



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

No. 06-16-00114-CR

GANELLE LEATRICE CLARK, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

On Appeal from the 124th District Court
Gregg County, Texas
Trial Court No. 43,727-B

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

MEMORANDUM OPINION

After Ganelle Leatrice Clark pled true to allegations in the State's motion to adjudicate guilt, including allegations that she failed to complete community supervision and did not report to her community supervision officer for several months, the trial court revoked Clark's community supervision, adjudicated her guilty of the underlying offense of possession of less than one gram of cocaine,¹ and sentenced her to twelve months' confinement in state jail. Clark appeals.

Clark's attorney on appeal has filed a brief, in which he states that he has reviewed the record and has found no genuinely arguable issues that could be raised on appeal. The brief sets out the case's procedural history and summarizes the evidence elicited during the course of the proceeding. The brief meets the requirements of *Anders v. California*, in that counsel has provided a professional evaluation of the record demonstrating why there are no arguable grounds to be advanced. *See 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.

On or about September 1, 2016, counsel mailed to Clark a copy of the brief, the motion to withdraw, and a form motion for pro se access to the appellate record, which lacked only Clark's signature. Clark was also informed of her right to review the record and file a pro se response. On September 6, 2016, this Court informed Clark that the motion for access to the appellate record

¹Clark had pled guilty to the charge and had been placed on deferred adjudication community supervision for a period of three years.

was due on or before October 6, 2016, and that her pro se response would be due thirty days after the receipt of the motion. Clark did not file a motion for access to the appellate record. By letter dated October 17, 2016, this Court again wrote to Clark to inform her that any pro se response was due on or before November 16, 2016. Clark did not file a pro se response.

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).

We affirm the trial court’s judgment.²

Josh R. Morriss, III
Chief Justice

Date Submitted: January 4, 2017
Date Decided: February 3, 2017

Do Not Publish

²Since 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, she 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.