

**NO. 12-13-00240-CR**

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS**

**TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT**

**TYLER, TEXAS**

*NATHANIEL JOHNSON,  
APPELLANT*

§ *APPEAL FROM THE 7TH*

*V.*

§ *JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT*

*THE STATE OF TEXAS,  
APPELLEE*

§ *SMITH COUNTY, TEXAS*

---

---

***MEMORANDUM OPINION  
PER CURIAM***

Nathaniel Johnson appeals his conviction for driving while intoxicated. 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 the offense of driving while intoxicated, a third degree felony. The indictment also included a jurisdictional enhancement paragraph, and an allegation that he used or exhibited a deadly weapon, a motor vehicle, during the commission of or immediate flight from the offense. Appellant entered an “open” plea of guilty to the offense charged in the indictment, and pleaded “true” to the enhancement paragraph. Appellant and his counsel signed various documents in connection with his guilty plea. These documents included a stipulation of evidence in which Appellant swore that all allegations in the indictment were true and correct. However, he pleaded “not true” to the deadly weapon allegation.

After a punishment hearing, the trial court adjudged Appellant guilty of driving while intoxicated, found the enhancement paragraph to be “true,” made an affirmative finding of a deadly weapon, a motor vehicle, and assessed his punishment at eight years of imprisonment. This appeal followed.

### ANALYSIS PURSUANT TO *ANDERS V. CALIFORNIA*

Appellant's counsel filed a brief in compliance with *Anders* and *Gainous*, stating 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. From our review of counsel's brief, it is apparent that counsel is well acquainted with the facts in this case. In compliance with *Anders*, *Gainous*, and *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807, 812 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978), counsel's brief presents a chronological summation of the procedural history of the case, and further states that counsel is unable to raise any arguable issues for appeal. We have reviewed the record for reversible error and have found none.<sup>1</sup> 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 the trial court's judgment is **affirmed**. See TEX. R. APP. P. 43.2.

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 the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals. See TEX. R. APP. P. 68.3. Any petition for discretionary review should comply with the requirements

---

<sup>1</sup> Counsel for Appellant certified that he provided Appellant with a copy of his brief and informed Appellant that he had the right to file his own brief. Appellant was given time to file his own brief, but the time for filing such a brief has expired and we have received no pro se brief.

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 April 30, 2014.

*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

APRIL 30, 2014

NO. 12-13-00240-CR

**NATHANIEL JOHNSON,**  
Appellant  
V.  
**THE STATE OF TEXAS,**  
Appellee

---

Appeal from the 7th District Court  
of Smith County, Texas (Tr.Ct.No. 007-0090-13)

---

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.*

# THE STATE OF TEXAS M A N D A T E

\*\*\*\*\*

**TO THE 7TH DISTRICT COURT OF SMITH COUNTY, GREETING:**

Before our Court of Appeals for the 12th Court of Appeals District of Texas, on the 30th day of April, 2014, the cause upon appeal to revise or reverse your judgment between

**NATHANIEL JOHNSON, Appellant**

**NO. 12-13-00240-CR; Trial Court No. 007-0090-13**

By *per curiam* opinion.

**THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee**

was determined; and therein our said Court made its order in these words:

“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.”

**WHEREAS, WE COMMAND YOU** to observe the order of our said Court of Appeals for the Twelfth Court of Appeals District of Texas in this behalf, and in all things have it duly recognized, obeyed, and executed.

**WITNESS, THE HONORABLE JAMES T. WORTHEN**, Chief Justice of our Court of Appeals for the Twelfth Court of Appeals District, with the Seal thereof affixed, at the City of Tyler, this the xx day of April, 2014.



CATHY S. LUSK, CLERK

By: Katrina McClenny  
Chief Deputy Clerk