

NO. 12-09-00290-CR

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT

TYLER, TEXAS

<i>KEITHEN JERMAINE HARRIS, APPELLANT</i>	§	<i>APPEAL FROM THE 217TH</i>
<i>V.</i>	§	<i>JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF</i>
<i>THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE</i>	§	<i>ANGELINA COUNTY, TEXAS</i>

***MEMORANDUM OPINION
PER CURIAM***

Keithen Jermaine Harris appeals his conviction for robbery. Appellant pleaded guilty to that offense and true to the four enhancement paragraphs in the indictment. The trial court assessed punishment at twenty-five years of imprisonment. Appellant’s counsel filed a motion to withdraw and a brief in support of that motion in compliance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 87 S. Ct. 1396, 18 L. Ed. 2d 493 (1967) and *Gainous v. State*, 436 S.W.2d 137 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969). We dismiss Appellant’s appeal.

ANALYSIS PURSUANT TO *ANDERS V. CALIFORNIA*

Appellant’s counsel filed a brief in compliance with *Anders* and *Gainous*, stating that he is well acquainted with the facts in this case and has diligently reviewed the appellate record. In compliance with *Anders*, *Gainous*, and *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978), Appellant’s brief presents a chronological summation of the procedural history of the case, and further states that Appellant’s counsel is of the opinion that the record reflects no reversible error and counsel is unable to raise any arguable issues for appeal. We have considered counsel’s brief and conducted our own independent review of the record. We have found no reversible error.

See *Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826-27 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005).

CONCLUSION

As required, Appellant's counsel has moved for leave to withdraw. See *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403, 407 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008) (orig. proceeding); *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 511 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991). We are in agreement with Appellant's counsel that the appeal is wholly frivolous. Accordingly, his motion to withdraw is hereby **granted**, and we **dismiss** this appeal. See *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 408-09.

Counsel has a duty to, within five days of the date of this opinion, send a copy of the opinion and judgment to Appellant and advise him of his right to file a petition for discretionary review. See TEX. R. APP. P. 48.4; *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 411 n.35. 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 he must file a pro se petition for discretionary review. Any petition for discretionary review must be filed within thirty days from the date of this opinion or the date the last timely filed motion for rehearing is overruled by this court. See TEX. R. APP. P. 68.2. Any petition for discretionary review must be filed with this court, after which it will be forwarded to the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals along with the rest of the filings in the case. See TEX. R. APP. P. 68.3. Any petition for discretionary review should comply with the requirements of Rule 68.4 of the Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure. See TEX. R. APP. P. 68.4; *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 408 n.22.

Opinion delivered July 14, 2010.

Panel consisted of Worthen, C.J., Griffith, J., and Hoyle, J.

(DO NOT PUBLISH)