

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

---

---

**NO. 03-17-00673-CR**

---

---

**Michael Todd Englert, Appellant**

**v.**

**The State of Texas, Appellee**

---

---

**FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF TOM GREEN COUNTY, 119TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT  
NO. B-16-0824-SB, HONORABLE JAY K. WEATHERBY, JUDGE PRESIDING**

---

---

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Appellant Michael Todd Englert was charged with aggravated assault with a deadly weapon, a second degree felony. Tex. Penal Code § 22.02(a)(2). After a jury trial, the trial court rendered a judgment of conviction for the underlying offense. The trial court assessed Englert's punishment at eight years in the Texas Department of Criminal Justice-Institutional Division.

Appellant's court-appointed attorney has filed a motion to withdraw supported by a brief concluding that the appeal is frivolous and without merit. The brief meets the requirements of *Anders v. California* by presenting a professional evaluation of the record demonstrating why there are no arguable grounds to be advanced. *See Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 744 (1967); *Garner v. State*, 300 S.W.3d 763, 766 (Tex. Crim. App. 2009); *see also Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 86–87 (1988).

Appellant’s counsel has represented to the Court that he has provided copies of the motion and brief to appellant; advised appellant of his right to examine the appellate record and file a pro se brief; and provided appellant with a form motion for pro se access to the appellate record along with the mailing address of this Court. *See Kelly v. Smith*, 436 S.W.3d 313, 319-21 (Tex. Crim. App. 2014); *see also Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744; *Garner*, 300 S.W.3d at 766. Englert has not filed a pro se brief.

We have conducted an independent review of the record, including appellate counsel’s brief, and find no reversible error. *See Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744; *Garner*, 300 S.W.3d at 766; *Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826–27 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005). We agree with counsel that the record presents no arguably meritorious grounds for review and the appeal is frivolous.

Counsel’s motion to withdraw is granted. The judgment of conviction is affirmed.

---

Scott K. Field, Justice

Before Chief Justice Rose, Justices Goodwin and Field

Affirmed

Filed: September 27, 2018

Do Not Publish