



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

No. 07-17-00432-CR

JADE BLOSSOM, APPELLANT

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE

On Appeal from the 137th District Court
Lubbock County, Texas
Trial Court No. 2017-411,248, Honorable John J. "Trey" McClendon III, Presiding

February 20, 2019

MEMORANDUM OPINION

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

On October 17 and 18, 2017, appellant, Jade Blossom, was tried for the state jail felony offense of theft. Appellant pled not guilty and the case proceeded to a jury trial. After hearing evidence, the jury acquitted appellant of felony theft but found him guilty of a lesser-included class A misdemeanor theft. At punishment, appellant pled true to five prior felony convictions and, after a brief punishment hearing, the jury sentenced appellant to 365 days' incarceration and a \$4,000 fine. Appellant timely filed his notice of appeal. We affirm.

Appellant's court-appointed appellate counsel filed a motion to withdraw from the representation supported by an *Anders* brief. See *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 87 S. Ct. 1396, 18 L. Ed. 2d 493 (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; *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403, 406 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008). In compliance with *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807, 813 (Tex. Crim. App. [Panel Op.] 1978), counsel has discussed why, under the controlling authorities, there are no reversible errors in the trial court's judgment. Counsel notified appellant by letter of his motion to withdraw; provided him a copy of the motion, *Anders* brief, and appellate record; and informed him of his right to file a pro se response. See *Kelly v. State*, 436 S.W.3d 313, 319-20 (Tex. Crim. App. 2014) (specifying appointed counsel's obligations on the filing of a motion to withdraw supported by an *Anders* brief). By letter, this Court also advised appellant of his right to file a pro se response to counsel's *Anders* brief. Appellant did not file a pro se response. The State did not file a brief.

In the present case, appellant was found guilty of the lesser-included offense of class A misdemeanor theft, and sentenced to 365 days' incarceration and a \$4,000 fine. By his *Anders* brief, counsel discusses areas in the record where reversible error may have occurred but concludes that the appeal is frivolous. We have independently examined the record to determine whether there are any non-frivolous issues that were preserved in the trial court which might support this appeal but, like counsel, we have found no such issues. See *Person v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 80, 109 S. Ct. 346, 102 L. Ed.

2d 300 (1988); *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 409; *Gainous v. State*, 436 S.W.2d 137, 138 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969).

After carefully reviewing the appellate record and counsel's brief, we conclude there are no plausible grounds for appellate review. We therefore affirm the trial court's judgment and grant counsel's motion to withdraw.¹ See TEX. R. APP. P. 43.2(a).

Judy C. Parker
Justice

Do not publish.

¹ Even though appellant was informed of his right to file a pro se petition for discretionary review upon execution of the Trial Court's Certification of Defendant's Right of Appeal, counsel must comply with Rule 48.4 of the Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure, which provides that counsel shall within five days after this opinion is handed down, send appellant a copy of the opinion and judgment together with notification of his right to file a pro se petition for discretionary review. *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 408 n.22 & 411 n.35. This duty is an informational one, not a representational one. It is ministerial in nature, does not involve legal advice, and exists after the court of appeals has granted counsel's motion to withdraw. *Id.* at 411 n.33.