



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

No. 07-15-00292-CR

CHRISTOPHER LAWSON, APPELLANT

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE

On Appeal from the 364th District Court
Lubbock County, Texas
Trial Court No. 2013-437,333; Honorable William R. Eichman, II, Presiding

March 11, 2016

MEMORANDUM OPINION

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

Appellant, Christopher Lawson, entered a plea of guilty, pursuant to a plea bargain, to the offense of possession of a controlled substance with intent to deliver,¹ in an amount of four grams or more but less than 200 grams in a drug-free zone.² Appellant was sentenced to confinement for ten years with the term of confinement suspended and appellant was placed on community supervision for a period of ten

¹ See TEX. HEALTH & SAFETY CODE ANN. § 481.112 (West 2010).

² See *id.* § 481.134 (West Supp. 2015).

years. Subsequently, the State filed a motion to revoke appellant's community supervision. After hearing the evidence regarding the alleged violations of appellant's community supervision, the trial court revoked appellant's community supervision and sentenced appellant to serve ten years in the Institutional Division of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice. Appellant has perfected his appeal and 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. [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 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) (en banc). 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 motion to be used to acquire 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 not 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, 82-83, 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 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.