



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

No. 07-15-00328-CR

DANNY MEDINA, APPELLANT

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE

On Appeal from the 64th District Court
Hale County, Texas
Trial Court No. A19823-1412, Honorable Robert W. Kinkaid, Jr., Presiding

June 17, 2016

MEMORANDUM OPINION

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

Appellant, Danny Medina, entered a plea of guilty before a jury to the offense of credit card abuse,¹ a state jail felony offense. Following a trial before the jury on punishment, the jury assessed appellant's punishment at confinement in a state jail facility for a period of two years and a fine of \$2,000. Appellant has appealed, and we will affirm.

¹ See TEX. PENAL CODE ANN. § 32.31(b)(1)(A), (d) (West 2011).

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 copy of the clerk's record and the reporter's 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 no 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.²

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

Mackey K. Hancock
Justice

Do not publish

² 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.