



**In The
Court of Appeals
Sixth Appellate District of Texas at Texarkana**

No. 06-14-00201-CR

MARK VICTOR DHEIL, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

On Appeal from the 4th District Court
Rusk County, Texas
Trial Court No. CR14-089

Before Morriss, C.J., Moseley and Burgess, JJ.
Memorandum Opinion by Justice Moseley

MEMORANDUM OPINION

In the hopes of receiving community supervision, Mark Victor Dheil entered an open plea of guilty to the offense of driving while intoxicated, third or more. After receiving his oral and written judicial confession to the crime, the trial court sentenced Dheil to four years' imprisonment. Dheil appeals.

On appeal, Dheil's attorney has filed a brief which discusses the record and reviews the proceedings in detail. Meeting the requirements of *Anders v. California*, counsel has provided a professional evaluation of the record demonstrating why there are no arguable grounds to be advanced. *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 743–44 (1967); *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403, 406 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008) (orig. proceeding); *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 509–10 (Tex. Crim. App. 1981); *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807, 812–13 (Tex. Crim. App. [Panel Op.] 1978).

Counsel also filed a motion with this Court seeking to withdraw as counsel in this appeal. On January 26, 2015, counsel mailed to Dheil a copy of (1) the brief, (2) the clerk's record, (3) the reporter's record, and (4) the motion to withdraw. By letter, counsel informed Dheil of his right to review the record and file a pro se response. Counsel's letter informed Dheil that he had thirty days in which to file his pro se response. To date, Dheil has neither filed a pro se response nor requested an extension of time in which to do so.

We have determined that this appeal is wholly frivolous. We have independently reviewed the clerk's record and the reporter's record, and we agree that no arguable issues support an appeal. *See Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826–27 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005).

We affirm the trial court's judgment.¹

Bailey C. Moseley
Justice

Date Submitted: March 30, 2015

Date Decided: April 8, 2015

Do Not Publish

¹Since we agree this case presents no reversible error, we also, in accord with *Anders*, grant counsel's request to withdraw from further representation of appellant in this case. *Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744. No substitute counsel will be appointed. Should appellant wish to seek further review of this case by the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals, appellant must either retain an attorney to file a petition for discretionary review or appellant must file a pro se petition for discretionary review. Any petition for discretionary review must be filed within thirty days from either the date of this opinion or the date on which the last timely motion for rehearing or for en banc reconsideration was overruled by this Court. See TEX. R. APP. P. 68.2. Any petition for discretionary review must be filed with the clerk of the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals. See TEX. R. APP. P. 68.3. Any petition for discretionary review should comply with the requirements of Rule 68.4 of the Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure. See TEX. R. APP. P. 68.4.