



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

---

No. 07-18-00038-CR

---

**DERRICK JAMES WILLIAMS, JR., APPELLANT**

**V.**

**THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE**

---

On Appeal from the 272nd District Court  
Brazos County, Texas  
Trial Court No. 17-02667-CRF-272, Honorable Travis B. Bryan, Presiding

---

**August 2, 2018**

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

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

Derrick James Williams, Jr., appellant, appeals his conviction for unauthorized use of a motor vehicle, enhanced. After a jury trial, appellant was found guilty and punishment was assessed at eight years' imprisonment. Appellant filed an appeal and counsel was appointed.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Because this appeal was transferred from the Tenth Court of Appeals, we are obligated to apply its precedent when available in the event of a conflict between the precedents of that court and this Court. See TEX. R. APP. P. 41.3.

Appointed counsel filed a motion to withdraw and an *Anders*<sup>2</sup> 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 is 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 the letter indicate that a copy of the appellate record was provided to appellant. By letter dated May 3, 2018, this Court also notified appellant of his right to file his own response by June 29, 2018. Appellant filed a response.

In compliance with the principles enunciated in *Anders*, appellate counsel discussed one potential area for appeal, which included whether the evidence was sufficient to support guilt. However, counsel then explained why the issue 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 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.

Accordingly, the motion to withdraw is granted, and the judgment is affirmed.<sup>3</sup>

Brian Quinn  
Chief Justice

Do not publish.

---

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

<sup>3</sup> Appellant has the right to file a petition for discretionary review with the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals.