



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

No. 07-15-00100-CR

PATRICIA DANIELLE MOFFETT, APPELLANT

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE

On Appeal from the 100th District Court
Donley County, Texas
Trial Court No. 3768, Honorable Stuart Messer, Presiding

October 15, 2015

MEMORANDUM OPINION

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

Appellant, Patricia Danielle Moffett, appeals her conviction for forgery. Appellant pled guilty. The trial court deferred the adjudication of her guilt and placed her on community supervision for three years. Subsequently, the State moved to adjudicate guilt, which motion the trial court granted after an evidentiary hearing. Appellant was then sentenced to eighteen months in a state jail facility, fined \$2,500, and ordered to pay restitution.

Appellant's appointed counsel has filed a motion to withdraw, together with an *Anders*¹ brief. In the brief, he certifies that, after diligently searching the record, no arguable issue appears meriting appeal. So too did he mail his client 1) a letter informing her of his conclusion and right to file her own brief or reply, 2) a copy of his brief, 3) a copy of his motion to withdraw, and 4) a copy of the appellate record. By letter, this court also notified appellant of her right to file her own brief or response by October 9, 2015, if she wished to do so. To date, no response has been received.

In compliance with the principles enunciated in *Anders*, appellate counsel discussed 1) the sufficiency of the evidence, 2) potential due process violations, 3) the sentence and 4) the effectiveness of trial counsel. However, he concluded that no arguable grounds for a meritorious appeal existed.

We also conducted our own review of the record to assess the accuracy of appellate counsel's conclusions and to uncover any arguable 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). We also failed to uncover arguable error.

Accordingly, the motion to withdraw is granted, and the judgment is affirmed.

Brian Quinn
Chief Justice

Do not publish.

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