

**NO. 12-08-00251-CR**

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS**

**TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT**

**TYLER, TEXAS**

***KRISTOPHER DEQUENSTON RYDER,***     §   ***APPEAL FROM THE 7TH***  
***APPELLANT***

***V.***                                     §   ***JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF***

***THE STATE OF TEXAS,***                     §   ***SMITH COUNTY, TEXAS***  
***APPELLEE***

---

***MEMORANDUM OPINION***  
***PER CURIAM***

Kristopher DeQuenston Ryder appeals his conviction for aggravated robbery. Appellant's counsel has filed a brief asserting 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 dismiss Appellant's appeal.

**BACKGROUND**

Appellant was charged by indictment with aggravated robbery. The grand jury further alleged that Appellant used a deadly weapon in the robbery. Appellant pleaded guilty and was placed on deferred adjudication community supervision. The State filed an application to proceed to final disposition alleging that Appellant had violated the terms of his suspended sentence. Appellant pleaded true to the allegations. The trial court found the allegations to be true, found Appellant guilty, and assessed punishment at imprisonment for nineteen years. This appeal followed.

**ANALYSIS PURSUANT TO *ANDERS V. CALIFORNIA***

Appellant’s counsel has filed a brief in compliance with *Anders* and *Gainous*. Counsel states that he has diligently reviewed the appellate record and that he is well acquainted with the facts of this case. In compliance with *Anders*, *Gainous*, and *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978), counsel’s brief presents a thorough chronological summary of the procedural history of the case and further states that counsel is unable to present any arguable issues for appeal. We have considered counsel’s brief and have conducted our own independent review of the record. *See Anders*, 386 U.S. at 745, 87 S. Ct. at 1400; *see also Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 80, 109 S. Ct. 346, 350, 102 L. Ed. 2d 300 (1988). We have found no reversible error. *See Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826–27 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005).

#### CONCLUSION

As required, Appellant’s counsel has moved for leave to withdraw. *See In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403, 407 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008) (orig. proceeding); *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 511 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991). We are in agreement with Appellant’s counsel that this appeal is wholly frivolous. Accordingly, his motion for leave to withdraw is hereby *granted*, and we *dismiss* this appeal. *See In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 408–09 (“After the completion of these four steps, the court of appeals will either agree that the appeal is wholly frivolous, grant the attorney’s motion to withdraw, and dismiss the appeal, or it will determine that there may be plausible grounds for appeal.”).

Counsel has a duty, within five days of the date of this opinion, to send a copy of the opinion and judgment to Appellant and advise him of his right to file a petition for discretionary review. *See TEX. R. APP. P.* 48.4; *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 411 n.35. 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 he must file a pro se petition for discretionary review. *See In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 408 n.22. Any petition for discretionary review must be filed within thirty days following the date of this opinion or the date the last timely motion for rehearing is overruled by this court. *See TEX. R. APP. P.* 68.2. Any petition for discretionary review must be filed with this court, after which it will be forwarded to the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals along

with the rest of the filings in this case. See TEX. R. APP. P. 68.3. Any petition for discretionary review should comply with the requirements of Rule 68.4 of the Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure. See TEX. R. APP. P. 68.4; *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 408 n.22.

Opinion delivered June 30, 2009.

*Panel consisted of Worthen, C.J., Griffith, J., and Hoyle, J.*

(DO NOT PUBLISH)