

Affirmed and Memorandum Opinion filed March 1, 2016.



In The

Fourteenth Court of Appeals

NO. 14-15-00300-CR

NO. 14-15-00301-CR

LASHONDA DEON JONES, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

**On Appeal from the 221st District Court
Montgomery County, Texas
Trial Court Cause Nos. 15-01-00219 CR (Count 1) and 15-01-00219 CR
(Count 2)**

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

Appellant appeals her convictions for possession of a controlled substance and tampering with physical evidence. In each case, 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 was furnished a copy of the record on October 28, 2015. 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 is wholly frivolous and without merit. Further, we find no reversible error in the records. 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 Jamison, Donovan and Brown.
Do Not Publish — Tex. R. App. P. 47.2(b).