



In The

Fourteenth Court of Appeals

NO. 14-13-01146-CR

JOE ROGERS PARKER, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

**On Appeal from the 248th District Court
Harris County, Texas
Trial Court Cause No. 0829249**

M E M O R A N D U M O P I N I O N

Appellant Joe Rogers Parker appeals from the trial court's denial of his motion for post-conviction DNA testing.¹ 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, 87 S.Ct. 1396

¹ See also *Parker v. State*, 14-04-00873-CR, 2006 WL 2771809 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] Sept. 28, 2006, pet. ref'd) (affirming trial court's denial of appellant's motion for post-conviction DNA testing).

(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. (Tex. Crim. App.1991). The record was provided to appellant. On July 25, 2014, 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 Chief Justice Frost and Justices Donovan and Brown.

Do Not Publish — Tex.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