

**Affirmed and Memorandum Opinion filed March 21, 2017.**



**In The**

**Fourteenth Court of Appeals**

---

**NO. 14-15-00755-CR**

---

**PHILIP ANTHONY COX, Appellant**

**V.**

**THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee**

---

**On Appeal from the 180th District Court  
Harris County, Texas  
Trial Court Cause No. 1450528**

---

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

Appellant Philip Anthony Cox appeals his conviction for assault of a family member, second offender. Tex. Pen. Code Ann. §§ 22.01(b)(2)(A) (West 2011). 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 his rights to view the 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, a copy of the record was sent to him. The court granted appellant more than 120 days in extensions of time to file a pro se response. As of this date, no pro se response has been filed.

We have reviewed the record and counsel's brief carefully 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 Christopher, Busby, and Jewell.  
Do Not Publish — Tex. R. App. P. 47.2(b).