

NUMBER 13-15-00493-CR

COURT OF APPEALS

THIRTEENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS

CORPUS CHRISTI – EDINBURG

ASHLEY GARCIA,

Appellant,

٧.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,

Appellee.

On appeal from the 117th District Court of Nueces County, Texas.

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Before Chief Justice Valdez and Justices Garza and Longoria Memorandum Opinion by Justice Garza

In 2008, appellant Ashley Garcia pleaded guilty to possession of cocaine with intent to deliver, a first-degree felony. See Tex. Health & Safety Code Ann. §481.112(a), (d) (West, Westlaw through 2015 R.S.). The trial court placed her on deferred

adjudication community supervision for five years. In 2011, the trial court revoked appellant's deferred adjudication community supervision, adjudicated her guilty, and placed her on community supervision for five years. In 2015, the State revoked appellant's community supervision and sentenced her to seven years' imprisonment. Appellant's court-appointed counsel has filed an *Anders* brief. *See Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 744 (1967). We affirm.

I. ANDERS BRIEF

Pursuant to *Anders v. California*, appellant's court-appointed appellate counsel has filed a brief and a motion to withdraw with this Court stating that his review of the record yielded no grounds of error upon which an appeal can be predicated. *See id.* Counsel's brief meets the requirements of *Anders* as it presents a professional evaluation demonstrating why there are no arguable grounds to advance on appeal. *See In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403, 407 n.9 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008) ("In Texas, an *Anders* brief need not specifically advance 'arguable' points of error if counsel finds none, but it must provide record references to the facts and procedural history and set out pertinent legal authorities.") (citing *Hawkins v. State*, 112 S.W.3d 340, 343–44 (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi 2003, no pet.)); *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 510 n.3 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991).

In compliance with *Kelly v. State*, 436 S.W.3d 313, 319–20 (Tex. Crim. App. 2014), and *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807, 813 (Tex. Crim. App. [Panel Op.] 1978), appellant's counsel carefully discussed why, under controlling authority, there is no reversible error in the trial court's judgment. Counsel has informed this Court, in writing, that counsel has: (1) notified appellant that counsel has filed an *Anders* brief and a motion to withdraw; (2) provided the appellant with copies of both pleadings; (3) informed the appellant of

appellant's rights to file a pro se response,¹ and review the record preparatory to filing that response; and (4) provided appellant with a pro se motion for access to the appellate record. *See Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744; *Kelly*, 436 S.W.3d at 319–320, *Stafford*, 813 S.W.2d at 510 n.3; *see also In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 409 n.23. More than an adequate time has passed, and appellant has not filed a pro se response.

II. INDEPENDENT REVIEW

Upon receiving an *Anders* brief, we must conduct a full examination of all the proceedings to determine whether the appeal is wholly frivolous. *Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 80 (1988). We have reviewed the record and counsel's brief, and we have found no reversible error. *See Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 827–28 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005) ("Due to the nature of *Anders* briefs, by indicating in the opinion it considered the issues raised in the brief and reviewed the record for reversible error but found none, the court of appeals met the requirements of Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 47.1."); *Stafford*, 813 S.W.2d at 509. Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of the trial court.

III. MOTION TO WITHDRAW

In accordance with *Anders*, appellant's attorney has asked this Court for permission to withdraw as counsel for appellant. *See Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744; *see also In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 408 n.17 (citing *Jeffery v. State*, 903 S.W.2d 776, 779–80 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1995, no pet.) ("[I]f an attorney believes the appeal is frivolous, he must withdraw from representing the appellant. To withdraw from representation, the appointed attorney must file a motion to withdraw accompanied by a brief showing the

¹ The Texas Court of Criminal Appeals has held that "the pro se response need not comply with the rules of appellate procedure in order to be considered. Rather, the response should identify for the court those issues which the indigent appellant believes the court should consider in deciding whether the case presents any meritorious issues." *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403, 409 n.23 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008) (quoting *Wilson v. State*, 955 S.W.2d 693, 696–97 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, no pet.)).

appellate court that the appeal is frivolous.") (citations omitted)). We grant counsel's motion to withdraw. Within five days of the date of this Court's opinion, counsel is ordered to send a copy of this opinion and this Court's judgment to appellant and to advise her of her right to file a petition for discretionary review.² See Tex. R. App. P. 48.4; see also In re Schulman, 252 S.W.3d at 412 n.35; Ex parte Owens, 206 S.W.3d 670, 673 (Tex. Crim. App. 2006).

DORI CONTRERAS GARZA, Justice

Do not publish. TEX. R. APP. P. 47.2(b).

Delivered and filed the 4th day of August, 2016.

² No substitute counsel will be appointed. Should appellant wish 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 must be filed within thirty days from the date of either this opinion or the last timely motion for rehearing or timely motion for en banc reconsideration that was overruled by this Court. See Tex. R. App. P. 68.2. Any petition for discretionary review must be filed with the clerk of the court of criminal appeals, see *id.* R. 68.3, and should comply with the requirements of Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 68.4. See *id.* R. 68.4.