

Affirmed and Memorandum Opinion filed July 23, 2015.



In The

Fourteenth Court of Appeals

**NO. 14-14-00852-CR
NO. 14-14-00853-CR**

CLIFFORD BAKER, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

**On Appeal from the 174th District Court
Harris County, Texas
Trial Court Cause No. 1299247 and 1299248**

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

Appellant appeals his convictions for possession of a controlled substance with intent to deliver and possession of body armor by a felon. Punishment was assessed at confinement for twelve years in each case and the sentences were ordered to run concurrently.

Appellant's appointed counsel filed a brief in which he concludes the appeal in each case is 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). As of this date, more than 60 days have passed and no 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 of either case. 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, in each case the judgment of the trial court is affirmed.

PER CURIAM

Panel consists of Chief Justice Frost and Justices Jamison and Busby.

Do Not Publish — Tex.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