



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

No. 06-23-00075-CR

NORMAN CHARLES ROBERTS, III, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

On Appeal from the 71st District Court
Harrison County, Texas
Trial Court No. 22-0323X

Before Stevens, C.J., van Cleef and Rambin, JJ.
Memorandum Opinion by Chief Justice Stevens

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Norman Charles Roberts, III, entered an open plea of guilty to burglary of a building. After a presentence investigation report and additional evidence were received, the trial court sentenced Roberts to twenty months' confinement in state jail. This appeal followed.

Roberts's appellate counsel filed a brief that outlined the procedural history of the case, provided a detailed summary of the evidence elicited during the trial court proceedings, and stated that counsel found no meritorious issues to raise on appeal. Meeting the requirements of *Anders v. California*, counsel 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).

Roberts's counsel filed a motion with this Court seeking to withdraw as counsel in this appeal and provided Roberts with copies of the brief, the appellate record, and the motion to withdraw. Counsel also informed Roberts of his rights to review the appellate record and to file a pro se response. On August 2, 2023, we notified Roberts that his pro se response was due on September 1, 2023. By letter dated September 13, 2023, we notified Roberts that the case would be submitted on briefs on October 4, 2023. Roberts did not file a pro se response.

We reviewed the entire appellate record and independently determined that no reversible error exists. *See Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826–27 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005). We affirm the judgment of the trial court.¹

Scott E. Stevens
Justice

Date Submitted: October 4, 2023
Date Decided: October 5, 2023

Do Not Publish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, 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.