## NO. 12-11-00402-CR

## IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

## TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT

## **TYLER, TEXAS**

JACQUELYN BARNETT, APPELLANT	Ş	APPEAL FROM THE 7TH
V.	§	JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE	§	SMITH COUNTY, TEXAS

#### MEMORANDUM OPINION PER CURIAM

Jacquelyn Barnett appeals her conviction for possession of less than one gram of cocaine, for which she was sentenced to imprisonment for eight 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 affirm.

#### **BACKGROUND**

Appellant was charged by indictment with possession of less than one gram of cocaine and pleaded "guilty." The indictment further alleged that Appellant had been previously convicted of two felonies. The matter proceeded to a bench trial on punishment, at which Appellant pleaded "true" to the enhancement allegations in the indictment. Ultimately, the trial court sentenced Appellant to imprisonment for eight years. This appeal followed.

#### 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.<sup>1</sup> 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 trial court's judgment is *affirmed*.

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 her of her 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, she must either retain an attorney to file a petition for discretionary review on her behalf or she 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 the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals. *See* Tex. R. App. P. 68.3(a). 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 August 31, 2012. Panel consisted of Worthen, C.J., Griffith, J., and Hoyle, J.

#### (DO NOT PUBLISH)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Counsel for Appellant certified in his brief that he provided Appellant with a copy of the brief. Appellant was given time to file her own brief in this cause. The time for filing such a brief has expired and no pro se brief in compliance with the Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure has been filed.



# COURT OF APPEALS TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT OF TEXAS JUDGMENT

**AUGUST 31, 2012** 

NO. 12-11-00402-CR

#### JACQUELYN BARNETT,

Appellant

V.

#### THE STATE OF TEXAS,

Appellee

Appeal from the 7th Judicial District Court of Smith County, Texas. (Tr.Ct.No. 007-0988-11)

THIS CAUSE came to be heard on the appellate record and briefs filed herein, and the same being considered, it is the opinion of this court that there was no error in the judgment.

It is therefore ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED that Appellant's counsel's motion to withdraw is **granted**, the judgment of the court below **be in all things affirmed**, and that this decision be certified to the court below for observance.

By per curiam opinion.

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