

In The
Court of Appeals
Ninth District of Texas at Beaumont

NO. 09-22-00073-CR

MAC ANTHONY CORRALES, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

On Appeal from the 253rd District Court
Liberty County, Texas
Trial Cause No. CR34322

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Mac Anthony Corrales appeals his conviction for online solicitation of a minor, a second-degree felony.¹ After filing the notice of appeal, the trial court appointed an attorney to represent Corrales for the appeal.

¹See Tex. Penal Code Ann. § 33.021(f).

The attorney discharged his responsibilities to Corrales by filing an *Anders* brief.²

In the brief, Corrales's attorney represents he was unable to find any meritorious issues to present in the appeal.³ The brief the attorney filed contains a professional evaluation of the record. In the brief, Corrales's attorney explains why, under the record in Corrales's case, no arguable issues exist to reverse the trial court's judgment.⁴ Corrales's attorney also represented that he sent Corrales a copy of the brief and the record. When the brief was filed, the Clerk of the Ninth Court of Appeals notified Corrales, by letter, that he could file a pro se brief or response with the Court on or before September 20, 2022. Corrales, however, failed to respond.

When an attorney files an *Anders* brief, we are required to independently examine the record and determine whether the attorney assigned to represent the defendant has a non-frivolous argument that would support the appeal.⁵ After reviewing the clerk's record, the

²See *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 744 (1967).

³See *id.*; *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978).

⁴*Id.*

⁵*Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 80 (1988) (citing *Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744).

reporter's record, and the attorney's brief, we agree there are no arguable grounds to support the appeal.⁶ Thus, it follows the appeal is frivolous.⁷ For that reason, we need not require the trial court to appoint another attorney to re-brief the appeal.⁸

The trial court's judgment is affirmed.

AFFIRMED.

HOLLIS HORTON
Justice

Submitted on July 26, 2023
Opinion Delivered August 2, 2023
Do Not Publish

Before Golemon, C.J., Horton and Johnson, JJ.

⁶See *Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 827-28 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005) ("Due to the nature of Anders briefs, by indicating in the opinion that it considered the issues raised in the briefs and reviewed the record for reversible error but found none, the court of appeals met the requirements of Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 47.1.").

⁷*Id.* at 826.

⁸See *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 511 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991). Corrales may challenge our decision in the case by filing a petition for discretionary review. See Tex. R. App. P. 68.