

Affirmed and Memorandum Opinion filed November 10, 2015.



In The

Fourteenth Court of Appeals

NO. 14-15-00201-CR

NO. 14-15-00202-CR

ANTHONY DEON BRADFORD, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

**On Appeal from the 122nd District Court
Galveston County, Texas
Trial Court Cause Nos. 14CR0146 and 14CR0147**

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 tampering with evidence. Appellant's appointed counsel filed a brief in which she 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 in each case 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). The record was provided to appellant. As of this date, more than 60 days have passed and no pro se response has been filed.

We have carefully reviewed the record in each case and counsel’s brief and agree the appeal in each case is wholly frivolous and without merit. Further, we find no reversible error in the record in 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, the judgments of the trial court are affirmed.

PER CURIAM

Panel consists of Chief Justice Frost and Justices Christopher and Donovan.
Do Not Publish — Tex. R. App. P. 47.2(b).