

Affirmed and Memorandum Opinion filed May 18, 2017.



**In The
Fourteenth Court of Appeals**

**NO. 14-16-00398-CR
NO. 14-16-00399-CR
NO. 14-16-00400-CR
NO. 14-16-00401-CR**

RAYSHAUN BOSTON, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

**On Appeal from the 182nd District Court
Harris County, Texas
Trial Court Cause Nos. 1381606, 1384692, 1384694, and 1393149**

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

Appellant Rayshaun Boston appeals his convictions for aggravated robbery.¹ Tex. Pen. Code Ann. § 29.03 (West 2011). Appellant's appointed counsel filed a brief in which he concludes each appeal is wholly frivolous and without merit. The

¹ Appellant also appealed his conviction for aggravated sexual assault. *See* No. 14-16-00402-CR, *Boston v. State*. This opinion does not include that appeal.

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 right to examine the appellate record and file a pro se response to the brief. *See Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 512 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991). As of this date, more than 60 days have passed and no pro se response has been filed.

We have carefully reviewed the record and counsel’s brief and agree each 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 judgments of the trial court are affirmed.

PER CURIAM

Panel consists of Justices Boyce, Donovan, and Jewell.
Do Not Publish — Tex. R. App. P. 47.2(b).