

**NO. 12-07-00144-CR
NO. 12-07-00145-CR**

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT
TYLER, TEXAS**

*HERMAN D. LIGGINS, JR.,
APPELLANT*

§ *APPEALS FROM THE 241ST*

V.

§ *JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF*

*THE STATE OF TEXAS,
APPELLEE*

§ *SMITH COUNTY, TEXAS*

***MEMORANDUM OPINION
PER CURIAM***

Herman D. Liggins, Jr. appeals his conviction for burglary of a habitation and his conviction for burglary of a building. 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 pleaded guilty to burglary of a habitation and burglary of a building. Appellant also pleaded true to two enhancement paragraphs included in the indictment for each offense. The paragraphs related to two previous felonies committed by Appellant. There was no agreement between Appellant and the State as to the appropriate punishment for the charged offenses. However, the State had agreed to recommend to the trial court that Appellant's sentences run concurrently with each other, with the sentence of an additional offense, unrelated to these appeals, and with an additional sentence being served following a parole revocation. The trial court found Appellant guilty of both offenses and sentenced Appellant to life imprisonment for the burglary of

a habitation offense and twenty years of imprisonment for the burglary of a building offense. This appeal followed.

ANALYSIS PURSUANT TO *ANDERS V. CALIFORNIA*

Appellant's counsel filed a brief in compliance with *Anders v. California* and *Gainous v. State*. The brief shows that Appellant's counsel diligently reviewed the appellate record and considered the applicable law 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. 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 examined the record for reversible error and have found none. See *Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826-27 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005).

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 judgments are **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 these causes. The time for filing such a brief has expired and we have received no pro se brief.