporter's record, counsel's briefs, and Laughlin's pro se briefs, we agree that the appeals are frivolous. *See id.* Therefore, we find it unnecessary to order appointment of new counsel to re-brief Laughlin's appeals.

See id.; *cf. Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 511 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991). We affirm the trial court's judgments.³

AFFIRMED.

HOLLIS HORTON
Justice

Submitted on June 25, 2010
Opinion Delivered July 7, 2010
Do Not Publish

Before McKeithen, C.J., Kreger and Horton, JJ.

³Laughlin may challenge our decision in these cases by filing a petition for discretionary review. TEX. R. APP. P. 68.