

NO. 12-09-00451-CR

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT

TYLER, TEXAS

<i>MARCUS JEFFREY WALKER,</i> <i>APPELLANT</i>	§	<i>APPEAL FROM THE 114TH</i>
<i>V.</i>	§	<i>JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT</i>
<i>THE STATE OF TEXAS,</i> <i>APPELLEE</i>	§	<i>SMITH COUNTY, TEXAS</i>

MEMORANDUM OPINION
PER CURIAM

Marcus Jeffrey Walker appeals his conviction for aggravated robbery with a deadly weapon. Appellant pleaded guilty without a plea bargain, and the trial court assessed punishment at thirty 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). Thereafter, Appellant filed a pro se brief. 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.

Appellant filed a pro se brief in which he asserted that his trial counsel was ineffective. We

have considered counsel's brief and Appellant's pro se 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 June 30, 2011.

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

(DO NOT PUBLISH)