

**Affirmed and Memorandum Opinion filed March 15, 2018.**



**In The**

**Fourteenth Court of Appeals**

---

**NO. 14-17-00412-CR  
NO. 14-17-00413-CR**

---

**OLIVER HOWARD, Appellant**

**V.**

**THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee**

---

**On Appeal from the 230th District Court  
Harris County, Texas  
Trial Court Cause Nos. 1520408 & 1520409**

---

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

Appellant appeals his convictions for evading arrest or detention using a vehicle, and unlawful possession of a firearm by a felon. Appellant's appointed counsel filed a brief in which he concludes the appeal is wholly frivolous and without merit. The brief meets the requirement of *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 87 S.Ct. 1396 (1967), 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 the right to examine the appellate 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, the record was provided to him. On December 11, 2017, appellant filed a pro se response to counsel’s brief.

We have carefully reviewed the record, counsel’s brief, and appellant’s response, and agree the appeal is wholly frivolous and without merit. Further, we find no reversible error in the record. A discussion of the brief would add nothing to the jurisprudence of the state. 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 Busby, Brown, and Jewell.  
Do Not Publish — Tex. R. App. P. 47.2(b).