

NO. 07-07-0190-CR  
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE SEVENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
AT AMARILLO  
PANEL B  
AUGUST 13, 2008

---

RICHARD WARREN PAIGE JR.,

Appellant

v.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,

Appellee

---

FROM THE 320<sup>TH</sup> DISTRICT COURT OF POTTER COUNTY;  
NO. 53,570-D; HON. DAVID GLEASON, PRESIDING

---

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

After a jury trial, appellant Richard Warren Paige, Jr. was convicted of the offense of murder. Punishment was assessed by the jury at forty years in the Texas Department of Criminal Justice - Institutional Division. 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

---

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

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 that there was no reversible error and of appellant's right to appeal *pro se*. This court gave appellant until July 28, 2008, to file his own brief or response if he wished to do so. Appellant's *pro se* response was filed on that date.

In compliance with the principles enunciated in *Anders*, appellate counsel discussed one potential area for appeal that being ineffective assistance of counsel. However, counsel has explained why the argument lacked merit. Thereafter, we conducted our own review of the record and appellant's *pro se* response 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). Our own review has failed to reveal any arguably reversible error.

Accordingly, the motion to withdraw is granted, and the judgment is affirmed.<sup>2</sup>

Brian Quinn  
Chief Justice

Do not publish.

---

<sup>2</sup>Appellant has the right to file a *pro se* petition for discretionary review from this opinion.