



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

---

No. 07-13-00433-CR

---

**HAROLD WAYNE CAMPA, APPELLANT**

**V.**

**THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE**

---

On Appeal from the 242nd District Court  
Hale County, Texas  
Trial Court No. B19400-1302, Honorable Edward Lee Self, Presiding

---

July 7, 2014

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Before QUINN, C.J., and CAMPBELL, J., and BOYD, S.J.<sup>1</sup>

Harold Wayne Campa, appellant, appeals his conviction for Driving While Intoxicated. Appellant was tried and found guilty by a jury and was assessed five years in prison. Appellant's counsel has filed a motion to withdraw, together with an *Anders*<sup>2</sup> brief, wherein he certifies that, after diligently searching the record, he has concluded that the appeal is without merit. Along with his brief, he has filed a copy of a letter sent

---

<sup>1</sup> Senior Justice John T. Boyd, sitting by assignment.

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

to appellant informing him of counsel's belief that there was no reversible error and of appellant's right to file a *pro se* response. By letter dated May 16, 2014, this court also notified appellant of his right to file his own brief or response by June 16, 2014, if he wished to do so. To date, no response has been received.

In compliance with the principles enunciated in *Anders*, appellate counsel discussed potential areas for appeal which included the indictment, pretrial discovery, a pretrial motion for continuance, motion to suppress a recorded statement, adverse rulings made at trial, jury selection and charge, sufficiency of the evidence to support conviction and the punishment assessed, and the denial of a motion for new trial. However, he then explained why the issues lacked merit.

In addition, we conducted our own review of the record to assess the accuracy of counsel's conclusions and to uncover arguable error pursuant to *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008) and *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 508 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991). After doing so, we concurred with counsel's conclusions.

Accordingly, the motion to withdraw is granted and the judgment is affirmed.<sup>3</sup>

Brian Quinn  
Chief Justice

Do not publish.

---

<sup>3</sup> Appellant has the right to file a petition for discretionary review with the Court of Criminal Appeals.