In The
Court of Appeals
Seventh District of Texas at Amarillo

Nos. 07-13-00152-CR
07-13-00153-CR
07-13-00154-CR

JON LENNON HALL, APPELLANT

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE

On Appeal from the 213th District Court
Tarrant County, Texas
Trial Court Nos. 1244943D, 1244944D, 1244946D, Honorable Louis E. Sturns, Presiding

May 8, 2014

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Before CAMPBELL and HANCOCK and PIRTLE, JJ.

Appellant, Jon Lennon Hall, entered pleas of guilty, without benefit of a plea bargain, to three indictments alleging evading arrest or detention enhanced by a prior conviction, a state jail felony offense;[1] aggravated assault with a deadly weapon, a second-degree felony offense;[2] and aggravated assault on a public servant, a first-

[1] *See* TEX. PENAL CODE ANN. § 38.04(a), (b)(1)(A) (West Supp. 2013).

[2] *See id.* § 22.02(a)(2), (b) (West 2011).

degree felony offense.[3] The trial court subsequently heard the evidence regarding punishment and sentence appellant to two years in a State Jail Facility on the evading arrest or detention charge, 10 years confinement in the Institutional Division of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice (ID-TDCJ) aggravated assault with a deadly weapon charge, and 20 years in the ID-TDCJ on the aggravated assault on a public servant charge. Appellant has perfected his appeals. We will 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 reviewed all grounds that could possibly support an appeal, but concludes the appeals are 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.

[3] *See id.* § 22.02 (a)(2), (b)(2)(B).

Crim. App. 2005). We have found no such arguable grounds and agree with counsel that the appeals are frivolous.

Accordingly, counsel's motion to withdraw is hereby granted, and the trial court's judgments are affirmed.[4]

Mackey K. Hancock
Justice

Do not publish.

[4] 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.