

**Motion Granted, Affirmed and Memorandum Opinion filed September 22, 2011.**



**In The**

**Fourteenth Court of Appeals**

---

**NO. 14-10-01045-CR**

---

**DERRICK JEMAINÉ ALLISON, Appellant**

**V.**

**THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee**

---

**On Appeal from the 176th District Court  
Harris County, Texas  
Trial Court Cause No. 1211015**

---

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

A jury convicted appellant of burglary of a habitation. On October 20, 2010, the trial court sentenced appellant, Justice in accordance with the jury's assessment, to confinement for thirty-five years in the Institutional Division of the Texas Department of Criminal. Appellant filed a timely notice of appeal.

Appellant's appointed counsel filed a brief in which she concludes that the appeal is wholly frivolous and without merit. The brief meets the requirements 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, more than forty-five days has passed and 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 Chief Justice Hedges and Justices Anderson and Christopher.  
Do Not Publish — Tex. R. App. P. 47.2(b).