

**NO. 12-13-00251-CR**

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS**

**TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT**

**TYLER, TEXAS**

***REGINALD JEROME BELL,  
APPELLANT***

§ ***APPEAL FROM THE 114TH***

***V.***

§ ***JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT***

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

§ ***SMITH COUNTY, TEXAS***

---

---

***MEMORANDUM OPINION  
PER CURIAM***

Reginald Jerome Bell appeals his conviction for assault against a public servant. 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). Appellant filed a pro se brief. We affirm.

**BACKGROUND**

Appellant was charged by indictment with the offense of assault against a public servant, a third degree felony. The indictment also alleged two felony enhancement paragraphs. Appellant pleaded "not guilty," and the case proceeded to a jury trial. At the conclusion of the trial, the jury found Appellant guilty of assault against a public servant as charged in the indictment, found the enhancement paragraphs to be true, and assessed his punishment at twenty-five 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.

In Appellant's pro se brief, he argues that his trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance because he did not request a jury charge on necessity or resisting arrest and did not request that the court make a "particularized finding of need" regarding why he was wearing a leg brace. He also contends that the evidence is insufficient to support the conviction. Finally, Appellant argues that his appellate counsel rendered ineffective assistance because he did not raise arguable issues for review, i.e., that trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance.

We have reviewed the record for reversible error and have found none. 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 in the case. 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 court's judgment or the day the last timely motion for rehearing was overruled by this court. See TEX. R. APP. P. 68.2(a). 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 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 29, 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

AUGUST 29, 2014

NO. 12-13-00251-CR

**REGINALD JEROME BELL,**  
Appellant  
V.  
**THE STATE OF TEXAS,**  
Appellee

---

Appeal from the 114th District Court  
of Smith County, Texas (Tr.Ct.No. 114-0674-13)

---

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 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.*