



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

No. 06-15-00138-CR

ADELI MEDINA CARRANZA, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

On Appeal from the 6th District Court
Lamar County, Texas
Trial Court No. 26122

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

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Following an open plea of guilty, Adeli Medina Carranza was convicted of unlawful possession of a firearm and sentenced to ten years' imprisonment. Carranza appeals.¹

Carranza's attorney on appeal has filed a brief which states that he 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 proceedings. 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 on appeal. *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 December 14, 2015, counsel mailed Carranza copies of the brief, the appellate record, and the motion to withdraw. Carranza was informed of his right to review the record and file a pro se response, and he requested an extension of time to do so. This Court granted Carranza's request and informed him that any pro se response was due on February 15, 2016. Following a second request for extension of time, which we granted, we informed Carranza that his pro se response was due on or before March 16, 2016. To date, Carranza has not filed a pro se response.²

¹In a companion case filed under our cause number case 06-15-00139-CR, Carranza appeals his conviction of possession of more than one, but less than four, grams of methamphetamine in a drug-free zone.

²Carranza previously asked this Court for the appointment of new appellate counsel because his sentence "was base[d] on things that [Carranza] was not being charged with." The record indicates that Carranza's sentence in his companion case was enhanced following his plea of "true" to the State's enhancement allegation.

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 with counsel 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.³

Bailey C. Moseley
Justice

Date Submitted: April 6, 2016

Date Decided: May 3, 2016

Do Not Publish

³Since we agree that 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. *See Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744. No substitute counsel will be appointed. Should appellant desire 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 file a pro se petition for discretionary review. Any petition for discretionary review (1) 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, (2) must be filed with the clerk of the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals, *see* TEX. R. APP. P. 68.3, and (3) should comply with the requirements of Rule 68.4 of the Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure, *see* TEX. R. APP. P. 68.4.