



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

No. 06-15-00065-CR

CHRISTOPHER ANTHONY DAVIDSON, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

On Appeal from the 354th District Court
Hunt County, Texas
Trial Court No. 29922

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

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Following an open plea of guilty, Christopher Anthony Davidson was convicted of burglary of a building. He was sentenced to two years' confinement in state jail and was ordered to pay \$57,941.00 in restitution. Davidson appeals.¹

Davidson's attorney on appeal has filed a brief which states that she has reviewed the record and has found no genuinely arguable issues that could be raised. The brief sets out the procedural history and summarizes the evidence elicited during the course of the proceeding. 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. 1991); *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 July 2, 2015, counsel mailed to Davidson a copy of the brief, the appellate record, and the motion to withdraw. By letter, counsel informed Davidson of his right to review the record and file a pro se response. We informed Davidson that any pro se response was due on or before August 6, 2015. Counsel also explained that Davidson could request an extension of time to file the pro se response, if needed. To date, Davidson has neither filed a pro se response nor requested an extension of time in which to do so.

¹In companion causes 06-15-00066-CR and 06-15-00071-CR, Davidson also appeals judgments convicting him of possession of less than one gram of methamphetamine and another burglary of a building. By separate opinions issued this day, we affirm the trial court's judgment in each of those causes.

We have determined that this appeal is wholly frivolous. We have independently reviewed the clerk's and reporter's records, 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.²

Josh R. Morriss, III
Chief Justice

Date Submitted: September 2, 2015
Date Decided: September 18, 2015

Do Not Publish

²Since we agree this case presents no reversible error, we also, in accordance 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 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.