



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

No. 07-19-00332-CR

ROBIN LEANN POWELL, APPELLANT

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE

On Appeal from the 242nd District Court
Hale County, Texas
Trial Court No. B20247-1606, Honorable Kregg Hukill, Presiding

March 19, 2020

MEMORANDUM OPINION

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

Robin Leann Powell, appellant, appeals the order revoking her probation. After a guilty plea for forgery of a financial instrument, appellant was placed on four years' probation. Subsequently, the State filed a Motion to Revoke and a hearing was held on same. After appellant pled true to the State's allegations and testimony was presented in support of the allegations, the trial court found the allegations to be true, revoked appellant's probation and sentenced her to ten months in a State Jail facility. Appellant filed an appeal.

Appellant's counsel has filed a motion to withdraw together with an *Anders*¹ brief. Through those documents, he certifies to the Court that, after diligently searching the record, the appeal is 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 is no reversible error and of appellant's right to file a response, *pro se*, to counsel's *Anders* brief. So too did counsel provide appellant with a copy of the clerk's and reporter's records, according to the letter. By letter dated February 11, 2020, this Court notified appellant of her right to file her own brief or response by March 12, 2020, if she wished to do so. To date, no response has been received.

In compliance with the principles enunciated in *Anders*, appellate counsel discussed potential areas for appeal. However, he then explained why the issues lacked merit.

We conducted our own review of the record 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) (en banc). No issues of arguable merit were uncovered, however.

Accordingly, the motion to withdraw is granted and the judgment is affirmed.²

Brian Quinn
Chief Justice

Do not publish.

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

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