



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

---

Nos. 07-13-00234-CR  
07-13-00235-CR  
07-13-00236-CR  
07-13-00237-CR  
07-13-00238-CR  
07-13-00239-CR

---

**AARON EDWARD BELL, APPELLANT**

**V.**

**THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE**

---

On Appeal from the 372nd District Court  
Tarrant County, Texas  
Trial Court Nos. 1288725D, 1288726D, 1288727D, 1288728D, 1290870D, 1290871D,  
Honorable David Scott Wisch, Presiding

---

February 19, 2014

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

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

Aaron Edward Bell appeals his six convictions for aggravated robbery. After an open plea of guilty and a plea of true to two enhancements, the trial court sentenced him to fifty years confinement in one case (No. 1288727D/07-13-00236-CR) and forty years confinement in the other five cases to be served concurrently.

Appellant's appointed counsel has filed a motion to withdraw, together with an *Ander's*<sup>1</sup> brief wherein he certified that, after diligently searching the record, he concluded that the appeal is without merit. Along with his brief, appellate counsel attached 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 file a response or brief *pro se*. By letter, this court also notified appellant of his right to tender his own brief or response and set February 10, 2014, as the deadline to do so. To date, no response or brief has been filed.

In compliance with the principles enunciated in *Anders*, appellate counsel discussed potential areas for appeal including the sufficiency of the evidence, the admonishments, objections made at the punishment hearing, the sentence, arguments of counsel, and the effectiveness of counsel. Appellate counsel also explained that each issue lacked merit.

In addition, we have conducted our own review of the record to assess the accuracy of appellate counsel's conclusions and to uncover any error pursuant to *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008) and *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991). Our own review has failed to reveal reversible error.

Accordingly, the motion to withdraw is granted, and the judgments are affirmed.

Per Curiam

Do not publish.

---

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