



**NUMBER 13-22-00259-CR**

**COURT OF APPEALS**

**THIRTEENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS**

**CORPUS CHRISTI – EDINBURG**

---

---

**LEANDRO FERNANDO RODRIGUEZ,**

**Appellant,**

**v.**

**THE STATE OF TEXAS,**

---

---

**Appellee.**

**On appeal from the 2nd 25th District Court  
of Lavaca County, Texas.**

---

---

## **MEMORANDUM OPINION**

**Before Justices Benavides, Longoria, and Tijerina  
Memorandum Opinion by Justice Benavides**

Pursuant to a plea bargain agreement, appellant Leandro Fernando Rodriguez pleaded guilty to the offense of possession of a controlled substance, penalty group four, in an amount of more than twenty-eight grams but less than 200 grams, a third-degree felony, and the trial court placed him on deferred adjudication community supervision for a period of two years. See TEX. HEALTH & SAFETY CODE ANN. § 481.118(c). On the State's

motion, the trial court later revoked appellant's community supervision, adjudicated him guilty, and sentenced him to five years' imprisonment. See TEX. PENAL CODE ANN. § 12.34(a). Although appellant filed a notice of appeal, his court-appointed counsel have 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.

#### 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 their review of the record yielded no grounds of reversible error upon which an appeal could 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 they: (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 copy of the appellate record. 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. Appellant 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 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.

## **III. MOTION TO WITHDRAW**

In accordance with *Anders*, appellant’s counsel have 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 are 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>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.

GINA M. BENAVIDES  
Justice

Do not publish.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

Delivered and filed on the  
18th day of May, 2023.

---

<sup>1</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. 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.