



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

---

No. 06-16-00127-CR

---

RORY GOLD HICKS, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

---

On Appeal from the 6th District Court  
Lamar County, Texas  
Trial Court No. 26400

---

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

## MEMORANDUM OPINION

Rory Gold Hicks pled guilty to, and was convicted of, aggravated robbery with a deadly weapon. After a punishment hearing, the trial court sentenced Hicks to five years' imprisonment. Hicks appeals.

Hicks' attorney on appeal has filed a brief which states that he has reviewed the record and has found no genuinely arguable issues that could be raised. The brief sets out the procedural history and summarizes the evidence elicited during the course of the proceeding. 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.

On November 7, 2016, counsel mailed to Hicks a copy of the brief, the appellate record, and the motion to withdraw. Hicks was informed of his right to review the record and file a pro se response. By letter dated November 7, 2016, this Court informed Hicks that his pro se response was due on or before December 7, 2016. By letter dated January 9, 2017, we also informed Hicks that the case would be set for submission on January 30, 2017. Hicks did not file a pro se response.

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

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

Bailey C. Moseley  
Justice

Date Submitted: January 30, 2017  
Date Decided: February 24, 2017

Do Not Publish

---

<sup>1</sup>Since we agree that this case presents no reversible error, we also, in accord 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.