



NUMBER 13-18-00581-CR

COURT OF APPEALS

THIRTEENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS

CORPUS CHRISTI - EDINBURG

TYLER JENNINGS BOYKIN,

Appellant,

v.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,

Appellee.

**On appeal from the 54th District Court
of McLennan County, Texas.**

MEMORANDUM OPINION

**Before Justices Benavides, Hinojosa, and Perkes
Memorandum Opinion by Justice Hinojosa**

Tyler Jennings Boykin appeals his conviction of possession of a controlled substance, a state jail felony.¹ See TEX. HEALTH & SAFETY CODE ANN. § 481.121. Boykin

¹ This cause is before this Court on transfer from the Tenth Court of Appeals in Waco pursuant to a docket-equalization order issued by the Supreme Court of Texas. See TEX. GOV'T CODE ANN. § 73.001.

received a sentence of two years' confinement. Boykin'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*, Boykin's court-appointed appellate counsel has filed a brief and a motion to withdraw with this Court, stating that her review of the record yielded no grounds of reversible 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–Edinburg 2003, no pet.)); *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 510 n.3 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991).

In compliance with *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807, 813 (Tex. Crim. App. [Panel Op.] 1978) and *Kelly v. State*, 436 S.W.3d 313, 319–22 (Tex. Crim. App. 2014), Boykin's counsel carefully discussed why, under controlling authority, there is no reversible error in the trial court's judgment. Boykin's counsel has also informed this Court that Boykin has been (1) notified that counsel has filed an *Anders* brief and a motion to withdraw; (2) provided with copies of both pleadings; (3) informed of his rights to file a pro se response, review the record preparatory to filing that response, and seek discretionary review if we conclude that the appeal is frivolous; and (4) provided with a form motion for pro se access to the appellate record with instructions to file the motion within ten days. See *Anders*,

386 U.S. at 744; *Kelly*, 436 S.W.3d at 319–20, *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 period of time has passed, and Boykin has not filed a pro se response.²

II. INDEPENDENT REVIEW

Upon receiving an *Anders* brief, we must conduct a full examination of all the proceedings to determine whether the case is wholly frivolous. *Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 80 (1988). We have reviewed the entire record and counsel’s brief, and we have found nothing that would arguably support an appeal. *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 that it considered the issues raised in the briefs and reviewed the record for reversible error but found none, the court of appeals met the requirement of Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 47.1.”); *Stafford*, 813 S.W.2d at 509. We affirm the judgment of the trial court.

III. MOTION TO WITHDRAW

In accordance with *Anders*, Boykin’s attorney has asked this Court for permission to withdraw as counsel. *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 appellate court that the

² 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.)).

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 Boykin and to advise him of his right to file a petition for discretionary review.³ 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).

LETICIA HINOJOSA
Justice

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

Delivered and filed the
27th day of June, 2019.

³ No substitute counsel will be appointed. Should Boykin wish to seek further review of this case by the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals, he 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. A petition for discretionary review must be filed with the clerk of the Court of Criminal Appeals. See *id.* R. 68.3. Any petition for discretionary review should comply with the requirements of Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 68.4. See *id.* R. 68.4.