

NOS. 12-14-00282-CR  
12-14-00283-CR

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT

TYLER, TEXAS

<i>GENEVA DORIS VASQUEZ,</i> <i>APPELLANT</i>	§	<i>APPEALS FROM THE 159TH</i>
<i>V.</i>	§	<i>JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT</i>
<i>THE STATE OF TEXAS,</i> <i>APPELLEE</i>	§	<i>ANGELINA COUNTY, TEXAS</i>

---

*MEMORANDUM OPINION*  
*PER CURIAM*

Geneva Doris Vasquez appeals her convictions for burglary of a habitation and credit card abuse. The court sentenced her to fifteen years of imprisonment in the Texas Department of Criminal Justice-Institutional Division and two years in a state jail facility, respectively, the sentences to run concurrently. Appellant's counsel filed a motion to withdraw and a brief in support of that motion 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.

*ANALYSIS PURSUANT TO ANDERS V. CALIFORNIA*

Appellant's counsel filed a brief in compliance with *Anders* and *Gainous*, stating that he has diligently reviewed the appellate records and is of the opinion that the records reflect no reversible error upon which an appeal can be predicated. He further relates that he is well acquainted with the facts in these cases. 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 cases, and further states that Appellant's counsel is

unable to raise any arguable issues for appeal.<sup>1</sup> We have considered counsel's brief and conducted our own independent review of the records. 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 carried the motion for consideration with the merits. Having done so and finding no reversible error, we grant Appellant's counsel's motion to withdraw, and affirm the trial court's judgments. See *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 408-09.

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 her of her 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 these cases by the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals, she must either retain an attorney to file a petition for discretionary review or she must file a pro se petition for discretionary review. Any petition for discretionary review must be filed within thirty days from the date of this opinion or the date the last timely filed motion for rehearing is overruled by this court. See TEX. R. APP. P. 68.2. Any petition for discretionary review must be filed with the clerk for 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 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 July 31, 2015.

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

(DO NOT PUBLISH)

---

<sup>1</sup> Counsel for Appellant has certified that he provided Appellant with a copy of this brief. Appellant was given time to file her own brief in this cause. The time for filing such a brief has expired, and we have not received a pro se brief.



## COURT OF APPEALS

### TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT OF TEXAS

#### JUDGMENT

JULY 31, 2015

NO. 12-14-00282-CR

**GENEVA DORIS VASQUEZ,**  
Appellant  
V.  
**THE STATE OF TEXAS,**  
Appellee

---

Appeal from the 159th District Court  
of Angelina County, Texas (Tr.Ct.No. 2012-0039)

---

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

It is therefore ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED that the judgment of the court below **be in all things affirmed**, and that the decision be certified to the court below for observance.

By *per curiam* opinion.  
*Panel consisted of Worthen, C.J., Hoyle, J. and Neeley, J.*



## COURT OF APPEALS

### TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT OF TEXAS

#### JUDGMENT

JULY 31, 2015

NO. 12-14-00283-CR

GENEVA DORIS VASQUEZ,

Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,

Appellee

---

Appeal from the 159th District Court  
of Angelina County, Texas (Tr.Ct.No. 2014-0421)

---

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

It is therefore ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED that the judgment of the court below **be in all things affirmed**, and that the decision be certified to the court below for observance.

By *per curiam* opinion.

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