



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

No. 06-17-00191-CR

TYLER COLEMAN-CONE, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

On Appeal from the 71st District Court
Harrison County, Texas
Trial Court No. 15-0419X

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

MEMORANDUM OPINION

In March 2017, Tyler Coleman-Cone, pursuant to a plea bargain agreement, pled guilty to intoxication assault¹ and was placed on community supervision for a period of ten years. In September 2017, the State filed a motion to revoke his community supervision, alleging that Coleman-Cone failed to abide by its terms and conditions by smoking marihuana. Coleman-Cone judicially confessed to the alleged violation in writing and pled true to the State's allegation in open court. After an evidentiary hearing, the trial court granted the State's motion and sentenced Coleman-Cone to seven years' imprisonment. He appeals.

Coleman-Cone's attorney has filed a brief which states that he has reviewed the record and has found no genuinely arguable issues that could be raised on appeal. The brief sets out the procedural history of the case and summarizes the evidence elicited during the course of the trial court 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 11, 2017, counsel mailed copies of the brief, the appellate record, and the motion to withdraw to Coleman-Cone, who was simultaneously informed of his rights to review

¹TEX. PENAL CODE ANN. § 49.07(a) (West 2011).

the record and file a pro se response. Coleman-Cone filed a pro se response that does not raise any point of error, but constitutes only a plea for mercy.

We have determined that this appeal is wholly frivolous. We have independently reviewed the entire appellate record and, like counsel, have determined that no arguable issue supports an appeal. *See Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826–27 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005). In the *Anders* context, once we determine that the appeal is without merit, we must affirm the trial court’s judgment. *Id.*

We affirm the judgment of the trial court.²

Bailey C. Moseley
Justice

Date Submitted: February 7, 2018
Date Decided: February 8, 2018

Do Not Publish

²Since 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, he 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.