

NO. 07-05-0263-CR
NO. 07-05-0264-CR
NO. 07-05-0265-CR
NO. 07-05-0266-CR

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SEVENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AT AMARILLO
PANEL A
MAY 24, 2006

MIGUEL A. TIJERINA, APPELLANT

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE

FROM THE 140TH DISTRICT COURT OF LUBBOCK COUNTY;
NOS. 2004-407714, 2005-408363, 2005-408364 & 2005-408365;
HONORABLE JIM BOB DARNELL, JUDGE

Before REAVIS and CAMPBELL and HANCOCK, JJ.

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Following an open plea of guilty, appellant Miguel A. Tijerina was convicted of four counts of burglary of a habitation and sentenced to 20 years confinement. In presenting this appeal, counsel has filed an *Anders*¹ brief in support of a motion to withdraw. We grant counsel's motion and affirm.

¹Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738, 87 S.Ct. 1396, 18 L.Ed.2d 493 (1967).

In support of his motion to withdraw, counsel certifies he has diligently reviewed the record, and in his opinion, the record reflects no reversible error upon which an appeal can be predicated. *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 87 S.Ct. 1396, 18 L.Ed.2d 493 (1967); *Monroe v. State*, 671 S.W.2d 583, 585 (Tex.App.–San Antonio 1984, no pet.). Thus, he concludes the appeal is frivolous. In compliance with *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807, 813 (Tex.Cr.App. 1978), counsel has candidly discussed why, under the controlling authorities, there is no error in the trial court's judgment. Counsel has also shown that he sent a copy of the brief to appellant and informed appellant that, in counsel's view, the appeal is without merit. In addition, counsel has demonstrated that he notified appellant of his right to review the record and file a *pro se* response if he desired to do so. Appellant did not file a response. Neither did the State favor us with a brief.

By his *Anders* brief, counsel raises several grounds that could arguably support an appeal. We have reviewed these grounds and made an independent review of the entire record to determine whether there are any arguable grounds which might support an appeal. See *Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 109 S.Ct. 346, 102 L.Ed.2d 300 (1988); *Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824 (Tex.Cr.App. 2005). We have found no such grounds and agree with counsel that the appeal is frivolous.

Accordingly, counsel's motions to withdraw are hereby granted and the trial court's judgments are affirmed.

Don H. Reavis
Justice

Do not publish.