



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

No. 07-14-00387-CR

STEVEN DEWAINA HILL, APPELLANT

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE

On Appeal from the 47th District Court
Potter County, Texas
Trial Court No. 68,260-A, Honorable Dan L. Schaap, Presiding

July 15, 2015

MEMORANDUM OPINION

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

Appellant, Steven Dewaine Hill, was convicted of possession of a controlled substance, methamphetamine, of more than one gram but less than four grams.¹ Appellant entered a plea of “True” to two enhancement paragraphs contained in the indictment.² The trial court sentenced appellant to 30 years’ confinement in the

¹ See TEX. HEALTH & SAFETY CODE ANN. § 481.115(a), (c) (West 2010).

² See TEX. PENAL CODE ANN. § 12.42(d) (West Supp. 2014).

Institutional Division of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice. Appellant appealed the trial court's judgment. 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. Additionally, appellant's counsel has certified that he has provided appellant with a copy of the record to use in preparation of a *pro se* response. *See Kelly v. State*, 436 S.W.3d 313, 319-20 (Tex. Crim. App. 2014). Appellant has filed a response.

By his *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, 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.³ We have also reviewed the response filed by appellant. We have found no arguable grounds contained in the response.

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 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.