



NUMBER 13-23-00083-CR

COURT OF APPEALS

THIRTEENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS

CORPUS CHRISTI – EDINBURG

BERNARDO RODRIGUEZ,

Appellant,

v.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,

Appellee.

**ON APPEAL FROM THE 36TH DISTRICT COURT
OF SAN PATRICIO COUNTY, TEXAS**

MEMORANDUM OPINION

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

Appellant Bernardo Rodriguez pleaded guilty to the offense of driving while intoxicated with two or more prior convictions, a third-degree felony. See TEX. PENAL CODE ANN. §§ 49.04(a) (driving while intoxicated), 49.09(b)(2) (providing that driving while intoxicated is a third-degree felony if a person has two prior convictions for driving while intoxicated). The trial court found appellant guilty and assessed punishment at six years'

imprisonment. However, the trial court suspended the sentence and placed appellant on community supervision for a term of five years, then later extended the term by two years. The State filed a motion to revoke community supervision. Appellant pleaded true to the sole allegation in the State's motion. After a hearing, the trial court found that appellant violated the terms of his community supervision, revoked appellant from his community supervision, and sentenced appellant to five years' imprisonment. Appellant'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 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 his 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 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 right to file a pro se response, 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 if he so desires. 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. An adequate amount of time has passed and appellant has not filed either a motion seeking pro se access to the appellate record or 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 has 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).

IV. CONCLUSION

We affirm the trial court's judgment.

NORA L. LONGORIA
Justice

Do not publish.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

Delivered and filed on the
15th day of August, 2024.

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.