



**In The
Court of Appeals
Seventh District of Texas at Amarillo**

No. 07-12-00478-CR

ALEJANDRO CARRASCO, JR., APPELLANT

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE

On Appeal from the 242nd District Court
Castro County, Texas
Trial Court No. B3181-0807, Honorable Edward Lee Self, Presiding

July 19, 2013

MEMORANDUM OPINION

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

Appellant, Alejandro Carrasco, Jr., entered a plea of guilty to the offense of possession of a controlled substance with intent to deliver¹ in an amount of one gram or more but less than four grams. Pursuant to the plea bargain, appellant was placed on community supervision for a period of eight years. Subsequently, the State filed a motion to revoke appellant's community supervision. After hearing the evidence, the trial court found that appellant had violated the terms and conditions of community

¹ See TEXAS HEALTH & SAFETY CODE ANN. § 481.112(a), (c) (West 2010).

supervision and revoked his community supervision and ordered appellant to serve a period of eight years in the Institutional Division of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice. We affirm.

Appellant's attorney has filed an Anders brief and a motion to withdraw. Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738, 87 S.Ct. 1396, 18 L.Ed. 2d 498 (1967). In support of his motion to withdraw, counsel certifies that he has diligently reviewed the record, and in his opinion, the record reflects no reversible error upon which an appeal can be predicated. Id. at 744–45. In compliance with High v. State, 573 S.W.2d 807, 813 (Tex.Crim.App. 1978), counsel has candidly discussed why, under the controlling authorities, there is no error in the trial court's judgment. Additionally, counsel has certified that he has provided appellant a copy of the Anders brief and motion to withdraw and appropriately advised appellant of his right to file a *pro se* response in this matter. Stafford v. State, 813 S.W.2d 503, 510 (Tex.Crim.App. 1991). The Court has also advised appellant of his right to file a *pro se* response. Appellant has not filed a response.

By his Anders brief, counsel raises grounds that could possibly support an appeal, but concludes the appeal is frivolous. We have reviewed these grounds and made an independent review of the entire record to determine whether there are any arguable grounds which might support an appeal. See Penson v. Ohio, 488 U.S. 75, 109 S.Ct. 346, 102 L.Ed.2d 300 (1988); Bledsoe v. State, 178 S.W.3d 824 (Tex.Crim.App. 2005). We have found no such arguable grounds and agree with

counsel that the appeal is frivolous. Accordingly, counsel's motion to withdraw is hereby granted, and the trial court's judgment is affirmed.²

Mackey K. Hancock
Justice

Do not publish.

²Counsel shall, within five days after this opinion is handed down, send his client a copy of the opinion and judgment, along with notification of appellant's right to file a *pro se* petition for discretionary review. See TEX. R. APP. P. 48.4.