

**NO. 12-10-00146-CR**

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS**

**TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT**

**TYLER, TEXAS**

*YADUR SANCHEZ RODRIGUEZ,* § *APPEAL FROM THE 7TH*  
*APPELLANT*

*V.* § *JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF*

*THE STATE OF TEXAS,* § *SMITH COUNTY, TEXAS*  
*APPELLEE*

---

---

***MEMORANDUM OPINION***  
***PER CURIAM***

Yadur Sanchez Rodriguez appeals his conviction for aggravated assault. Appellant's counsel has filed a brief asserting 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 the appeal.

**BACKGROUND**

Appellant was indicted for the felony offense of aggravated assault.<sup>1</sup> The indictment alleged that Appellant threatened another individual with imminent bodily injury with a deadly weapon. As alleged, the offense is a second degree felony.<sup>2</sup> Appellant pleaded guilty as charged in exchange for the State's agreement not to proceed with additional charges. The trial court conducted a sentencing hearing and assessed a sentence of imprisonment for twenty years. This appeal followed.

---

<sup>1</sup> See TEX. PENAL CODE ANN. § 22.02 (Vernon Supp. 2010).

<sup>2</sup> See *id.* § 22.02(a)(2).

**ANALYSIS PURSUANT TO ANDERS V. CALIFORNIA**

Appellant's counsel has filed a brief in compliance with *Anders* and *Gainous*. Counsel states that he has diligently reviewed the appellate record and that he is well acquainted with the facts of this case. In compliance with *Anders*, *Gainous*, and *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978), counsel's brief presents a thorough chronological summary of the procedural history of the case and further states that counsel is unable to present any arguable issues for appeal.<sup>3</sup> See *Anders*, 386 U.S. at 745, 87 S. Ct. at 1400; see also *Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 80, 109 S. Ct. 346, 350, 102 L. Ed. 2d 300 (1988). We have likewise reviewed the record for reversible error and have found none.

**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 for leave to withdraw is hereby **granted**, and we **dismiss** this appeal. See *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 408–09 (“After the completion of these four steps, the court of appeals will either agree that the appeal is wholly frivolous, grant the attorney's motion to withdraw, and dismiss the appeal, or it will determine that there may be plausible grounds for appeal.”).

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. See *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 408 n.22. 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 that was 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

---

<sup>3</sup> Counsel for Appellant has certified that he provided Appellant with a copy of this brief. Appellant was given time to file his own brief in this cause. The time for filing such a brief has expired, and we have not received a pro se brief.

the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals along with the rest of the filings in this 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 March 31, 2011.

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

(DO NOT PUBLISH)