

Affirmed and Memorandum Opinion filed December 2, 2014.



In The

Fourteenth Court of Appeals

**NO. 14-14-00104-CR
NO. 14-14-00105-CR
NO. 14-14-00106-CR**

GEORGE WILHELM VOGEL, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

**On Appeal from the 359th District Court
Montgomery County, Texas
Trial Court Cause No. 13-04-04450 CR**

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

Appellant appeals his convictions for three counts of aggravated sexual assault of a child. Appellant's appointed counsel filed a brief in which he concludes the appeals are wholly frivolous and without merit. The brief meets the requirements of *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (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, 811–13 (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, 512 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991). Appellant received the record on July 30, 2014, and received two extensions of time to file a pro se response. As of this date, pro se response has been filed.

We have carefully reviewed the record and counsel’s brief and agree the appeals are 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 McCally, Brown, and Wise.

Do Not Publish — Tex.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