

TEXAS COURT OF APPEALS, THIRD DISTRICT, AT AUSTIN

**NO. 03-12-00053-CR
NO. 03-12-00054-CR**

Reginald Timothy Prince, Appellant

v.

The State of Texas, Appellee

**FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF BELL COUNTY, 264TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
NOS. 68388 & 68387, HONORABLE MARTHA J. TRUDO, JUDGE PRESIDING**

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Reginald Timothy Prince pleaded guilty to two counts of burglary of a habitation. *See* Tex. Penal Code Ann. § 30.02(a) (West 2011). He entered his pleas in open court without the benefit of a plea agreement as to punishment, other than that the State would recommend that the punishments would run concurrently. Following a punishment hearing, the court adjudged Prince guilty and assessed punishment at eighteen years' imprisonment for each conviction, with sentences to run concurrently.

Prince'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). Prince 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. *See Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826–27 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005). Counsel's motion to withdraw is granted.

The judgment of conviction is affirmed.

Diane M. Henson, Justice

Before Justices Puryear, Pemberton, and Henson

Affirmed

Filed: October 3, 2012

Do Not Publish