Affirmed and Memorandum Opinion filed August 12, 2010.



In The

Fourteenth Court of Appeals

NO. 14-09-00668-CR

DONALD RAY CRAVIN, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

On Appeal from the 232nd District Court Harris County, Texas Trial Court Cause No. 711920

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Appellant was convicted of aggravated sexual assault. On July 24, 2009, the State filed a motion requesting the court to deny DNA testing. Prior to that date, appellant filed a motion for DNA testing that does not appear in our record. The trial court granted the State's motion and denied DNA testing. Appellant filed a notice of appeal.

Appellant's appointed counsel filed a brief in which he concludes the appeal is wholly frivolous and without merit. The brief meets the requirement of *Anders v*.

California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), presenting a professional evaluation of the record demonstrating why there are no arguable grounds to be advanced. *See High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978).

A copy of counsel's brief was delivered to appellant. Appellant was advised of the right to examine the appellate record and file a pro se response. *See Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 510 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991). At appellant's request, the record was provided to him. On April 21, 2010, appellant filed a pro se response to counsel's brief.

We have carefully reviewed the record, counsel's brief, and appellant's response, and agree the appeal is wholly frivolous and without merit. Further, we find no reversible error in the record. A discussion of the brief would add nothing to the jurisprudence of the state. We are not to address the merits of each claim raised in an *Anders* brief or a pro se response when we have determined there are no arguable grounds for review. *See Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 827–28 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005).

Accordingly, the judgment of the trial court is affirmed.

PER CURIAM

Panel consists of Justices Anderson, Frost, and Seymore. Do Not Publish — Tex. R. App. P. 47.2(b).