

TEXAS COURT OF APPEALS, THIRD DISTRICT, AT AUSTIN

NO. 03-05-00366-CR

Christopher Eugene Loard, Appellant

v.

The State of Texas, Appellee

**FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF BELL COUNTY, 264TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
NO. 57155, HONORABLE JOE CARROLL, JUDGE PRESIDING**

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Appellant Christopher Eugene Loard pleaded guilty before a jury to the offense of aggravated robbery. *See* Tex. Pen. Code Ann. § 29.03 (West 2003). After hearing evidence, the jury returned a directed verdict of guilty and assessed punishment at twenty-seven years' imprisonment.

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 received a copy of counsel's brief and was advised of his right to examine the appellate record and to file a pro se brief. No pro se brief has been filed.

We have reviewed the record and counsel's brief and agree that the appeal is frivolous and without merit. We find nothing in the record that might arguably support the appeal. Counsel's motion to withdraw is granted.

The judgment of conviction is affirmed.

Jan P. Patterson, Justice

Before Justices B. A. Smith, Patterson and Puryear

Affirmed

Filed: May 12, 2006

Do Not Publish