

Affirmed and Memorandum Opinion filed May 5, 2016.



In The

Fourteenth Court of Appeals

**NO. 14-15-00303-CR
NO. 14-15-00304-CR**

CHARLES EDWARD BARLOW, SR., Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

**On Appeal from the 252nd District Court
Jefferson County, Texas
Trial Court Cause Nos. 06-98217 and 06-98392**

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

Appellant Charles Edward Barlow, Sr. appeals his convictions for possession of a controlled substance. 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 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). At appellant’s request, the record was provided to him. 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 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 Chief Justice Frost and Justices Boyce and Wise.

Do Not Publish — Tex.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