



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

---

No. 07-14-00316-CR

---

**JOYCE MARIE ACEY, APPELLANT**

**V.**

**THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE**

---

On Appeal from the 251st District Court  
Potter County, Texas  
Trial Court No. 67,658-C, Honorable Ana Estevez, Presiding

---

February 5, 2015

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

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

Appellant, Joyce Marie Acey, entered a plea of guilty to the offense of failure to comply with sex offender registration requirements<sup>1</sup> and, pursuant to a plea agreement was placed on deferred adjudication community supervision for a period of four years. Subsequently, the State of Texas filed a motion to adjudicate her guilty of the offense of failure to comply with sex offender registration requirements. Appellant entered pleas of “not true” to two of the ten allegations and “true” to the other eight allegations. After

---

<sup>1</sup> See Tex. Crim. Proc. Code Ann. art. 62.102(c) (West Supp. 2014).

hearing the evidence, the trial court found that all ten allegations were true. Thereafter, the trial court found appellant guilty of the primary offense and assessed her punishment at confinement in the Institutional Division of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice for a period of five years. 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. 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 her 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 her right to file a *pro se* response. Additionally, appellant's counsel has certified that she has provided appellant with a copy of the record to use in preparation of a *pro se* response and a motion to seek a printed copy of the record. *See Kelly v. State*, 436 S.W.3d 313, 319-20 (Tex. Crim. App. 2014). Appellant has not filed a response.

By her *Anders* brief, counsel reviewed all 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, 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>2</sup>

Mackey K. Hancock  
Justice

Do not publish.

---

<sup>2</sup> 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.