

Affirmed and Memorandum Opinion filed May 25, 2017.



In The

Fourteenth Court of Appeals

NO. 14-16-00626-CR

PAUL PATRICK SECHELSKI, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

**On Appeal from the 12th District Court
Grimes County, Texas
Trial Court Cause No. 16,732**

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

Appellant Paul Patrick Sechelski appeals his conviction for possession of less than one gram of a controlled substance in Penalty Group 1. *See* Tex. Health & Safety Code Ann. § 481.115(b) (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 right to inspect 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 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 Boyce, Donovan, and Jewell.
Do Not Publish — Tex. R. App. P. 47.2(b).