

Affirmed and Memorandum Opinion filed April 28, 2016.



In The

Fourteenth Court of Appeals

NO. 14-15-00222-CR

CLARENCE HENRY MATHIS, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

**On Appeal from the 180th District Court
Harris County, Texas
Trial Court Cause No. 1072790**

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

Appellant brings this appeal from an order denying his request for DNA testing.¹ *See* Tex. Code Crim. Proc. art. 64.03. Appellant's appointed counsel filed a brief in which he concludes the appeal is wholly frivolous and without merit. The brief meets the requirements of *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), by

¹ Appellant's conviction was affirmed on direct appeal in *Mathis v. State*, No. 14-07-00732-CR, 2009 WL 3003252, (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] Feb. 10, 2009, no pet.)(mem. op., not designated for publication).

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 and the record 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 appeal is 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 Boyce, Christopher and Jamison
Do Not Publish — Tex. R. App. P. 47.2(b).