NOS. 07-11-00226-CR; 07-11-00227-CR; 07-11-00228-CR; 07-11-00229-CR

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE SEVENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS

AT AMARILLO

PANEL B

FEBRUARY 13, 2012

IRVIN WILLIS VEALE, APPELLANT

v.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE

FROM THE 108TH DISTRICT COURT OF POTTER COUNTY;

NOS. 62,127-E, 62,128-E, 62,129-E, 63,344-E;

HONORABLE DOUGLAS WOODBURN, JUDGE

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

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Appellant, Irvin Willis Veale, appeals his three convictions for aggravated sexual assault of a child[1] and one conviction for indecency with a child.[2] After finding appellant guilty of the offenses noted, the jury assessed a sentence of confinement of 20 years in the Institutional Division of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice (ID-TDCJ) on each of the aggravated sexual assault convictions and a term of confinement in the ID-TDCJ

---

[1] See TEX. PENAL CODE ANN. § 22.021(a)(1)(B) (West Supp. 2011).

[2] See TEX. PENAL CODE ANN. § 21.11(a)(1) (West 2011).

of five years on the indecency with a child conviction. Based upon the jury's verdicts on punishment, the trial court ordered the confinement on the aggravated sexual assault cases to be served concurrently and the confinement on the indecency with a child case to be served consecutively, following the completion of the confinement on the aggravated sexual assault cases. 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. [3]

Mackey K. Hancock
Justice

Do not publish.

[3]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. See TEX. R. APP. P. 48.4.