



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

---

No. 07-17-00074-CR

---

**EDGAR RONALD BARTON, APPELLANT**

**V.**

**THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE**

---

On Appeal from the 31st District Court  
Gray County, Texas  
Trial Court No. 10,049, Honorable Steven R. Emmert, Presiding

---

September 1, 2017

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

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

Edgar Ronald Barton, appellant, appeals his conviction for Indecency with a Child by Sexual Contact, a second degree felony. Pursuant to a plea of guilty, the trial court placed appellant on deferred adjudication probation for a period of six years. Subsequently, the State filed a motion to proceed with the adjudication of appellant's guilt. After a hearing on the State's motion, the trial court found appellant had violated a term of his probation, found him guilty of the charged offense and sentenced him to fifteen years in prison. Appellant appealed and was appointed counsel.

Appointed counsel filed a motion to withdraw and an *Anders*<sup>1</sup> brief in the cause. Through those documents, he certified that, after diligently searching the record, the appeal was without merit. Accompanying the brief and motion is a copy of a letter sent by counsel to appellant informing the latter of counsel's belief that there was no reversible error and of appellant's right to file a response, *pro se*. Appellant filed a response wherein he questioned the 1) voluntariness of his plea due to coercion by the trial court, the prosecuting attorney and defense counsel, 2) ineffective assistance of defense counsel, and 3) sufficiency of the evidence to support the adjudication of his guilt.

In compliance with the principles enunciated in *Anders*, appellate counsel discussed potential areas for appeal, which areas included 1) the original guilty plea, 2) ineffective assistance of counsel and 3) the severity of the punishment. However, counsel then explained why the issues lacked merit.

In addition, we conducted our own review of the record and appellant's response to assess the accuracy of counsel's conclusions and to uncover arguable error pursuant to *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008) and *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 508 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991). No such error was uncovered.

Accordingly, the motion to withdraw is granted, and the judgment is affirmed.<sup>2</sup>

Brian Quinn  
Chief Justice

Do not publish.

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 744-45, 87 S. Ct. 1396, 18 L. Ed. 2d 493 (1967).

<sup>2</sup> Appellant has the right to file a petition for discretionary review with the Court of Criminal Appeals.