



**NUMBER 13-21-00287-CR**

**COURT OF APPEALS**

**THIRTEENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS**

**CORPUS CHRISTI – EDINBURG**

---

**TINA RENEE CARROLL,**

**Appellant,**

**v.**

**THE STATE OF TEXAS,**

**Appellee.**

---

**On appeal from the 25th District Court  
of Gonzales County, Texas.**

---

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

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

Following a jury trial, appellant Tina Renee Carroll was found guilty of delivery of a controlled substance under Penalty Group 1, namely methamphetamine, in an amount of four grams or more but less than 200 grams, a first-degree felony. See TEX. HEALTH & SAFETY CODE ANN. § 481.112(d). The trial court sentenced Carroll to eighteen years' imprisonment, a sentence enhanced by a prior felony drug conviction. See TEX. PENAL

CODE ANN. § 12.42(c)(1) (providing for a term of “not more than 99 years or less than 15 years” for repeat felony offenders on trial of a first-degree felony).

Carroll’s court-appointed appellate 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**

Pursuant to *Anders*, Carroll’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), Carroll’s counsel carefully discussed why, under controlling authority, there is no reversible error in the trial court’s judgment. Carroll’s counsel also informed this Court in writing that he (1) notified Carroll that counsel filed an *Anders* brief and a motion to withdraw;

(2) provided Carroll with copies of both pleadings; (3) informed Carroll of her rights to file a pro se response, to review the record prior to filing a response, and to seek discretionary review in the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals if this Court finds that the appeal is frivolous; and (4) provided Carroll with a form motion for pro se access to the appellate record with instructions to sign and file the motion with the court of appeals within ten days by mailing it to the address provided. See *Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744; *Kelly*, 436 S.W.3d at 319–20; *Stafford*, 813 S.W.2d at 510 n.3; see also *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 409 n.23. An adequate time has passed, and Carroll has not requested access to the record nor 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 counsel’s brief and the entire record, and we have found nothing that would support a finding of reversible error. 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 509.

## III. MOTION TO WITHDRAW

In accordance with *Anders*, Carroll’s attorney asked this Court for permission to withdraw as counsel. See *Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744; see also *Kelly*, 436 S.W.3d at 318–19. 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 Carroll and to advise her of her right to file a petition for discretionary review.<sup>1</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.

CLARISSA SILVA  
Justice

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

Delivered and filed on the  
31st day of March, 2022.

---

<sup>1</sup> No substitute counsel will be appointed. If Carroll seeks further review of this case by the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals, she 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. A 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.