



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

---

No. 07-17-00459-CR

---

JASON ANTHONY LONG, APPELLANT

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE

---

On Appeal from the 251st District Court  
Randall County, Texas  
Trial Court No. 27,499-C, Honorable Ana Estevez, Presiding

---

December 19, 2018

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

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

Jason Anthony Long, appellant, appeals his conviction for aggravated robbery, enhanced, and the ensuing sentence of twenty-five years' imprisonment. Appellant timely 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, counsel certified that, after he diligently searched the record, the appeal was without merit. Accompanying the brief and motion is a copy of a letter

---

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

informing appellant of counsel's belief that there was no reversible error and of appellant's right to file a response, pro se. So too did the letter indicate that a copy of the appellate record was provided to appellant. Due to an apparent transfer to a nearby prison or some other type of address confusion, it was not clear that appellant received said letter. Counsel sent appellant another letter dated October 31, 2018, and again included a copy of the clerk's and reporter's records. The Court also sent a notice to the updated address to remind appellant that, should he choose to file a pro se response, he will need to do so no later than November 30, 2018. The latter date was extended to December 10, 2018 in response to appellant's motion to extend the deadline. The deadline has lapsed, and we have not received a pro se response from appellant.

In compliance with the principles enunciated in *Anders*, appellate counsel discussed potential areas for appeal, which included examination of various stages of the proceeding and explanations as to why no error was presented in those stages. 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 503 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991) (en banc). No such arguable 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>2</sup> Appellant has the right to file a petition for discretionary review with the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals.