



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

No. 07-19-00365-CR

THOMAS HENRY BOYD, APPELLANT

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE

On Appeal from the 181st District Court
Randall County, Texas
Trial Court No. 29180B, Honorable John B. Board, Presiding

July 15, 2021

MEMORANDUM OPINION

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

After Appellant, Thomas Henry Boyd, was convicted by a jury of aggravated sexual assault of a disabled person and sentenced to fifty years' confinement,¹ he brought this appeal. His counsel has filed an *Anders*² brief in support of a motion to withdraw. We grant counsel's motion and affirm the judgment of the trial court.

¹ See TEX. PENAL CODE ANN. § 22.021(a)(2)(c), (b)(3), (e) (West 2019) (a first-degree felony).

² See *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 744 (1967).

Appellant's counsel has certified that after diligently searching the record, he has conducted a conscientious examination of the record and, in his opinion, the record reflects no reversible error upon which an appeal can be predicated. *Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744; *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403, 406 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008). In a letter, Appellant's counsel notified him of his motion to withdraw, provided him with a copy of the motion, and the *Anders* brief. His counsel also provided Appellant with a copy of the 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 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 filed a pro se response. The State has not filed a brief.

We have carefully reviewed counsel's *Anders* brief, Appellant's pro se response, and conducted an independent review of the record to determine whether there are any non-frivolous issues that were preserved in the trial court which might support an appeal. Like counsel, we have found no such issues. See *Penon v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 80 (1988); *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 409; *Gainous v. State*, 436 S.W.2d 137, 138 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969). Following our review, we conclude there are no plausible grounds for appellate review. Therefore, we grant counsel's motion to withdraw and affirm the judgment of the trial court.³

Lawrence M. Doss
Justice

Do not publish.

³ Counsel shall, within five days after this opinion is handed down, send Appellant a copy of the opinion and judgment, along with notification of Appellant's right to file a pro se petition for discretionary review. See TEX. R. APP. P. 48.4. This duty is an informational one, not a representational one. It is ministerial in nature, does not involve legal advice, and exists after this Court grants counsel's motion to withdraw. *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 411 n.33.