

**NOS. 12-10-00380-CR
12-10-00381-CR**

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT

TYLER, TEXAS

<i>WILLIAM LAMON GOODWIN, APPELLANT</i>	§	<i>APPEAL FROM THE 114TH</i>
<i>V.</i>	§	<i>JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT</i>
<i>THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE</i>	§	<i>SMITH COUNTY, TEXAS</i>

***MEMORANDUM OPINION
PER CURIAM***

William Lamon Goodwin appeals his convictions for possession of a firearm by a felon, for which he was sentenced to imprisonment for ten years, and aggravated assault with a deadly weapon, for which he was sentenced to imprisonment for thirty years. Appellant’s counsel filed a brief 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 the appeal.

BACKGROUND

Appellant was charged by separate indictments with felon in possession of a firearm and aggravated assault with a deadly weapon.¹ Appellant pleaded “guilty” as charged in each cause and pleaded “true” to the deadly weapon allegation as well as the enhancement allegation pertaining to the aggravated assault charge. The trial court found Appellant “guilty” as charged in each cause and sentenced him to imprisonment for ten years for felon in possession of a firearm and thirty years for aggravated assault. This appeal followed.

¹ The latter indictment also alleged that Appellant had been previously convicted of a felony.

ANALYSIS PURSUANT TO *ANDERS V. CALIFORNIA*

Appellant's counsel filed a brief in compliance with *Anders v. California* and *Gainous v. State*. Appellant's counsel states that he has diligently reviewed the appellate record and is of the opinion that the record reflects no reversible error and that there is no error upon which an appeal can be predicated. He further relates that he is well acquainted with the facts in this case. In compliance with *Anders*, *Gainous*, and *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807 (Tex. Crim. App. [Panel Op.] 1978), Appellant's brief presents a chronological summation of the procedural history of the case and further states that Appellant's counsel is unable to raise any arguable issues for appeal.² We have likewise reviewed the record for reversible error and have found none.

CONCLUSION

As required by *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991), Appellant's counsel has moved for leave to withdraw. *See also In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403, 407 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008) (orig. proceeding). We carried the motion for consideration with the merits. Having done so and finding no reversible error, Appellant's counsel's motion for leave to withdraw is hereby **granted** and the appeal is **dismissed**.

As a result of our disposition of this case, Appellant's 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 review of this case by the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals, he must either retain an attorney to file a petition for discretionary review on his behalf or he must file a petition for discretionary review pro se. 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.

² 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.

See TEX. R. APP. P. 68.3. Any petition for discretionary review should comply with the requirements of Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 68.4. See *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 408 n.22.

Opinion delivered July 29, 2011.

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

(DO NOT PUBLISH)