

NO. 07-10-0367-CR
NO. 07-10-0368-CR

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SEVENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS

AT AMARILLO

PANEL B

JUNE 13, 2011

CARLOS ENRIQUE VIGIL,

Appellant

v.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,

Appellee

FROM THE 251ST DISTRICT COURT OF POTTER COUNTY;
NOS. 57173-C & 57174-C; HONORABLE ANA ESTEVEZ, PRESIDING

Memorandum Opinion

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

Carlos Enrique Vigil (appellant) appeals his convictions for aggravated sexual assault of a child and sexual assault of a child, both offenses enhanced. Before us is appointed counsel's motion to withdraw, together with an *Anders*¹ brief, wherein he certified that, after diligently searching the record, he concluded that the appeal was without merit. Along with his brief, appellate counsel filed a copy of a letter sent to

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

appellant informing him of counsel's belief that there was no reversible error and of appellant's right to file a response *pro se*. By letter dated May 4, 2011, this court also notified appellant of his right to tender his own response and set June 3, 2011, as the deadline to do so. To date, no response has been filed.

In compliance with the principles enunciated in *Anders*, appellate counsel discussed two potential areas for appeal. They included 1) the sufficiency of the evidence, and 2) the cumulation of sentences. However, counsel then proceeded to explain why none of the issues required reversal on appeal.

In addition, we conducted our own review of the record to assess the accuracy of appellate counsel's conclusions and to uncover any reversible error pursuant to *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 508 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991). After doing so, we concur with those conclusions.

Accordingly, the motion to withdraw is granted, and the judgments are affirmed.

Brian Quinn
Chief Justice

Do not publish.