



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

No. 06-16-00187-CR

SHAUN ANTOINE PERKINS, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

On Appeal from the County Court at Law No. 1
Hunt County, Texas
Trial Court No. CR1600103

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

MEMORANDUM OPINION

A jury found Shaun Antoine Perkins guilty of driving while intoxicated. In accord with the jury's assessment, the trial court sentenced Perkins to 180 days' confinement in the county jail and assessed a \$1,000.00 fine, but suspended the sentence in favor of placing Perkins on community supervision for twenty-four months. Perkins appeals.

Perkins' 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 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 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 February 1, 2017, counsel hand-delivered to Perkins a copy of the brief, the appellate record, and the motion to withdraw. Perkins was informed of his right to review the record and file a pro se response. By letter dated February 1, 2017, this Court informed Perkins that any pro se response was due on or before March 3, 2017. To date, Perkins has not filed a pro se response.

We have determined that this appeal is wholly frivolous. We have independently reviewed the appellate record, and we agree that no arguable issue supports 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: April 17, 2017

Date Decided: May 12, 2017

Do Not Publish

¹Since we agree that 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. *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, she 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.