

NO. 12-12-00349-CR

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT

TYLER, TEXAS

<i>RODERICK ROY GIBSON,</i>	§	<i>APPEALS FROM THE 145TH</i>
<i>APPELLANT</i>		
<i>V.</i>	§	<i>JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT</i>
<i>THE STATE OF TEXAS,</i>		
<i>APPELLEE</i>	§	<i>NACOGDOCHES COUNTY, TEXAS</i>

MEMORANDUM OPINION
PER CURIAM

Roderick Roy Gibson appeals his convictions for possession of four hundred or more grams of cocaine, for which he was sentenced to imprisonment for ten 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 four hundred or more grams of cocaine and pleaded “guilty.” The matter proceeded to a bench trial on punishment. Following the presentation of evidence and argument of counsel, the trial court sentenced Appellant to imprisonment for ten years. 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*. 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. [Panel Op.] 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. See also *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403, 407 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008) (orig. proceeding). 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**.

As a result of our disposition of this case, Appellant's counsel has a duty to, within five days of the date of this opinion, 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 review of this case by the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals, he must either retain an attorney to file a petition for discretionary review on his behalf or he must file a petition for discretionary review pro se. 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 that was overruled by this court. See TEX. R. APP. P. 68.2. Any petition for discretionary review must be filed with the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals. See TEX. R. APP. P. 68.3(a). Any petition for discretionary review should comply with the requirements of Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 68.4. See *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 408 n.22.

Opinion delivered June 25, 2013.

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

(DO NOT PUBLISH)

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



**COURT OF APPEALS
TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT OF TEXAS
JUDGMENT**

JUNE 25, 2013

NO. 12-12-00349-CR

RODERICK ROY GIBSON,

Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,

Appellee

Appeal from the 145th Judicial District Court
of Nacogdoches County, Texas. (Tr.Ct.No.F1118932)

THIS CAUSE came to be heard on the appellate record and briefs filed herein, and the same being considered, it is the opinion of this court that there was no error in the judgment.

It is therefore ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED that Appellant's counsel's motion to withdraw is **granted**, the judgment of the court below **be in all things affirmed**, and that this decision be certified to the court below for observance.

By *per curiam* opinion.

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