

**TEXAS COURT OF APPEALS, THIRD DISTRICT, AT AUSTIN**

---

---

**NO. 03-13-00118-CR  
NO. 03-13-00119-CR  
NO. 03-13-00120-CR  
NO. 03-13-00121-CR**

---

---

**Reginald Darnell Hamilton, Appellant**

**v.**

**The State of Texas, Appellee**

---

---

**FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF MILAM, 20TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT  
NOS. CR23,400, CR23,401, CR23,425 & CR23,454  
HONORABLE JOHN YOUNGBLOOD, JUDGE PRESIDING**

---

---

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Appellant Reginald Darnell Hamilton brings these appeals from his pleas of guilty to four offenses and pleas of true to enhancement paragraphs in his indictments without a plea bargain for punishment. In trial court cause number CR23,400 (appellate cause number 03-13-00118-CR), Hamilton pleaded guilty to the state jail felony offense of endangering a child, enhanced to a third-degree felony. *See* Tex. Penal Code § 22.041. In trial court cause number CR23,401 (appellate cause number 03-13-00119-CR), Hamilton pleaded guilty to the state jail felony offense of unlawful possession of a firearm, enhanced to a third degree-felony. *See id.* § 46.04. In trial court cause number CR23,425 (appellate cause number 03-13-00120-CR), Hamilton pleaded guilty to the first-degree felony offense of possession of a controlled substance between 4 and 200 grams

with intent to deliver in a drug-free zone, enhanced by his pleading of true to a prior felony conviction. *See* Tex. Health & Safety Code § 481.134. In trial court cause number CR23,454 (appellate cause number 03-13-00121-CR), Hamilton pleaded guilty to the state jail felony offense of delivery of a controlled substance less than one gram, enhanced to a third-degree felony. *See id.* § 481.112. After a hearing, the trial court assessed punishment at ten years' imprisonment for the offense of child endangerment, ten years' imprisonment for the offense of unlawful possession of a firearm, thirty years' imprisonment for the offense of possession of a controlled substance between 4 and 200 grams with intent to deliver in a drug-free zone, and ten years' imprisonment for the offense of delivery of a controlled substance less than one gram.

Hamilton's court-appointed attorney has filed a motion to withdraw supported by a brief addressing each of these appeals and concluding that these appeals are frivolous and without merit. The brief meets the requirements of *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 744 (1967), by presenting a professional evaluation of the record in these causes demonstrating why there are no arguable grounds to be advanced. *See id.*; *see also Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 80 (1988); *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807, 811-13 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978); *Currie v. State*, 516 S.W.2d 684, 684 (Tex. Crim. App. 1974); *Jackson v. State*, 485 S.W.2d 553, 553 (Tex. Crim. App. 1972); *Gainous v. State*, 436 S.W.2d 137, 138 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969). Counsel sent a copy of the brief to Hamilton and advised him of his right to examine the appellate record in these causes and to file a pro se brief. *See Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744. Hamilton did not file a pro se brief and did not request an extension of time to do so.

We have reviewed the record in these causes and find no reversible error. *See Garner v. State*, 300 S.W.3d 763, 766 (Tex. Crim. App. 2009); *Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826-27 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005). We agree with counsel that these appeals are frivolous. Counsel's motion to withdraw from these appeals is granted. The judgments of conviction are affirmed.

---

Jeff Rose, Justice

Before Justices Puryear, Rose, and Goodwin

Affirmed

Filed: November 21, 2013

Do Not Publish