



Fourth Court of Appeals
San Antonio, Texas

MEMORANDUM OPINION

No. 04-12-00608-CR

Juan Jose **RAMIREZ**,
Appellant

v.

The **STATE** of Texas,
Appellee

From the 437th District Court, Bexar County, Texas
Trial Court No. 2006-CR-8683
The Honorable Lori I. Valenzuela, Judge Presiding

Opinion by: Marialyn Barnard, Justice

Sitting: Sandee Bryan Marion, Justice
Marialyn Barnard, Justice
Luz Elena D. Chapa, Justice

Delivered and Filed: May 15, 2013

MOTION TO WITHDRAW GRANTED; AFFIRMED

Pursuant to a plea bargain agreement, appellant Juan Jose Ramirez pled nolo contendere to the offense of assault with bodily injury of a security officer, a third degree felony. The trial court, in accordance with the plea agreement, deferred a finding of guilt and placed Ramirez on community supervision for a period of five years.

The State filed a Motion to Revoke Community Supervision and a Motion to Supplement the Motion to Revoke Community Supervision, alleging Ramirez had violated numerous conditions of his community supervision. At the hearing, Ramirez pled true to the violations.

The trial court found Ramirez had violated the terms of his community supervision, adjudicated him guilty, and sentenced him to five years confinement. Ramirez then perfected this appeal.

Ramirez's court-appointed appellate attorney filed a motion to withdraw and a brief in which he raises no arguable points of error and concludes this appeal is without merit. The brief meets the requirements of *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978), and *Gainous v. State*, 436 S.W.2d 137 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969). Counsel provided proof Ramirez was given a copy of the brief and motion to withdraw and was informed of his right to review the record and file his own brief. Ramirez has not filed a brief.

After reviewing the record and counsel's brief, we find no reversible error and agree with counsel the appeal is without merit. *See Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826–27 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005). We therefore grant the motion to withdraw filed by Ramirez's counsel and affirm the trial court's judgment. *See id.*; *Nichols v. State*, 954 S.W.2d 83, 86 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1997, no pet.); *Bruns v. State*, 924 S.W.2d 176, 177 n.1 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1996, no pet.).

No substitute counsel will be appointed. Should Ramirez wish to seek further review of this case in the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals, he must either retain an attorney to file a petition for discretionary review or file a *pro se* petition for discretionary review. Any petition for discretionary review must be filed within thirty days after either the day our judgment is rendered or the day the last timely motion for rehearing or timely motion for en banc reconsideration is overruled by this court. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 68.2. Any petition for discretionary review must be filed with the clerk of the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals. *See id.* R. 68.3. Any petition for discretionary review must comply with the requirements of Rule 68.4 of the Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure. *See id.* R. 68.4.

Marialyn Barnard, Justice

Do Not Publish