NO. 07-05-0458-CR

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE SEVENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS

AT AMARILLO

PANEL B

SEPTEMBER 11, 2006

HENRY COLUMBUS BEAN, JR.,

Appellant

v.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,

Appellee

FROM THE 121ST DISTRICT COURT OF TERRY COUNTY;

NO. 5166; HON. KELLY G. MOORE, PRESIDING

Memorandum Opinion

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

Henry Columbus Bean, Jr. appeals his conviction for possessing a controlled substance (cocaine) in an amount of less than one gram. He was convicted by a jury and sentenced to an enhanced punishment of twenty years confinement and a fine of $10,000.

Appellant's appointed counsel filed a motion to withdraw, together with an *Anders*[1] brief in which he certified that, after diligently searching the record, he concluded that the appeal was without merit. Along with his brief, appellate counsel attached a copy of a letter

---

[1] *Anders v. California,* 386 U.S. 738, 744-45, 87 S.Ct. 1396, 18 L.Ed.2d 493 (1967).

sent to appellant informing him of counsel's belief that there was no reversible error and of appellant's right to file a response or *pro se* brief. By letter dated July 24, 2006, this court also notified appellant of his right to tender his own brief or response and set August 23, 2006, as the deadline to do so. To date, no response has been filed.

In compliance with the principles enunciated in *Anders,* appellate counsel reviewed the various stages of the trial and discussed several potential areas for appeal. However, he adequately explained why each argument lacks merit. We have also conducted our own review of the record to assess the accuracy of appellate counsel's conclusions and to uncover any error pursuant to *Stafford v. State,* 813 S.W.3d 503 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991). Our own review has failed to reveal any reversible error.

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

Brian Quinn
Chief Justice

Do not publish.