



**NUMBER 13-21-00205-CR**

**COURT OF APPEALS**

**THIRTEENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS**

**CORPUS CHRISTI – EDINBURG**

---

---

**HILARY DANE NORRIS,**

**Appellant,**

**v.**

**THE STATE OF TEXAS,**

**Appellee.**

---

---

**On appeal from the 36th District Court  
of Aransas County, Texas.**

---

---

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

**Before Justices Longoria, Hinojosa, and Silva  
Memorandum Opinion by Justice Hinojosa**

Appellant Hilary Dane Norris appeals his conviction for possession of a controlled substance in penalty group one in an amount less than one gram, a state jail felony. See TEX. HEALTH & SAFETY CODE ANN. § 481.115(b). Norris entered an open plea of guilty to the offense. Following a punishment hearing, the trial court sentenced Norris to eighteen

months of imprisonment in the State Jail Division of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice. Norris's court-appointed counsel has filed an *Anders* brief stating that there are no arguable grounds for appeal. See *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 744 (1967). We affirm.

### I. **ANDERS BRIEF**

In his brief, Norris's counsel states that he has diligently reviewed the entire record and has found no non-frivolous grounds for appeal. See *id.* 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, 406 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—Edinburg 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) and *Kelly v. State*, 436 S.W.3d 313, 318–19 (Tex. Crim. App. 2014), Norris's counsel carefully discussed why, under controlling authority, there is no reversible error in the trial court's judgment. Counsel has informed this Court in writing that he has: (1) notified Norris that counsel has filed an *Anders* brief and a motion to withdraw; (2) provided Norris with copies of both pleadings; (3) informed Norris of his rights to file a pro se response,<sup>1</sup> review the record preparatory to filing that response, and seek

---

<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

discretionary review if the court of appeals concludes that the appeal is frivolous; and (4) provided Norris with a form motion for pro se access to the appellate record, lacking only Norris's signature and the date and including the mailing address for the court of appeals, with instructions to file the motion within ten days. See *Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744; *Kelly*, 436 S.W.3d at 318–19; see also *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 409 n.23. An adequate amount of time has passed, and Norris has not filed a pro se response.

## 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 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.

## III. MOTION TO WITHDRAW

In accordance with *Anders*, Norris'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 (“[I]f an attorney believes the appeal is frivolous, he must withdraw from representing the appellant. To withdraw from representation, the

---

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.)).

appointed attorney must file a motion to withdraw accompanied by a brief showing the appellate court that the appeal is frivolous.” (citing *Jeffery v. State*, 903 S.W.2d 776, 779–80 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1995, no pet.) (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 Norris 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 411 n.35; *Ex parte Owens*, 206 S.W.3d 670, 673 (Tex. Crim. App. 2006).

#### IV. CONCLUSION

We affirm the trial court’s judgment.

LETICIA HINOJOSA  
Justice

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

Delivered and filed on the  
24th day of March, 2022.

---

<sup>2</sup> No substitute counsel will be appointed. Should Norris 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. Any petition for discretionary review must be filed with the clerk of the Court of Criminal Appeals. See *id.* R. 68.3. Any petition for discretionary review should comply with the requirements of Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 68.4. See *id.* R. 68.4.