

Affirmed and Memorandum Opinion filed March 30, 2017.



**In The
Fourteenth Court of Appeals**

**NO. 14-15-00977-CR
NO. 14-15-00978-CR**

ERIK MARTINEZ, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

**On Appeal from the 178th District Court
Harris County, Texas
Trial Court Cause Nos. 1442947 and 1445876**

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

Appellant Erik Martinez appeals his convictions for (1) possession of a controlled substance with intent to deliver, 4 to 200 grams; and (2) theft. Tex. Health & Safety Code Ann. § 481.112(d) (West 2010); Tex. Pen. Code Ann. § 31.03(e)(5)(A) (West 2011). Appellant's appointed counsel filed a brief in which she concludes the appeals are 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 records and file a pro se response. *See Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 512 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991). More than 60 days have passed, and no pro se response has been filed.

We have reviewed the record and counsel’s brief carefully and agree the appeals are 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 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, Jamison, and Brown.
Do Not Publish — Tex. R. App. P. 47.2(b).