



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

---

No. 07-13-00136-CR

---

**LARRY JOE MORGAN, APPELLANT**

**V.**

**THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE**

---

On Appeal from the 396th District Court  
Tarrant County, Texas  
Trial Court No. 1249895D, Honorable George W. Gallagher, Presiding

---

June 4, 2014

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Before **CAMPBELL** and **HANCOCK** and **PIRTLE, JJ.**

Appellant, Larry Joe Morgan, was convicted by a jury of aggravated assault with a deadly weapon.<sup>1</sup> The same jury found the enhancement paragraph alleged in the indictment “True” and sentenced appellant to serve 20 years in the Institutional Division of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice.<sup>2</sup> Appellant appealed, and we will affirm.

---

<sup>1</sup> See TEX. PENAL CODE ANN. § 22.02(a)(2) (West 2011).

<sup>2</sup> See *id.* § 12.42(b) (West Supp. 2013).

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 filed a response. By his *Anders* brief, counsel reviewed all grounds that could possibly support an appeal, but concludes the appeal is frivolous. Independent of counsel, appellant has, by his response, urged the Court to reverse his conviction for a number of different reasons. We have reviewed the grounds suggested by counsel and the grounds alleged by appellant, and we have 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.<sup>3</sup>

Mackey K. Hancock  
Justice

Do not publish.

---

<sup>3</sup> 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.