

Opinion issued August 31, 2021



In The
Court of Appeals
For The
First District of Texas

NO. 01-19-00927-CR

MARQUIS CAMILLE, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

**On Appeal from the 337th District Court
Harris County, Texas
Trial Court Case No. 1590275**

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Appellant, Marquis Camille, was found guilty by a jury of the offense of aggravated sexual assault. *See* TEX. PENAL CODE § 22.021. After a punishment hearing, the jury assessed punishment and the trial court sentenced appellant in

accordance with the jury's verdict to 14 years' imprisonment in the Institutional Division of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice. We affirm.

On appeal, Camille's appointed counsel filed a motion to withdraw, along with a brief, stating that the record presents no reversible error and the appeal is without merit and is frivolous. *See Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 87 S. Ct. 1396 (1967).

Counsel's brief meets the *Anders* requirements by presenting a professional evaluation of the record and supplying us with references to the record and legal authority. 386 U.S. at 744, 87 S. Ct. at 1400; *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 is unable to advance any grounds of error that warrant reversal. *See Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744, 87 S. Ct. at 1400; *Mitchell v. State*, 193 S.W.3d 153, 155 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2006, no pet.).

Counsel advised Camille of his right to access the record and provided him with a form motion for access to the record. Counsel further advised Camille of his right to file a pro se response to the *Anders* brief. Camille requested and was given access to the record and he filed a pro se response to counsel's brief.

We have independently reviewed the entire record in this appeal, and we conclude that no reversible error exists in the record, there are no arguable grounds for review, and the appeal is frivolous. *See Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744, 87 S. Ct. at 1400

(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, 826–27 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005) (same); *Mitchell*, 193 S.W.3d at 155 (reviewing court determines whether arguable grounds exist by reviewing entire record). We note that 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.

We affirm the judgment of the trial court and grant counsel’s motion to withdraw.¹ Attorney Cheri Duncan must immediately send Camille the required notice and file a copy of the 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

Panel consists of Justices Kelly, Landau, and Hightower.

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

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 Ex Parte Wilson*, 956 S.W.2d 25, 27 (Tex. Crim. App. 1997).