

NO. 07-06-0235-CR  
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE SEVENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
AT AMARILLO  
PANEL C  
MARCH 15, 2007

---

ALBERT CHARLES KUCINSKI,

Appellant

v.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,

Appellee

---

FROM THE 181<sup>ST</sup> DISTRICT COURT OF RANDALL COUNTY;  
NO. 17249-B; HON. JOHN B. BOARD, PRESIDING

---

***Memorandum Opinion***

---

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

Albert Charles Kucinski appeals his conviction, after a jury trial, for manslaughter with a deadly weapon, i.e. a motor vehicle. Appellant's appointed counsel filed a motion to withdraw, together with an *Anders*<sup>1</sup> brief in which she has stated that, after diligently searching the record, she concluded that the appeal was without merit. Included with her brief, is a copy of a letter sent to appellant informing him of counsel's belief that there was

---

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

no reversible error and of appellant's right to file a response or brief *pro se*. By letter dated December 19, 2006, we also notified appellant of his right to tender his own brief or response and set January 18, 2007, as the deadline to do so. Appellant filed two motions to extend the response deadline which were granted and resulted in an extension to March 8, 2007. To date, appellant has filed neither a response, brief nor another request for extension.

In compliance with the principles enunciated in *Anders*, appellate counsel discussed four potential areas for appeal all having to do with claims of ineffective assistance of counsel. However, counsel then satisfactorily explained why each argument lacked merit. We have also conducted our own review of the record, see *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991), and failed to uncover any reversible error.

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

Brian Quinn  
Chief Justice

Do not publish.