



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

No. 07-20-00062-CR

JUAN ARTURO MARTINEZ, APPELLANT

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE

On Appeal from the 64th District Court
Castro County, Texas
Trial Court No. A3522-1401, Honorable Danah L. Zirpoli, Presiding

December 15, 2021

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Before QUINN, CJ. and PIRTLE and DOSS, JJ.

Appellant, Juan Arturo Martinez, appeals from a judgment revoking his community supervision and sentencing him to a state jail facility for two years and assessing a \$2,000 fine. Before having been placed on five years' community supervision, the trial court convicted him of possessing a controlled substance, sentenced him to two years in a state jail facility, and suspended that sentence. In July of 2019, the State moved to revoke appellant's community supervision. The motion was granted by the trial court after hearing and accepting appellant's plea of true to four alleged instances of him violating

terms of his probation. On appeal, appellant's counsel has filed an *Anders*¹ brief and a motion to withdraw. We grant counsel's motion and affirm the trial court's judgment.

Counsel certified that he conducted a conscientious examination of the record, and, in his opinion, the record reflected no reversible error upon which an appeal could be predicated. *Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744; *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403, 406 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008). In a letter to appellant, his counsel notified him of his motion to withdraw and provided him with a copy of the motion and his *Anders* brief. He 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. Appellant did not file a response. Nor has the State has filed a response brief.

We reviewed counsel's *Anders* brief and conducted an independent search of the record to determine whether there are any nonfrivolous issues that were preserved in the trial court which might support an appeal. Like appellant's counsel, we too found none. See *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 409.

Thus, we conclude there are no plausible grounds for appellate review, grant counsel's motion to withdraw, and affirm the judgment of the trial court.²

Per Curiam

Do not publish.

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

² Counsel, shall, within five days after this memorandum 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 only. Counsel has no duty to provide further representation to appellant.