

NO. 07-07-0408-CR
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SEVENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AT AMARILLO
PANEL A
JULY 22, 2008

MAURICIA BELEN GARCIA AKA BELEN REYNA, APPELLANT

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE

FROM THE 252ND DISTRICT COURT OF JEFFERSON COUNTY;

NO. 90086; HONORABLE LAYNE WALKER, JUDGE

Before CAMPBELL and HANCOCK and PIRTLE, JJ.

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Appellant, Mauricia Belen Garcia, pleaded guilty to the offense of abandoning a child with intent to return, a state jail felony. As a result of a plea agreement, adjudication was deferred and appellant was placed on probation for four years. After the State had filed its second motion to proceed with adjudication, appellant pleaded true to four allegations of failure to comply with various aspects of her probation. The trial court received her pleas of true and adjudicated appellant guilty of the underlying offense. After a hearing on the issue of punishment, appellant was sentenced to confinement in a state

jail facility for a term of 13 months. The trial court certified appellant's right to appeal and this appeal followed. We affirm.

Appellant's attorney has filed an Anders brief and a motion to withdraw. Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738, 87 S.Ct. 1396, 18 L.Ed. 2d 498 (1967). In support of his motion to withdraw, counsel certifies that he has diligently reviewed the record, and in his opinion, the record reflects no reversible error upon which an appeal can be predicated. Id. at 744-45. In compliance with High v. State, 573 S.W.2d 807, 813 (Tex.Crim.App. 1978), counsel has candidly discussed why, under the controlling authorities, there is no error in the trial court's judgment. Additionally, counsel has certified that he has provided appellant a copy of the Anders brief and motion to withdraw and appropriately advised appellant of his right to file a *pro se* response in this matter. Stafford v. State, 813 S.W.2d 503, 510 (Tex.Crim.App. 1991). The court has also advised appellant of his right to file a *pro se* response. Appellant has not filed a response.

By his Anders brief, counsel raises grounds that could possibly support an appeal, but concludes the appeal is frivolous. 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.Crim.App. 2005). We have found no such arguable grounds and agree with counsel that the appeal is frivolous.

Accordingly, counsel's motion to withdraw is hereby granted and the trial court's judgment is affirmed.¹

Mackey K. Hancock
Justice

Do not publish.

¹Counsel shall, within five days after the opinion is handed down, send his client a copy of the opinion and judgment, along with notification of the defendant's right to file a *pro se* petition for discretionary review. See TEX. R. APP. P. 48.4.