



NUMBER 13-23-00281-CR

COURT OF APPEALS

THIRTEENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS

CORPUS CHRISTI – EDINBURG

**BRANDON GUZMAN A/K/A
BRANDON LUCIO GUZMAN,**

Appellant,

v.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,

Appellee.

**ON APPEAL FROM THE 187TH DISTRICT COURT
OF BEXAR COUNTY, TEXAS**

MEMORANDUM OPINION

**Before Benavides, Tijerina, and Silva
Memorandum Opinion by Justice Silva**

Appellant Brandon Guzman a/k/a Brandon Lucio Guzman was convicted of murder and sentenced to seventy years' imprisonment. See TEX. PENAL CODE ANN. § 19.02.¹

¹ This case is before this Court on transfer from the Fourth Court of Appeals in San Antonio pursuant to a docket-equalization order issued by the Supreme Court of Texas. See TEX. GOV'T CODE ANN.

Appellant’s court-appointed counsel has filed an *Anders* brief stating that there are no arguable grounds for appeal. See *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 744 (1967). We affirm the trial court’s judgment.

I. **ANDERS BRIEF**

Pursuant to *Anders v. California*, appellant’s court-appointed appellate counsel filed a brief and a motion to withdraw with this Court, stating that his review of the record yielded no grounds of reversible error upon which an appeal could 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, 406 n.9 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008) (orig. proceeding) (“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), appellant’s court-appointed appellate counsel carefully discussed why, under controlling authority, there is no reversible error in the trial court’s judgment. Appellant’s counsel also informed this Court in writing that he: (1) notified appellant that counsel has filed an *Anders* brief and a motion to withdraw; (2) provided appellant with copies of both

pleadings; (3) informed appellant of his rights to file pro se responses, to review the record prior to filing those responses, and to seek discretionary review if we conclude that the appeal is frivolous; and (4) provided appellant with a form motion for pro se access to the appellate record that only requires appellant's signature and date with instructions to file the motion within ten days. *See Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744; *Kelly*, 436 S.W.3d at 319–20; *see also In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 408–09.

In this case, appellant filed a motion on October 23, 2023, seeking pro se access to the appellate record, which this Court granted. This Court has granted multiple extensions of time to file a pro se brief since then. On February 27, 2024, this Court notified appellant his brief was due no later than March 28, 2024. Appellant has not filed a pro se response or brief to date.

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 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 requirements of Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 47.1.”); *Stafford*, 813 S.W.2d at 511.

III. MOTION TO WITHDRAW

In accordance with *Anders*, appellant's court-appointed appellate counsel 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 We grant counsel’s motion to withdraw. Within five days from 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 him of his 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 411 n.35; *Ex parte Owens*, 206 S.W.3d 670, 673 (Tex. Crim. App. 2006).

IV. CONCLUSION

We affirm the trial court’s judgment.

CLARISSA SILVA
Justice

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

Delivered and filed on the
18th day of April, 2024.

² No substitute counsel will be appointed. Should appellant 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. Any petition for discretionary review must be filed with the Clerk of the Texas 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.