



IN THE  
TENTH COURT OF APPEALS

\_\_\_\_\_  
No. 10-19-00203-CR

JAMES ROBINSON,

Appellant

v.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,

Appellee

\_\_\_\_\_  
From the 85th District Court  
Brazos County, Texas  
Trial Court No. 16-03564-CRF-85

---

---

MEMORANDUM OPINION

---

---

James Robinson appeals from the trial court's judgment revoking his community supervision. We affirm the trial court's judgment.

Robinson's appointed counsel filed a motion to withdraw and an *Anders* brief in support of the motion asserting that he has diligently reviewed the appellate record and that, in his opinion, the appeal is frivolous. *See Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967). Counsel's brief evidences a professional evaluation of the record for error and compliance with the other duties of appointed counsel. We conclude that counsel has performed the

duties required of appointed counsel. *See id.* at 744; *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807, 812 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978); *see also Kelly v. State*, 436 S.W.3d 313, 319-20 (Tex. Crim. App. 2014); *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403, 407 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008).

In reviewing an *Anders* appeal, we must, “after a full examination of all the proceedings, ... decide whether the case is wholly frivolous.” *Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744; *see Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 80 (1988); *accord Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 509-11 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991). An appeal is “wholly frivolous” or “without merit” when it “lacks any basis in law or fact.” *McCoy v. Court of Appeals*, 486 U.S. 429, 439 n.10 (1988). After a review of the entire record in this appeal, we have determined the appeal to be wholly frivolous. *See Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826-27 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005). Accordingly, we affirm the trial court’s judgment.

Counsel’s motion to withdraw from representation of Robinson is granted.

REX D. DAVIS  
Justice

Before Chief Justice Gray,  
Justice Davis, and  
Justice Neill

Affirmed  
Opinion delivered and filed November 24, 2020  
Do not publish  
[CR25]

