

TEXAS COURT OF APPEALS, THIRD DISTRICT, AT AUSTIN

NO. 03-04-00191-CR

David Bruce Adams, Appellant

v.

The State of Texas, Appellee

**FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF WILLIAMSON COUNTY, 368TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
NO. 03-357-K368, HONORABLE BURT CARNES, JUDGE PRESIDING**

MEMORANDUM OPINION

A jury found appellant David Bruce Adams guilty of three counts of aggravated robbery. *See* Tex. Pen. Code Ann. § 29.03 (West 2003). The jury assessed a forty-five year prison term for each count.

Appellant's court-appointed attorney filed a brief concluding that the appeal is frivolous and without merit. The brief meets the requirements of *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), by presenting a professional evaluation of the record demonstrating why there are no arguable grounds to be advanced. *See also* *Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75 (1988); *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978); *Currie v. State*, 516 S.W.2d 684 (Tex. Crim. App. 1974); *Jackson v. State*, 485 S.W.2d 553 (Tex. Crim. App. 1972); *Gainous v. State*, 436 S.W.2d 137 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969).

Appellant filed a pro se response to counsel's brief. In it, appellant asserts that his trial counsel was ineffective because he did not file motions suggested by appellant, that his counsel on appeal was ineffective because he filed an *Anders* brief, and that there were constitutional violations during his trial "which I will not elaborate at this time." On this record, we find no support for the ineffective assistance claims, and appellant's vague suggestion of other constitutional errors presents nothing for review.

We have reviewed the record, counsel's brief, and the pro se response. We agree that the appeal is frivolous and without merit. We find nothing in the record that might arguably support the appeal.

The judgments of conviction are affirmed.

Jan P. Patterson, Justice

Before Chief Justice Law, Justices Patterson and Puryear

Affirmed

Filed: February 3, 2005

Do Not Publish