



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

---

No. 02-18-00066-CR

No. 02-18-00067-CR

No. 02-18-00068-CR

No. 02-18-00069-CR

---

KELLY RODDY, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS

---

On Appeal from Criminal District Court No. 2  
Tarrant County, Texas  
Trial Court Nos. 1496170D, 1496171D, 1496173D, 1496175D

---

Before Birdwell, J.; Sudderth, C.J.; and Womack, J.  
Per Curiam Memorandum Opinion

## MEMORANDUM OPINION

Kelly Roddy appeals from her four convictions for aggravated robbery. Roddy pleaded guilty in all four trial court cause numbers without the benefit of a plea bargain. After receiving a presentence investigation report that was admitted into evidence, the trial court sentenced Roddy to concurrent sentences: one for twenty years' confinement and the other three for fifteen years' confinement each. We affirm.

Roddy's court-appointed appellate counsel has filed a motion to withdraw and a brief under *Anders v. California*, representing that these cases present no nonfrivolous grounds for appeal. 386 U.S. 738, 744–45, 87 S. Ct. 1396, 1400 (1967). Counsel's brief and motion meet the requirements of *Anders* by presenting a professional evaluation of the record and demonstrating why there are no arguable grounds for relief. *See id.*; *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403, 406–12 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008) (orig. proceeding). Counsel also complied with the requirements set forth in *Kelly v. State*, 436 S.W.3d 313, 319–20 (Tex. Crim. App. 2014). Roddy filed a response agreeing with counsel's brief, and the State has not filed a brief.

Once an appellant's court-appointed attorney files a motion to withdraw on the ground that an appeal is frivolous and fulfills the requirements of *Anders*, we must independently examine the record. *See Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 511 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991). 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, counsel’s brief, and Roddy’s pro se response. We agree with counsel that these appeals are wholly frivolous and without merit—we find nothing in the appellate record that might arguably support these 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.

Per Curiam

Do Not Publish  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

Delivered: July 18, 2019