

NO. 07-08-0184-CR  
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE SEVENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
AT AMARILLO  
PANEL D  
MARCH 13, 2009

---

DONALD R. PEASE, APPELLANT

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE

---

FROM THE 137TH DISTRICT COURT OF LUBBOCK COUNTY;  
NO. 2007-415,574; HONORABLE CECIL G. PURYEAR, JUDGE

---

Before QUINN, C.J., and CAMPBELL and PIRTLE, JJ.

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Following a plea of not guilty, Appellant, Donald R. Pease, was convicted by a jury of aggravated robbery with an affirmative finding on use of a deadly weapon and

sentenced to twenty-eight years confinement. In presenting this appeal, counsel has filed an *Anders*<sup>1</sup> brief in support of a motion to withdraw. We grant counsel's motion and affirm.

In support of his motion to withdraw, counsel certifies he has conducted a conscientious examination of the record and, in his opinion, the record reflects no potentially plausible basis to support an appeal. *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 744-45, 87 S.Ct. 1396, 18 L.Ed.2d 493 (1967); *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403, 406 (Tex.Crim.App. 2008). Counsel has candidly discussed why, under the controlling authorities, the appeal is frivolous. See *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807, 813 (Tex.Crim.App. 1978). Counsel has also demonstrated that he has complied with the requirements of *Anders* and *In re Schulman* by (1) providing a copy of the brief to Appellant, (2) notifying him of his right to file a pro se response if he desired to do so, and (3) informing him of his right to file a pro se petition for discretionary review. *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 408.<sup>2</sup> By letter, this Court granted Appellant thirty days in which to exercise his right to file a response to counsel's brief, should he be so inclined. *Id.* at n.23. Appellant did not file a response. Neither did the State favor us with a brief.

---

<sup>1</sup>*Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 87 S.Ct. 1396, 18 L.Ed.2d 493 (1967).

<sup>2</sup>Notwithstanding that Appellant was informed of his right to file a pro se petition for discretionary review upon execution of the *Trial Court's Certification of Defendant's Right of Appeal*, counsel must comply with Rule 48.4 of the Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure which provides that counsel shall within five days after this opinion is handed down, send Appellant a copy of the opinion and judgment together with notification of his right to file a pro se petition for discretionary review. *In re Schulman*, at 408 fn.22 & at 411 fn.35.

## Potential Issues

By the *Anders* brief, counsel raises three potential issues, to-wit: (1) the evidence was legally insufficient to support Appellant's conviction; (2) the evidence was factually insufficient to support Appellant's conviction; and (3) the non-accomplice evidence was insufficient to corroborate the testimony of Clifford Johnson, Appellant's co-actor. Counsel then explains why the issues have no merit.

We have independently examined the entire record to determine whether there are any non-frivolous issues which might support the appeal. See *Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 109 S.Ct. 346, 102 L.Ed.2d 300 (1988); *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 409; *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 511 (Tex.Crim.App. 1991). We have found no such issues. See *Gainous v. State*, 436 S.W.2d 137 (Tex.Crim.App. 1969). After reviewing the record and counsel's brief, we agree with counsel that there are no plausible grounds for appeal. See *Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824 (Tex.Crim.App. 2005).

Accordingly, counsel's motion to withdraw is granted and the trial court's judgment is affirmed.

Patrick A. Pirtle  
Justice

Do not publish.