

Affirmed and Memorandum Opinion filed March 15, 2011.



In The

Fourteenth Court of Appeals

NO. 14-10-00692-CR

NO. 14-10-00693-CR

JUSTIN LEE QUIRK, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

**On Appeal from the 163rd District Court
Orange County, Texas
Trial Court Cause Nos. B100089-R & B100119-R**

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Appellant entered a plea of guilty to the offenses of fraudulent use of identifying information and felony theft. On June 24, 2010, the trial court sentenced appellant to confinement for 20 months on each offense in the State Jail Division of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice. Pursuant to trial court's judgment, appellant's sentences will run consecutively. Appellant filed a notice of appeal.

Appellant's appointed counsel filed a brief in which she concludes the appeal is wholly frivolous and without merit. The brief meets the requirement of *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 87 S.Ct. 1396 (1967), by presenting a professional evaluation of the record and 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). As of this date, no pro se response has been filed.

We have carefully reviewed the record and counsel's brief and agree the appeal is wholly frivolous and without merit. Further, we find no reversible error in the record. 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, Seymore, and McCally.

Do Not Publish — Tex. R. App. P. 47.2(b).