



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

No. 07-14-00274-CR

ANTHONY PANSZA, APPELLANT

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE

On Appeal from the 187th District Court
Bexar County, Texas
Trial Court No. 2012CR5757, Honorable Raymond Angelini II, Presiding

June 2, 2015

MEMORANDUM OPINION

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

Following the denial of a motion to suppress his confessions, appellant, Anthony Panza, entered a plea of guilty pursuant to a plea bargain agreement to the indicted offense of murder¹ and “True” to the enhancement allegations alleged.² In accordance with the plea agreement, appellant was sentenced to serve 40 years confinement in the

¹ See TEX. PENAL CODE ANN. § 19.02(b)(2) (West 2011).

² See *id.* § 12.42(c)(1) (West Supp. 2014).

Institutional Division of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice. Appellant gave notice of appeal. 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 her motion to withdraw, counsel certifies that she has diligently reviewed the record and, in her 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. [Panel Op.] 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 she 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) (en banc). The Court has also advised appellant of his right to file a *pro se* response. Additionally, appellant's counsel has certified that she has assisted appellant in obtaining access to a copy of the record to use in preparation of a *pro se* response. See *Kelly v. State*, 436 S.W.3d 313, 315 (Tex. Crim. App. 2014). Appellant has not filed a response.

By her *Anders* brief, counsel raises grounds that could possibly support an appeal, but concludes the appeal is 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, 80, 109 S. Ct. 346, 102 L. Ed. 2d 300 (1988); *Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826–

27 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005). We have found no such arguable grounds and agree with counsel that the appeal is frivolous.³

Accordingly, counsel's motion to withdraw is hereby granted, and the trial court's judgment is affirmed.

Mackey K. Hancock
Justice

Do not publish.

³ Counsel shall, within five days after this opinion is handed down, send her 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.