



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

---

No. 07-22-00135-CR

---

**ENRIQUE CUVILLIER, APPELLANT**

**V.**

**THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE**

---

On Appeal from the 364th District Court  
Lubbock County, Texas  
Trial Court No. 2020-421,078, Honorable William R. Eichman II, Presiding

---

December 21, 2022

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

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

Appellant, Enrique Cuvillier, appeals his conviction for murder,<sup>1</sup> a felony of the first degree. In March 2022, he entered an open plea of guilty to murder.<sup>2</sup> After administering

---

<sup>1</sup> TEX. PENAL CODE ANN. § 19.02(b)(1).

<sup>2</sup> As part of his plea, appellant signed several plea papers, including a waiver of constitutional rights, agreement to stipulate, and judicial confession.

the requisite admonishments, the trial court accepted appellant's plea. Following a punishment hearing during which appellant pled "true" to the enhancement allegation, the trial court sentenced him to a 70-year prison term. Appellant's court-appointed appellate counsel filed a motion to withdraw supported by an *Anders*<sup>3</sup> brief. We grant counsel's motion to withdraw and affirm the judgment of the trial court.

In support of his motion to withdraw, counsel certified that he conducted a conscientious examination of the record, and in his opinion, it reflected no arguable basis for reversing appellant's conviction. *Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744-45; *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403, 406 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008). Counsel explained why, under the controlling authorities, the record supports that conclusion. He further demonstrated that he complied with the requirements of *Anders* and *In re Schulman* by 1) providing a copy of the brief, motion to withdraw, and appellate record to appellant, 2) notifying appellant of his right to file a pro se response, and 3) informing appellant of his right to file a pro se petition for discretionary review. *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 408. By letter, this Court granted him an opportunity to exercise his right to file a response to counsel's brief. Appellant requested an extension of time in which to file his response, which this Court granted. The extended deadline was November 21, 2022. Despite the deadline's lapse, the Court has received, to date, neither the response nor any other communication from appellant.

---

<sup>3</sup> *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 87 S. Ct. 1396, 18 L. Ed. 2d 493 (1967).

We independently examined the record to determine whether there were any non-frivolous issues supporting reversal as required by *In re Schulman*. None were found. So, after thoroughly reviewing the record and counsel's brief, we 1) agree that there is no plausible basis for reversal of appellant's conviction, 2) affirm the trial court's judgment, and 3) grant counsel's motion to withdraw.<sup>4</sup>

Brian Quinn  
Chief Justice

Do not publish.

---

<sup>4</sup> Within five days after the date of this opinion, appellate counsel shall 1) send appellant a copy of the opinion and judgment and 2) inform appellant of his right to file a pro se petition for discretionary review. See TEX. R. APP. P. 48.4. This duty is only informational and ministerial. It does not encompass or require the rendition of legal advice or further representation.