

Opinion filed October 20, 2022



In The

Eleventh Court of Appeals

Nos. 11-22-00071-CR & 11-22-00102-CR

ALEXANDER CHRISTOPHER LOPEZ, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

**On Appeal from the 350th District Court
Taylor County, Texas
Trial Court Cause Nos. 14075-D & 13650-D**

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Alexander Christopher Lopez, Appellant, waived a jury in each cause and entered an open plea of guilty to two unrelated offenses: murder and aggravated assault with a deadly weapon.¹ See TEX. PENAL CODE ANN. § 19.02(b)(1) (West 2019), § 22.02(a)(2) (West Supp. 2021). The trial court admonished Appellant,

¹We note that the State waived the charge of capital murder that was included as a separate count in the indictment in trial court cause no. 14075-D.

accepted his judicial confessions, and recessed each of the proceedings so that a presentence investigation report could be prepared. The trial court later conducted a joint hearing on punishment, at which several witnesses testified. At the end of the hearing, the trial court found Appellant guilty of the offenses of murder and aggravated assault, made affirmative deadly weapon findings, and assessed Appellant's punishment at imprisonment for life for the offense of murder and at imprisonment for a term of twenty years for the aggravated assault, to run concurrently. We affirm.

Appellant's court-appointed counsel has filed a motion to withdraw in each cause. Each motion is supported by a brief in which counsel professionally and conscientiously examines the record and applicable law and states that he has concluded that the appeal is frivolous and without merit. Counsel has provided Appellant with a copy of the briefs, a copy of the motions to withdraw, and a copy of the clerk's records and the reporter's records. Counsel advised Appellant of his right to review the record in each case and to file a response to counsel's brief. Counsel also advised Appellant of his right to file a pro se petition for discretionary review in order to seek review by the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 68. Court-appointed counsel has complied with the requirements of *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967); *Kelly v. State*, 436 S.W.3d 313 (Tex. Crim. App. 2014); *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008); and *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991).

Appellant has not filed any response to counsel's *Anders* briefs. Following the procedures outlined in *Anders* and *Schulman*, we have independently reviewed the records, and we agree with counsel that no arguable grounds for appeal exist.²

²We note that Appellant has a right to file a petition for discretionary review pursuant to Rule 68 of the Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure.

We grant counsel's motions to withdraw, and we affirm the judgments of the trial court.

PER CURIAM

October 20, 2022

Do not publish. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 47.2(b).

Panel consists of: Bailey, C.J.,
Trotter, J., and Williams, J.