

Affirmed and Memorandum Opinion filed May 24, 2016.



In The

Fourteenth Court of Appeals

NO. 14-15-00249-CR

ROY G. WALKER, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

**On Appeal from the 232nd District Court
Harris County, Texas
Trial Court Cause No. 1395740**

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

Appellant Roy G. Walker appeals his conviction for aggravated robbery. 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 advancing frivolous contentions which might arguably support the appeal. *See Gainous v. State*, 436 S.W.2d 137 (Tex. Crim.

App. 1969); *Jackson v. State*, 485 S.W.2d 553 (Tex. Crim. App. 1972); *Currie v. State*, 516 S.W.2d 684 (Tex. Crim. App. 1974).

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 a copy of his trial record on November 6, 2015. On April 14, 2016, appellant filed a pro se response to counsel's brief.

We have carefully reviewed the record and counsel's brief, and appellant's response 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 Chief Justice Frost and Justices McCally and Brown.
Do Not Publish — Tex. R. App. P. 47.2(b).