

NO. 07-11-0272-CR
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SEVENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AT AMARILLO
PANEL C
MARCH 21, 2012

LATRELL DEVONNE ROBINSON,

Appellant

v.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,

Appellee

FROM THE 264TH DISTRICT COURT OF BELL COUNTY;

NO. 67,455; HON. MARTHA J. TRUDO, PRESIDING

Memorandum Opinion

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

Latrell Devonne Robinson (appellant) appeals his conviction for aggravated robbery. After a jury trial, appellant was found guilty and punishment was assessed at fifty years in prison.

Appellant's appointed counsel filed a motion to withdraw, together with an *Anders*¹ brief, wherein he certified that, after diligently searching the record, he

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

concluded that the appeal was without merit. Along with his brief, appellate counsel filed a copy of a letter sent to appellant informing him of counsel's belief that there was no reversible error and of appellant's right to file a response *pro se*. Appellant filed a response questioning the effectiveness of his trial and appellate counsel, the purported interjection of supposition by the prosecutor, and the availability of an instruction on a lesser-included offense.

In compliance with the principles enunciated in *Anders*, appellate counsel discussed each phase of the trial, the sufficiency of the evidence, and the legitimacy of the punishment levied. Thereafter, he concluded that no reversible error appeared of record.

We also conducted our own review of the record and appellant's *pro se* response to assess the accuracy of appellate counsel's conclusions and to uncover any arguable error pursuant to *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 508 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991). After doing so, we too conclude that no arguable issue exists meriting a continuation of the appeal.

Accordingly, the motion to withdraw is granted, and the judgment is affirmed.¹

Brian Quinn
Chief Justice

Do not publish.

¹Appellant has the right to file a *pro se* petition for discretionary review from this opinion.