

**Affirmed and Memorandum Opinion filed August 11, 2015.**



**In The**

**Fourteenth Court of Appeals**

---

**NO. 14-14-00889-CR  
NO. 14-14-00890-CR**

---

**DANIEL REYNULFO EDISON, Appellant**

**V.**

**THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee**

---

**On Appeal from the 232nd District Court  
Harris County, Texas  
Trial Court Cause Nos. 1379135 & 1372460**

---

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

Appellant appeals his convictions for aggravated robbery. Appellant's appointed counsel filed a brief in which she concludes the appeal 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. 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 judgments of the trial court are affirmed.

PER CURIAM

Panel consists of Justices Christopher, Brown, and Wise.

Do Not Publish — Tex.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