



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

No. 07-20-00187-CV

KEVIN LAWSON BLAYDES, APPELLANT

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE

On Appeal from the 100th District Court
Hall County, Texas
Trial Court Nos. 3914, Honorable Stuart Messer, Presiding

January 5, 2021

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Before **QUINN, C.J.**, and **PARKER**, and **DOSS, JJ.**

Kevin Lawson Blaydes appeals the trial court's judgment adjudicating his guilt and convicting him of assaulting a peace officer. Upon accepting a guilty plea and following a plea agreement, the trial court placed appellant on 5 year's deferred adjudication probation. Subsequently, the State moved the trial court to adjudicate appellant's guilt in the cause. After a hearing on the motion, the trial court found appellant violated various conditions of his probation, adjudicated him guilty, and sentenced him to fifteen years in prison. Appellant now appeals.

Appellant's counsel has filed a motion to withdraw together with an *Anders*¹ brief. Through those documents, she certifies to the Court that, after diligently searching the record, the appeal is without merit. Accompanying the brief and motion is a copy of a letter sent by counsel to appellant informing the latter of counsel's belief that there were no arguable issues warranting an appeal and of appellant's right to file a *pro se* response to counsel's *Anders* brief. So too did counsel provide appellant with a copy of the clerk's and reporter's records, according to the letter. By letter dated December 3, 2020, this Court notified appellant of his right to file his own brief or response by December 30, 2020, if he wished to do so. To date, no response has been received.

In compliance with the principles enunciated in *Anders*, appellate counsel discussed potential areas for appeal. Those areas included 1) sufficiency of the evidence to support appellant's probation violations and 2) disproportionate sentencing. However, she then explained why the issues lacked merit.

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 503, 508 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991) (en banc). No issues of arguable merit were uncovered, however.

Accordingly, the motion to withdraw is granted and the judgment is affirmed.²

Brian Quinn
Chief Justice

Do not publish.

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

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