



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

---

No. 07-13-00099-CR

---

**CLYDE GARNETT LAND, III, APPELLANT**

**V.**

**THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE**

---

On Appeal from the 242nd District Court  
Hale County, Texas  
Trial Court No. B17581-0803, Honorable Edward Lee Self, Presiding

---

December 5, 2013

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

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

Clyde Garnett Land, III, appellant, was charged with theft, a state jail felony and, after pleading guilty, was sentenced to twelve months in a state jail facility. His sentence was suspended, and appellant was placed on community supervision for four years. Subsequently, the State filed a motion to revoke appellant's community supervision which motion was dismissed when appellant became current on his fees. The State, later, sought to have appellant's probation revoked on other grounds. The court granted the motion and sentenced appellant to twelve months in a state jail facility.

Appellant's counsel has filed a motion to withdraw, together with an *Anders*<sup>1</sup> brief, wherein he certifies that, after diligently searching the record, the appeal is without merit. Along with his brief, he has filed a copy of a letter sent to appellant informing him of counsel's belief that there was no reversible error and of appellant's right to appeal *pro se*. By letter, this court also notified appellant of his right to file his own brief or response by November 15, 2013, if he wished to do so. Appellant filed a response wherein he generally stated he has grounds to pursue the appeal, however, he mentioned none.

In compliance with the principles enunciated in *Anders*, appellate counsel discussed potential areas for appeal which included the sufficiency of the evidence to revoke probation, and the propriety of the sentence assessed. However, he then explained why the issues lacked merit.

In addition, we conducted our own review of the record to assess the accuracy of counsel's conclusions and to uncover arguable error pursuant to *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008) and *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 508 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991). After doing so, we concurred with counsel's conclusions.

Accordingly, the motion to withdraw is granted and the judgment is affirmed.<sup>2</sup>

Brian Quinn  
Chief Justice

Do not publish.

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 744-45, 87 S.Ct. 1396, 18 L.Ed.2d 493 (1967).

<sup>2</sup> Appellant has the right to file a petition for discretionary review with the Court of Criminal Appeals.