

NO. 07-05-0354-CR  
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE SEVENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
AT AMARILLO  
PANEL B  
MAY 10, 2006

---

BUFORD WILLIAM MEADOWS,

Appellant

v.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,

Appellee

---

FROM THE 31<sup>ST</sup> DISTRICT COURT OF WHEELER COUNTY;  
NO. 4163; HON. STEVEN RAY EMMERT, PRESIDING

---

***Memorandum Opinion***

---

Before QUINN, C.J., and CAMPBELL and HANCOCK, JJ.

After a jury trial, appellant Buford William Meadows was convicted of sexually assaulting a child. Punishment was assessed by the jury at 20 years imprisonment. Appellant timely filed his notice of appeal. Appellant's appointed counsel has filed a motion to withdraw, together with an *Anders*<sup>1</sup> brief, wherein he certifies that, after diligently searching the record, he has concluded that appellant's appeal is without merit. Along with his brief, he has filed a copy of a letter sent to appellant informing him of counsel's belief

---

<sup>1</sup>See *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 744- 45, 87 S.Ct. 1396, 18 L.Ed.2d 493 (1967).

that there was no reversible error and of appellant's right to appeal *pro se*. By letter dated March 29, 2006, this court notified appellant of his right to file his own brief or response by April 28, 2006, if he wished to do so. The latter date has passed without the filing of either a motion for extension or a response.

In compliance with the principles enunciated in *Anders*, appellate counsel discussed four potential grounds of error and then explained why they were meritless. Thereafter, we conducted our own review of the record to assess the accuracy of appellate counsel's conclusions and to uncover any error, reversible or otherwise, pursuant to *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503 ( Tex. Crim. App. 1991) and concluded that none existed.

Accordingly, the motion to withdraw is granted and the judgment is affirmed.

Brian Quinn  
Chief Justice

Do not publish.