



NUMBER 13-21-00242-CR

COURT OF APPEALS

THIRTEENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS

CORPUS CHRISTI – EDINBURG

KELLY THOMAS KLEINMANN,

Appellant,

v.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,

Appellee.

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

MEMORANDUM OPINION

**Before Chief Justice Contreras and Justices Longoria and Tijerina
Memorandum Opinion by Chief Justice Contreras**

Appellant Kelly Thomas Kleinmann pleaded guilty to the offense of driving while intoxicated (third or more offense), a third-degree felony. See TEX. PENAL CODE ANN. §§ 49.04(b), 49.09(b)(2). Appellant pleaded true to the enhancement paragraph in the indictment noting a prior felony conviction, increasing appellant's offense level to a second-degree felony. See *id.* § 12.42(a). The trial court sentenced appellant to fifteen

years' incarceration in the Texas Department of Criminal Justice Correctional Institutions Division. See *id.* § 12.33(a). Appellant's court-appointed appellate counsel 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 the trial court's judgment as modified.

I. **ANDERS BRIEF**

Pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 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 reversible error upon which an appeal can be predicated. 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) (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—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, 319–22 (Tex. Crim. App. 2014), appellant's counsel carefully discussed why, under controlling authority, there is no reversible error in the trial court's judgment. Appellant's counsel also informed this Court in writing that he: (1) notified appellant that counsel has filed an *Anders* brief and a motion to withdraw; (2) provided appellant with copies of both pleadings; (3) informed appellant

of his rights to file pro se responses, to review the record prior to filing those responses, and to seek discretionary review if we conclude that the appeal is frivolous; and (4) provided appellant with a form motion for pro se access to the appellate record that only requires appellant's signature and date with instructions to file the motion within ten days. See *Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744; *Kelly*, 436 S.W.3d at 319–20; see also *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 408–09. In this case, appellant filed neither a timely motion seeking pro se access to the appellate record nor a motion for extension of time to do so. Appellant did not file a pro se response.

II. INDEPENDENT REVIEW & MODIFICATION

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 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, 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 requirements of Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 47.1.”); *Stafford*, 813 S.W.2d at 511.

However, we discovered through our independent review that the “Statute for Offense” section of the trial court's judgment incorrectly lists Texas Penal Code § 39.04(b) and § 14.425 as the statutes under which appellant was convicted. We may modify incorrect judgments to make the record “speak the truth” when we have the necessary data and information, and we may do so on our own motion. See TEX. R. APP. P. 43.2(b);

Bigley v. State, 865 S.W.2d 26, 27–28 (Tex. Crim. App. 1993); *Asberry v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 526, 529–30 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1991, pet. ref'd). A conviction for driving while intoxicated (third or more) is punishable under § 49.09(b)(2). See TEX. PENAL CODE ANN. § 49.09(b)(2). Having pleaded true to a prior third-degree felony, the relevant enhancement statute in this case is Texas Penal Code § 12.42(a). See *id.* § 12.42(a). Accordingly, we modify the judgment to: (1) replace “39.04(b)” with “49.09(b)(2)”; and (2) replace “14.425” with “12.42(a)” under the “Statute for Offense” section of the trial court’s judgment. See TEX. R. APP. P. 43.2(b); *Bigley*, 865 S.W.2d at 27–28; *Asberry*, 813 S.W.2d at 529–30.

III. MOTION TO WITHDRAW

In accordance with *Anders*, appellant’s counsel asked this Court for permission to withdraw as counsel. See *Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744; see also *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 408 n.17. We grant counsel’s motion to withdraw. Within five days from 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.¹ 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).

¹ 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. Any petition for discretionary review must be filed with the Clerk of the Texas 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.

IV. CONCLUSION

We affirm the trial court's judgment as modified.

DORI CONTRERAS
Chief Justice

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

Delivered and filed on the
7th day of July, 2022.