

COURT OF APPEALS SECOND DISTRICT OF TEXAS FORT WORTH

NO. 02-13-00551-CR

BRAD GUINN ALLEN

APPELLANT

٧.

THE STATE OF TEXAS

STATE

FROM THE 355TH DISTRICT COURT OF HOOD COUNTY TRIAL COURT NO. CR12016

MEMORANDUM OPINION¹

Appellant Brad Guinn Allen appeals his conviction for state-jail felony delivery of marijuana upon the revocation of his deferred-adjudication community supervision. We affirm.

Allen's court-appointed appellate counsel has filed a motion to withdraw as counsel and a brief in support of that motion. Counsel's brief and motion meet

¹See Tex. R. App. P. 47.4.

the requirements of *Anders v. California* by presenting a professional evaluation

of the record demonstrating why there are no arguable grounds for relief. 386

U.S. 738, 87 S. Ct. 1396 (1967). Allen had the opportunity to file a pro se brief

but did not do so; the State has not filed a brief.

Once an appellant's court-appointed attorney files a motion to withdraw on

the ground that the appeal is frivolous and fulfills the requirements of *Anders*, this

court is obligated to undertake an independent examination of the record. See

Stafford v. State, 813 S.W.2d 503, 511 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991); Mays v. State,

904 S.W.2d 920, 922–23 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 1995, no pet.). Only then may

we grant counsel's motion to withdraw. See Penson v. Ohio, 488 U.S. 75, 82-

83, 109 S. Ct. 346, 351 (1988).

We have carefully reviewed the record and counsel's brief. We agree with

counsel that this appeal is wholly frivolous and without merit; we find nothing in

the record that might arguably support the appeal. See Bledsoe v. State, 178

S.W.3d 824, 827–28 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005); see also Meza v. State, 206 S.W.3d

684, 685 n.6 (Tex. Crim. App. 2006). Accordingly, we grant counsel's motion to

withdraw and affirm the trial court's judgment.

PER CURIAM

PANEL: MCCOY, J.; LIVINGSTON, C.J.; and DAUPHINOT, J.

DO NOT PUBLISH

Tex. R. App. P. 47.2(b)

DELIVERED: November 6, 2014

2