

**NOS. 12-13-00094-CR
12-13-00095-CR
12-13-00096-CR**

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT

TYLER, TEXAS

***THOMAS HAROLD-GEORGE
BROOKBANK,
APPELLANT***

§ *APPEALS FROM THE 241ST*

§ *JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT*

V.

***THE STATE OF TEXAS,
APPELLEE***

§ *SMITH COUNTY, TEXAS*

***MEMORANDUM OPINION
PER CURIAM***

Thomas Harold-George Brookbank appeals his convictions for aggravated sexual assault of a child (cause numbers 12-13-00094-CR and 12-13-00096-CR) and indecency with a child (cause number 12-13-00095-CR). Appellant's counsel 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 affirm.

BACKGROUND

A Smith County grand jury returned three indictments against Appellant for the offenses of aggravated sexual assault of a child and indecency with a child. Appellant waived his right to a jury trial and pleaded guilty to the offense charged in each case. The trial court conducted a sentencing hearing, took judicial notice of the presentence investigation report, and assessed punishment at imprisonment for life in cause numbers 12-13-00094-CR and 12-13-00096-CR. In cause number 12-13-00095-CR, the trial court assessed punishment at imprisonment for

twenty years. The trial court did not assess a fine in any of the three cases. 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 reviewed the appellate record and that he is unable to find any reversible error or jurisdictional defects. 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 why counsel is unable to present any arguable issues for appeal.¹ See *Anders*, 386 U.S. at 745, 87 S. Ct. at 1400; *Gainous*, 436 S.W.2d at 138; 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 **granted**, and the judgment of the trial court is **affirmed**. See TEX. R. APP. P. 43.2(a).

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 *id.* at 408 n.22. Any petition for discretionary review must be filed within thirty days after the date of this opinion or after the date this court overrules the last timely motion for rehearing. See TEX. R. APP. P. 68.2(a). Any petition for discretionary review

¹ Counsel states in his motion to withdraw that he provided Appellant with a copy of his brief. Appellant was given time to file his own brief in this cause. The time for filing such brief has expired, and we have received no pro se brief.

must be filed with the clerk of 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 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 February 12, 2013.

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

(DO NOT PUBLISH)



COURT OF APPEALS

TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT OF TEXAS

JUDGMENT

FEBRUARY 12, 2014

NO. 12-13-00094-CR

THOMAS HAROLD-GEORGE BROOKBANK,
Appellant
V.
THE STATE OF TEXAS,
Appellee

Appeal from the 241st District Court
of Smith County, Texas (Tr.Ct.No. 241-1333-12)

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.



COURT OF APPEALS

TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT OF TEXAS

JUDGMENT

FEBRUARY 12, 2014

NO. 12-13-00095-CR

THOMAS HAROLD-GEORGE BROOKBANK,
Appellant
V.
THE STATE OF TEXAS,
Appellee

Appeal from the 241st District Court
of Smith County, Texas (Tr.Ct.No. 241-1334-12)

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.



COURT OF APPEALS

TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT OF TEXAS

JUDGMENT

FEBRUARY 12, 2014

NO. 12-13-00096-CR

THOMAS HAROLD-GEORGE BROOKBANK,
Appellant
V.
THE STATE OF TEXAS,
Appellee

Appeal from the 241st District Court
of Smith County, Texas (Tr.Ct.No. 241-1335-12)

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.