



**NUMBER 13-11-00365-CR**

**COURT OF APPEALS**

**THIRTEENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS**

**CORPUS CHRISTI - EDINBURG**

---

---

**ALEXANDER SAENZ,**

**Appellant,**

**v.**

**THE STATE OF TEXAS,**

**Appellee.**

---

---

**On appeal from the 105th District Court  
of Nueces County, Texas.**

---

---

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

**Before Chief Justice Valdez and Justices Garza and Vela  
Memorandum Opinion by Justice Vela**

Appellant, Alexander Saenz, pleaded guilty to the offense of burglary of a habitation with the intent to commit aggravated robbery, a first degree felony. See TEX. PENAL CODE ANN. § 30.02 (West 2003). Pursuant to a plea agreement, the court deferred adjudication and placed appellant on community supervision for ten years. An amended motion to revoke was filed on May 2, 2011, alleging that appellant: (1) failed to report to

his probation officer September 2010 to March 2011; (2) failed to remain within Nueces County; (3) was in arrears with respect to fines and fees; and (4) failed to complete a substance abuse aftercare program. At the hearing on the motion to revoke, appellant pleaded true to all allegations contained in the motion. At the conclusion of the hearing, the trial court adjudicated appellant guilty of burglary of a habitation with intent to commit aggravated robbery, and sentenced him to fifteen years' confinement in the Institutional Division of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice. Appellant timely perfected this appeal, and as discussed below, his court-appointed counsel filed an *Anders* brief. We affirm.

### **I. *ANDERS* BRIEF**

Pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 744 (1967), appellant's court-appointed appellate counsel filed a brief and a motion to withdraw with this Court, stating that his review of the record yielded no grounds of error upon which an appeal can be predicated. By the *Anders* brief, counsel raises a possible issue and then demonstrates why no reversible error exists. Counsel's brief meets the requirements of *Anders* as it presents a professional evaluation demonstrating why there are no arguable grounds to advance on appeal. See *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403, 407 n.9 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008) ("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).

In compliance with *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807, 813 (Tex. Crim. App. [Panel Op.] 1978), appellant's counsel has carefully discussed why, under controlling authority, there are no reversible 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 and counsel's motion to withdraw on appellant; and (3) informed appellant of his right to review the record and to file a pro se response.<sup>1</sup> 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, 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 as well as counsel's brief, and have found nothing that would arguably support an appeal. See *Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 827–28 (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. There is no reversible error in the record. Accordingly, the judgment of the trial court is affirmed.

---

<sup>1</sup> The 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) (quoting *Wilson v. State*, 955 S.W.2d 693, 696–97 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, no pet.)).

### III. MOTION TO WITHDRAW

In accordance with *Anders*, appellant's attorney 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.) ("[i]f an attorney believes the appeal is frivolous, he 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. Within five days of the date of this Court's opinion, counsel is ordered to send a copy of this opinion and this Court's judgment to appellant and to advise him of his right to file a petition for discretionary review.<sup>2</sup> 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).

---

JUSTICE ROSE VELA

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

Delivered and filed the  
12th day of January, 2012.

---

<sup>2</sup> No 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 or timely motion for en banc reconsideration that was overruled by this Court. See TEX. R. APP. P. 68.2. Effective September 1, 2011, any petition for discretionary review must be filed with the clerk of the Court of Criminal Appeals. See TEX. R. APP. P. 68.3. Any petition for discretionary review should comply with the requirements of Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 68.4. See TEX. R. APP. P. 68.4.