

**Affirmed and Memorandum Opinion filed May 23, 2017.**



**In The**

**Fourteenth Court of Appeals**

---

**NO. 14-16-00650-CR**

---

**TERRANISHA HORTON, Appellant**

**V.**

**THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee**

---

**On Appeal from the 182nd District Court  
Harris County, Texas  
Trial Court Cause No. 1466538**

---

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

Appellant Terranisha Horton appeals her conviction for aggravated robbery. Tex. Pen. Code Ann. § 29.03 (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 her right to inspect the 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 Christopher, Brown, and Wise.  
Do Not Publish — Tex. R. App. P. 47.2(b).