NO. 12-07-00049-CR

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT

TYLER, TEXAS

EDDIE BESHAWN THOMAS, APPELLANT § APPEAL FROM THE 7TH

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE § JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF

§ SMITH COUNTY, TEXAS

MEMORANDUM OPINION PER CURIAM

Eddie Beshawn Thomas appeals his conviction for possession of a controlled substance, for which he was sentenced to imprisonment for thirty years. Appellant's counsel filed a brief in compliance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 87 S. Ct. 1396, 18 L. Ed. 2d 493 (1967) and *Gainous v. State*, 436 S.W.2d 137 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969). We affirm.

BACKGROUND

Appellant was charged by indictment with possession of a controlled substance, specifically possession of more than 400 grams of cocaine. Appellant pleaded "not guilty," and the matter proceeded to a bench trial. At the outset of trial, Appellant made a motion to suppress, which was denied. Thereafter, Appellant stipulated to the evidence on the record. The trial court found Appellant to be "guilty" as charged, and a trial on punishment was conducted. Ultimately, the trial court sentenced Appellant to imprisonment for thirty-eight years. This appeal followed.

ANALYSIS PURSUANT TO ANDERS V. CALIFORNIA

Appellant's counsel filed a brief in compliance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 87 S. Ct. 1396,18 L. Ed. 2d 493 (1967) and *Gainous v. State*, 436 S.W.2d 137 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969). Appellant's counsel states that he has diligently reviewed the appellate record and is of the opinion that the record reflects no reversible error and that there is no error upon which an appeal can be predicated. He further relates that he is well acquainted with the facts in this case. In compliance with *Anders, Gainous*, and *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978), Appellant's brief presents a chronological summation of the procedural history of the case and further states that Appellant's counsel is unable to raise any arguable issues for appeal.¹ We have likewise reviewed the record for reversible error and have found none.

CONCLUSION

As required by *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991), Appellant's counsel has moved for leave to withdraw. We carried the motion for consideration with the merits. Having done so and finding no reversible error, Appellant's counsel's motion for leave to withdraw is hereby *granted* and the trial court's judgment is *affirmed*.

Opinion delivered June 25, 2008. Panel consisted of Worthen, C.J., Griffith, J., and Hoyle, J.

(DO NOT PUBLISH)

¹ Counsel for Appellant certified in his motion to withdraw that he provided Appellant with a copy of this brief. Appellant was given time to file his own brief in this cause. The time for filing such a brief has expired and we have received no pro se brief.