

NO. 12-15-00020-CR

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT

TYLER, TEXAS

***ROBERT MITCHELL DEAN, JR.,
APPELLANT***

§ ***APPEAL FROM THE 7TH***

V.

§ ***JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT***

***THE STATE OF TEXAS,
APPELLEE***

§ ***SMITH COUNTY, TEXAS***

***MEMORANDUM OPINION
PER CURIAM***

Robert Mitchell Dean, Jr., appeals his conviction for possession of a controlled substance. 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

In 2014, Appellant was indicted for felony possession of a controlled substance.¹ The indictment also contained allegations of two prior felony convictions, enhancing the punishment range to that of a second degree felony.²

Appellant made an open plea of “guilty” and pleaded “true” to the enhancement paragraphs in the indictment. After a hearing, the trial court accepted Appellant’s plea, found him guilty, found the enhancements to be true, and sentenced him to twelve years of imprisonment. This appeal followed.

¹ See TEX. HEALTH & SAFETY CODE ANN. § 481.115(a) (West 2010).

² See TEX. PENAL CODE ANN. § 12.425(b) (West Supp. 2014).

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.³ We have likewise reviewed 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. See also *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403, 407 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008) (orig. proceeding). We agree with Appellant's counsel that the appeal is wholly frivolous. Accordingly, we grant his motion for leave to withdraw, and affirm the trial court's judgment. See TEX. R. APP. P. 43.2.

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 this court's judgment or the date the last timely motion for rehearing 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

³ Counsel for Appellant states 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 no pro se brief has been filed.

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 July 22, 2015.

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

(DO NOT PUBLISH)



COURT OF APPEALS

TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT OF TEXAS

JUDGMENT

JULY 22, 2015

NO. 12-15-00020-CR

ROBERT MITCHELL DEAN, JR.,

Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,

Appellee

Appeal from the 7th District Court
of Smith County, Texas (Tr.Ct.No. 007-1251-14)

THIS CAUSE came to be heard on the appellate record and brief 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 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., Hoyle, J. and Neeley, J.