



**In the
Court of Appeals
Second Appellate District of Texas
at Fort Worth**

No. 02-17-00305-CR

No. 02-17-00306-CR

No. 02-17-00307-CR

MICHAEL WHITE, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS

On Appeal from the 213th District Court
Tarrant County, Texas
Trial Court Nos. 1464400D, 1470552D, 1470991D

Before Meier, Gabriel, and Kerr, JJ.
Memorandum Opinion by Justice Kerr

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Without entering into plea bargains, Michael White pleaded guilty to three aggravated robberies with a deadly weapon. *See* Tex. Penal Code Ann. § 29.03(a)(2) (West 2011). After hearing evidence, the trial court found White guilty, sentenced him to eight years in prison for each offense, and ordered all three sentences to run concurrently. White appealed.

White'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 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, 744, 87 S. Ct. 1396, 1400 (1967); *see In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403, 406–12 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008) (orig. proceeding) (analyzing the effect of *Anders*). Although White was given an opportunity to file a pro se response to the *Anders* brief, he has not done so. In a letter, the State agreed with White's counsel that the appeals are frivolous.

After an appellant's court-appointed counsel files a motion to withdraw on the ground that the appeals are frivolous and fulfills the requirements of *Anders*, this court must independently examine the record to see if any arguable ground may be raised on his behalf. *See Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 511 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991). We also consider the briefs and any pro se response. *See Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 408–09. Only after we conduct our own examination to determine whether counsel has

correctly assessed the case may we grant his motion to withdraw. *See Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 82–83, 109 S. Ct. 346, 351 (1988).

We have carefully reviewed counsel’s brief, the State’s letter, and the record. We agree with counsel that these appeals are wholly frivolous and without merit, and we find nothing in the record that arguably might support the appeals. *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 judgments. *See Isaacs v. State*, No. 02-18-00034-CR, 2018 WL 4781575, at *1 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth Oct. 4, 2018, no pet.) (mem. op., not designated for publication); *Lewis v. State*, No. 02-16-00388-CR, 2018 WL 1956230, at *1 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth Apr. 26, 2018, no pet.) (mem. op., not designated for publication).

/s/ Elizabeth Kerr
Elizabeth Kerr
Justice

Do Not Publish
Tex. R. App. P. 47.2(b)

Delivered: December 20, 2018