



**In The  
Court of Appeals  
Sixth Appellate District of Texas at Texarkana**

---

No. 06-16-00001-CR

---

LAMARCUS CRINER, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

---

On Appeal from the 202nd District Court  
Bowie County, Texas  
Trial Court No. 14F0911-202

---

Before Morriss, C.J., Moseley and Burgess, JJ.  
Memorandum Opinion by Justice Moseley

## MEMORANDUM OPINION

LaMarcus Criner was convicted by a jury of the first degree felony offense of aggravated robbery and was sentenced to forty years' confinement. *See* TEX. PENAL CODE ANN. § 29.03 (West 2011). Criner appeals.

Criner's appellate counsel filed a brief that outlined the procedural history of the case, provided a detailed summary of the evidence elicited during the course of the trial court proceedings, and stated that counsel found no meritorious issues to raise on appeal. Meeting the requirements of *Anders v. California*, counsel has provided a professional evaluation of the record demonstrating why there are no arguable grounds to be advanced. *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 743–44 (1967); *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403, 406 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008) (orig. proceeding); *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 509–10 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991); *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807, 812–13 (Tex. Crim. App. [Panel Op.] 1978). Counsel also filed a motion with this Court seeking to withdraw as counsel in this appeal. Counsel provided Criner with a copy of the brief, the appellate record, and the motion to withdraw. Counsel also informed Criner of his right to review the record and file a pro se response.

In response to counsel's *Anders* brief, Criner has filed a pro se response in which he claims that (1) the trial court erred in failing to grant his petition for writ of habeas corpus because he was not timely indicted, (2) the evidence is insufficient to support his conviction because he was not adequately identified as one of the two men who committed the robbery in question, (3) counsel was ineffective because he failed to strike certain venire members who indicated that they were acquainted with members of law enforcement, and (4) trial counsel should not have been appointed

to represent Criner on appeal. After reviewing the record, we find that these points are without merit.

We have determined that this appeal is wholly frivolous. We have independently reviewed the entire appellate record, and we agree that no arguable issues support an appeal. *See Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826–27 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005).

In the *Anders* context, once we determine that the appeal is without merit and is frivolous, we must either dismiss the appeal or affirm the trial court’s judgment. *See Anders*, 386 U.S. 738.

We affirm the judgment of the trial court.<sup>1</sup>

Bailey C. Moseley  
Justice

Date Submitted: April 3, 2017  
Date Decided: April 18, 2017

Do Not Publish

---

<sup>1</sup>Since we agree that this case presents no reversible error, we also, in accordance with *Anders*, grant counsel’s request to withdraw from further representation of Appellant in this case. *See Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744. No substitute counsel will be appointed. Should Appellant desire to seek further review of this case by the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals, he must either retain an attorney to file a petition for discretionary review or file a pro se petition for discretionary review. Any petition for discretionary review (1) must be filed within thirty days from either the date of this opinion or the date on which the last timely motion for rehearing was overruled by this Court, *see* TEX. R. APP. P. 68.2, (2) must be filed with the clerk of the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals, *see* TEX. R. APP. P. 68.3, and (3) should comply with the requirements of Rule 68.4 of the Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure, *see* TEX. R. APP. P. 68.4.