



NUMBER 13-09-00501-CR

COURT OF APPEALS

THIRTEENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS

CORPUS CHRISTI - EDINBURG

RYAN MARCEL WASHINGTON,

Appellant,

v.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,

Appellee.

**On appeal from the 24th District Court
of Jackson County, Texas.**

MEMORANDUM OPINION

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

Appellant Ryan Marcel Washington appeals from his conviction for burglary of a habitation, a second-degree felony. See TEX. PENAL CODE ANN. § 30.02 (Vernon 2003); see also *id.* § 12.33 (Vernon Supp. 2009). On June 9, 2009, appellant entered a plea of guilty before a jury. After testimony, the jury assessed punishment at twenty years'

confinement in the Institutional Division of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice and a fine of \$10,000.

Concluding that in his professional opinion there is no reversible error reflected by the record, counsel filed an *Anders* brief in which he reviewed the merits, or lack thereof, of the appeal. We affirm.

I. Compliance with *Anders v. California*

Pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 744 (1967), appellant's counsel has filed a brief with this Court, stating the following:

In an effort to establish grounds which might reasonably support an appeal, I reviewed the following areas, if any, for potential error: jurisdiction, pre-trial matters, *voir dire*, opening statement, State's case-in-chief, Appellant's case-in-chief, objections ruled adversely to Appellant, the Court's charge, argument of counsel, sufficiency of the evidence, and punishment.

After thoroughly discussing each area identified above, counsel concluded that there were "no apparent irregularities requiring reversal." See *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403, 407 n.9 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008) (orig. proceeding) ("In Texas, an *Anders* brief need not specifically advance 'arguable' points of error if counsel finds none, but it must provide record references to the facts and procedural history and set out pertinent legal authorities.") (citing *Hawkins v. State*, 112 S.W.3d 340, 343-44 (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi 2003, no pet.)); *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. [Panel Op.] 1978), appellant's counsel has, thus, carefully discussed why, under controlling authority, there are no errors in the trial court's judgment. Counsel has certified to this Court that he has: (1) forwarded a copy of the brief and his request to withdraw as counsel to appellant

and advised appellant that this appeal is without merit and wholly frivolous; and (2) informed appellant of his right to review the record and to file a pro se response.¹ See *Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744; *Stafford*, 813 S.W.2d at 510 n.3; see also *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 409 n.23. More than an adequate period of time has passed, and appellant has not filed a pro se response. See *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 409.

II. Independent Review

Upon receiving an *Anders* brief, this Court 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 we 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*, appellant’s attorney has asked this Court for permission to withdraw as counsel for appellant. See *Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744; see also *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 408 n.17 (citing *Jeffery v. State*, 903 S.W.2d 776, 779-80 (Tex. App.–Dallas 1995, no pet.) (noting that “[i]f an attorney believes the appeal is frivolous, he

¹The Texas Court of Criminal Appeals has held that “the pro se response need not comply with the rules of appellate procedure in order to be considered. Rather, the response should identify for the court those issues which the indigent appellant believes the court should consider in deciding whether the case presents any meritorious issues.” *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403, 409 n.23 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008) (orig. proceeding) (quoting *Wilson v. State*, 955 S.W.2d 693, 696-97 (Tex. App.–Waco 1997, no pet.)).

must withdraw from representing the appellant. To withdraw from representation, the appointed attorney must file a motion to withdraw accompanied by a brief showing the appellate court that the appeal is frivolous”) (citations omitted)). We grant counsel’s motion to withdraw that was carried with the case on February 25, 2010. Within five days of the date of this Court’s opinion, counsel is ordered to send a copy of the opinion and judgment to appellant and to advise appellant of his right to file a petition for discretionary review.² See TEX. R. APP. P. 48.4; see also *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 412 n.35; *Ex parte Owens*, 206 S.W.3d 670, 673 (Tex. Crim. App. 2006).

NELDA V. RODRIGUEZ
Justice

Do not publish.
TEX. R. APP. P. 47.2(b).

Delivered and filed the
10th day of June, 2010.

²No substitute counsel will be appointed. Should appellant wish to seek further review of this case by the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals, he must either retain an attorney to file a petition for discretionary review or file a pro se petition for discretionary review. Any petition for discretionary review must be filed within thirty days from the date of either this opinion or the last timely motion for rehearing that was overruled by this Court. See TEX. R. APP. P. 68.2. Any petition for discretionary review must be filed with this Court, after which it will be forwarded to the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals. See TEX. R. APP. P. 68.3; 68.7. Any petition for discretionary review should comply with the requirements of rule 68.4 of the Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure. See TEX. R. APP. P. 68.4.