

NO. 12-10-00247-CR

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT

TYLER, TEXAS

<i>DONNIE RAY SANDERS,</i> <i>APPELLANT</i>	§	<i>APPEAL FROM THE 217TH</i>
<i>V.</i>	§	<i>JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT</i>
<i>THE STATE OF TEXAS,</i> <i>APPELLEE</i>	§	<i>ANGELINA COUNTY, TEXAS</i>

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Donnie Ray Sanders appeals his convictions for three counts of 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

An Angelina County grand jury returned an indictment charging Appellant with three counts of aggravated assault and three counts of intoxication assault. The grand jury also alleged that Appellant had a prior felony conviction. Appellant pleaded guilty to the three counts of aggravated assault and pleaded true to the sentencing enhancement. There was no plea agreement, but the State dismissed the three intoxication assault counts the same day Appellant signed the plea papers. The trial court accepted Appellant’s guilty plea, found him guilty, and assessed a sentence of imprisonment for thirty years. This appeal followed.

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.¹ 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 considered counsel's brief and have conducted our own independent review of the record. We 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 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 the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals along with the rest of the filings in this case. See TEX. R.

¹ Counsel for Appellant states in his motion to withdraw 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 received no pro se brief.

APP. P. 68.3.² 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 August 17, 2011.

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

(DO NOT PUBLISH)

² By rule, after September 1, 2011, petitions should be filed directly with the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals. See TEX. R. APP. P. 68.3(a) (effective September 1, 2011).