## NO. 07-10-00292-CR

## IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

## FOR THE SEVENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS

AT AMARILLO

PANEL B

JULY 7, 2011

DOMINIC TOMLINSON, APPELLANT

v.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE

FROM THE CRIMINAL DISTRICT COURT NO. 3 OF TARRANT COUNTY;

NO. 1169831D; HONORABLE ELIZABETH BERRY, JUDGE

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

## **MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Appellant, Dominic Tomlinson, entered a plea of guilty to the offense of aggravated robbery.<sup>1</sup> After entry of appellant's plea of guilty, the trial court ordered the preparation of a pre-sentence investigation report. Subsequently, the trial court conducted a hearing on punishment. Following the receipt of evidence on punishment, appellant was sentenced to confinement for a period of 20 years in the Institutional Division of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice. Appellant appeals the judgment of the trial court.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> <u>See</u> TEX. PENAL CODE ANN. § 29.03(a) (West 2011).

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 reviewed all 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); <u>Bledsoe v. State</u>, 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.

2

Accordingly, counsel's motion to withdraw is hereby granted, and the trial court's judgment is affirmed.<sup>2</sup>

Mackey K. Hancock Justice

Do not publish.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Counsel shall, within five days after this opinion is handed down, send his client a copy of the opinion and judgment, along with notification of appellant's right to file a *pro se* petition for discretionary review. <u>See</u> TEX. R. APP. P. 48.4.