

NO. 07-11-00185-CR
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SEVENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AT AMARILLO
PANEL A
DECEMBER 14, 2011

CLINTON RAY WALL, APPELLANT

v.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE

FROM THE 242ND DISTRICT COURT OF HALE COUNTY;
NO. B18690-1101; HONORABLE EDWARD LEE SELF, JUDGE

Before CAMPBELL and HANCOCK and PIRTLE, JJ.

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Appellant, Clinton Ray Wall, was convicted of theft after having been twice before convicted of the offense of theft.¹ Appellant pleaded true to two prior felony enhancements.² The jury assessed appellant's punishment at confinement in the Institutional Division of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice (ID-TDCJ) for a term of 15 years. Appellant perfected this appeal. We affirm.

¹ See TEXAS PENAL CODE ANN. § 31.03(e)(4)(D) (West Supp. 2011).

² See TEXAS PENAL CODE ANN. § 12.42 (West Supp. 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 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.³

Mackey K. Hancock
Justice

Do not publish.

³Counsel 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. See TEX. R. APP. P. 48.4.