

Opinion issued September 24, 2020



In The
Court of Appeals
For The
First District of Texas

NO. 01-18-00715-CR

FREDERICK PIERRE COOKS, Appellant
V.
THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

On Appeal from the 180th District Court
Harris County, Texas
Trial Court Case No. 1552202

MEMORANDUM OPINION

A jury found appellant, Frederick Pierre Cooks, guilty of the third-degree felony offense of evading arrest in a motor vehicle. *See* TEX. PENAL CODE § 38.04(b)(2)(a). The jury assessed punishment at eight years' imprisonment, which is within the applicable sentencing range. *See* TEX. PENAL CODE § 12.34(a). The trial

court certified that this was not a plea-bargain case, and that appellant had the right of appeal. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 25.2(a)(2). Appellant timely filed a notice of appeal.

Appellant's appointed counsel on appeal has filed a motion to withdraw, along with an *Anders* brief stating that the record presents no reversible error and that, therefore, the appeal is without merit and is frivolous. *See Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967). Counsel's brief meets the *Anders* requirements by presenting a professional evaluation of the record and supplying this Court with references to the record and legal authority. *See id.* at 744; *see also High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807, 812 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978). Counsel indicates that she has thoroughly reviewed the record and that she is unable to advance any grounds of error that warrant reversal. *See Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744; *Mitchell v. State*, 193 S.W.3d 153, 155 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2006, no pet.).

Appellant's counsel has certified that she mailed a copy of the motion to withdraw and the *Anders* brief to appellant and informed appellant of his right to file a response and to access the record. *See In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403, 408 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008). Furthermore, counsel certified that she sent appellant the form motion for pro se access to the records for his response. *See Kelly v. State*, 436 S.W.3d 313, 322 (Tex. Crim. App. 2014). Appellant did not file a pro se response.

We have independently reviewed the entire record in this appeal, and we conclude that no reversible error exists in the record, that there are no arguable

grounds for review, and that therefore the appeal is frivolous. *See Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744 (emphasizing that reviewing court—and not counsel—determines, after full examination of proceedings, whether appeal is wholly frivolous); *Garner v. State*, 300 S.W.3d 763, 767 (Tex. Crim. App. 2009) (reviewing court must determine whether arguable grounds for review exist); *Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826–28 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005) (reviewing court is not to address merits of each claim raised in *Anders* brief or *pro se* response after determining there are no arguable grounds for review); *Mitchell*, 193 S.W.3d at 155. An appellant may challenge a holding that there are no arguable grounds for appeal by filing a petition for discretionary review in the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals. *See Bledsoe*, 178 S.W.3d at 827 n.6.

Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of the trial court and grant counsel’s motion to withdraw.¹ *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 43.2(a). Attorney Andreea Ionescu must immediately send the required notice and file a copy of that notice with the Clerk of this Court. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 6.5(c). We dismiss any other pending motions as moot.

PER CURIAM

¹ Appointed counsel still has a duty to inform appellant of the result of this appeal and that he may, on his own, pursue discretionary review in the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals. *See Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826–27 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005).

Panel consists of Justices Keyes, Lloyd, and Landau.

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