



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

No. 07-13-00176-CR

KERRIS TENNILE HARRIS, APPELLANT

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE

On Appeal from the 100th District Court
Childress County, Texas
Trial Court No. 5416, Honorable Stuart Messer, Presiding

November 4, , 2013

MEMORANDUM OPINION

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

Kerris Tennile Harris pled guilty to the offense of assault against a family member which was enhanced by a prior conviction. The trial court placed him on deferred adjudication for two years. Within less than a year, the State filed a motion to adjudicate appellant's guilt alleging numerous violations of his terms of community supervision. Appellant pled true to the majority of the allegations, and the State waived the ones to which he did not plead true. The trial court then adjudicated appellant's guilt and sentenced him to sixteen years confinement.

Appellant's counsel has filed a motion to withdraw, together with an *Anders*¹ brief, wherein he certifies that, after diligently searching the record, he has concluded that appellant's appeal is without merit. Along with his brief, he has 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 appeal *pro se*. By letter, this court also notified appellant of his right to file his own brief or response. After several motions to extend the time to file, appellant was given until October 10, 2013 to file his response or brief. To date, no response or brief has been filed.

In compliance with the principles enunciated in *Anders*, appellate counsel discussed potential areas for appeal which included the sufficiency of the evidence to support appellant's guilt for the original crime, the effectiveness of counsel, and the severity of the punishment. However, counsel then explained why the issues lack 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 *Schulman v. State*, 252 S.W.3d 403 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008) and *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 508 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991) and concluded the same.

Accordingly, the motion to withdraw is granted, and the judgment is affirmed.²

Brian Quinn
Chief Justice

Do not publish.

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

² Appellant has the right to file a petition for discretionary review with the Court of Criminal Appeals.