



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

No. 07-17-00406-CR

ABRAHAM ALVAREZ, APPELLANT

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE

On Appeal from the 320th District Court
Potter County, Texas
Trial Court No. 66,527-D, Honorable Don R. Emerson, Presiding

March 12, 2018

MEMORANDUM OPINION

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

Abraham Alvarez, appellant, appeals from the trial court's judgment adjudicating his guilt for the offense of forgery. His appointed counsel filed a motion to withdraw and an *Anders*¹ brief in the cause. Through those documents, counsel certified that, after diligently searching the record, the appeal was without merit. Accompanying the brief and motion was a copy of a letter informing appellant of his counsel's belief that there was no reversible error and of appellant's right to file a response, *pro se*. So too did

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

counsel indicate that appellant was provided a copy of the appellate record. By letter dated January 31, 2018, this Court also notified appellant of his right to file his own response by March 2, 2018. To date, appellant has not filed a *pro se* response.

In compliance with the principles enunciated in *Anders*, appellate counsel discussed potential areas for appeal, which areas included (1) the trial court's jurisdiction, (2) the sufficiency of the notice of allegations in the motion to revoke, (3) whether proper admonishments were given at the revocation hearing, (4) the voluntariness of the guilty plea, (5) the sufficiency of the evidence, (6) whether the sentence was lawful, and (7) whether appellant received the effective assistance of counsel. However, counsel then explained why those issues lacked merit.

In addition, we conducted our own review of the record to assess the accuracy of counsel's conclusions and to uncover any 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) (en banc). No such error was uncovered. Furthermore, a plea of true, alone, is sufficient to support revocation. *Maldonado v. State*, No. 07-17-00190-CR, 2017 Tex. App. LEXIS 9791, at *4 (Tex. App.—Amarillo Oct. 18, 2017, no pet.) (mem. op., not designated for publication). Appellant pled true to all the allegations contained in the State's motion to revoke. Accordingly, the motion to withdraw is granted, and the judgment is affirmed.²

Brian Quinn
Chief Justice

Do not publish.

² Appellant has the right to file a petition for discretionary review with the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals.