



NUMBER 13-06-00656-CR

COURT OF APPEALS

THIRTEENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS

CORPUS CHRISTI - EDINBURG

CHRISTOPHER QUARTARO,

Appellant,

v.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,

Appellee.

**On appeal from the 148th District Court
of Nueces County, Texas.**

MEMORANDUM OPINION

**Before Justices Rodriguez, Garza, and Benavides
Memorandum Opinion by Justice Garza**

Appellant, Christopher Quartaro, was indicted by a Nueces County grand jury on September 22, 2006 with one count of first-degree murder and one count of evading arrest or detention using a vehicle, a state jail felony. See TEX. PENAL CODE ANN. § 19.02(b)(1), (2), (c) (Vernon 2003); *id.* § 38.04(a), (b)(1) (Vernon 2003). On November 1, 2006, a jury found Quartaro guilty and sentenced him to life in prison with a \$10,000.00 fine for the

murder charge and two years' imprisonment with a \$10,000.00 fine for the charge of evading arrest or detention using a vehicle. Quartaro now appeals the judgment of the trial court. We affirm.

I. COMPLIANCE WITH *ANDERS V. CALIFORNIA*

Pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 744 (1967), Quartaro's court-appointed appellate counsel has filed a brief with this Court, stating that his review of the record yields "no meritorious issue[s] to bring forward for review." Counsel's brief meets the requirements of *Anders*, as it presents a professional evaluation of the record demonstrating why there are no arguable grounds to be advanced on appeal. See *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 510 n.3 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991) (en banc).

In compliance with *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807, 813 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978), counsel has carefully discussed why, under controlling authority, there are no errors in the trial court's judgment. Counsel has informed this Court that he has: (1) examined the record and found no arguable grounds to advance on appeal, (2) served a copy of the brief on appellant, and (3) informed appellant of his right to review the record and to file a pro se brief. See *Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744; *Stafford*, 813 S.W.2d at 510 n.3. No pro se brief has been filed.

II. INDEPENDENT REVIEW

Upon receiving an *Anders* brief, we must conduct a full examination of all the proceedings to determine whether the case is wholly frivolous. *Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 80 (1988). We have reviewed the entire record and counsel's brief and have found nothing that would arguably support an appeal. See *Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826-28 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005) ("Due to the nature of *Anders* briefs, by indicating in the

opinion that it considered the issues raised in the briefs and reviewed the record for reversible error but found none, the court of appeals met the requirement of Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 47.1.”); *Stafford*, 813 S.W.2d at 509. Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of the trial court.

III. MOTION TO WITHDRAW

In accordance with *Anders*, Quartaro’s attorney has asked this Court for permission to withdraw as counsel for appellant. See *Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744. We grant his motion to withdraw. We further order counsel to notify appellant of the disposition of this appeal and the availability of discretionary review. See *Ex parte Wilson*, 956 S.W.2d 25, 27 (Tex. Crim. App. 1997) (per curiam).

DORI CONTRERAS GARZA,
Justice

Do not publish.
TEX. R. APP. P. 47.2(b).
Memorandum Opinion delivered and
filed this the 3rd day of July, 2008.