



**In The  
Court of Appeals  
Seventh District of Texas at Amarillo**

---

No. 07-13-00003-CR

---

**REYNALDO REYES, APPELLANT**

**V.**

**THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE**

---

On Appeal from the 242<sup>nd</sup> District Court  
Hale County, Texas  
Trial Court No. A19242-1209, Honorable Edward Lee Self, Presiding

---

**MAY 10, 2013**

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

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

Reynaldo Reyes appeals his conviction of burglary of a habitation. He pled guilty to the offense and was sentenced by a jury to twelve years confinement and a fine of \$2000.

Appellant's appointed counsel has filed a motion to withdraw, together with an *Anders*<sup>1</sup> brief, wherein he certified that, after diligently searching the record, he has concluded that appellant's appeal is without merit. Along with his brief, he has provided

---

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

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*. By letter dated April 5, 2013, this court notified appellant of his right to file his own brief or response by May 6, 2013, if he wished to do so. To date, no response has been filed.

In compliance with the principles enunciated in *Anders*, appellate counsel discussed potential areas for appeal, which included the guilty plea, the sufficiency of the evidence, the range of punishment, and the jury charge. However, he has explained why the issues are without merit. In addition, we conducted our own review of the record 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) and have found none.

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

Brian Quinn  
Chief Justice

Do not publish.