

**NO. 12-14-00290-CR**

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS**

**TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT**

**TYLER, TEXAS**

***FREDERICK PERKINS,  
APPELLANT***

§ ***APPEAL FROM THE 114TH***

***V.***

§ ***JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT***

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

§ ***SMITH COUNTY, TEXAS***

---

---

***MEMORANDUM OPINION  
PER CURIAM***

Frederick Perkins appeals his conviction for possession of a controlled substance. 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. The indictment further alleged that Appellant had previously been convicted of two felony offenses, the second one having been committed prior to the primary offense and after the first felony conviction was final. Appellant pleaded “guilty” to the offense and “true” to the enhancement allegations. The matter proceeded to a bench trial on punishment. The trial court assessed Appellant’s punishment at imprisonment for fifteen 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 relates that he has reviewed the appellate record and found no reversible error or jurisdictional defects. In compliance with *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807, 812

(Tex. Crim. App. [Panel Op.] 1978), counsel's brief contains a thorough professional evaluation of the record demonstrating why there are no arguable grounds to be advanced.<sup>1</sup>

We have considered counsel's brief and conducted our own independent review of the record. *Id.* at 811. We have found no reversible error.

### **Conclusion**

As required by *Anders* and *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 511 (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, we agree with Appellant's counsel that the appeal is wholly frivolous. Accordingly, we grant counsel's motion for leave to withdraw and *affirm* the judgment of the trial court.

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 these cases 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 pro se petition for discretionary review. Any petition for discretionary review must be filed within thirty days from the date of this court's judgment or the date 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(a). Any petition for discretionary review should comply with the requirements of Rule 68.4 of the Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure. *See In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 408 n.22.

Opinion delivered July 22, 2015.

*Panel consisted of Worthen, C.J., Hoyle, J., and Neeley, J.*

(DO NOT PUBLISH)

---

<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 his own brief in this cause. The time for filing such a brief has expired and no pro se brief has been filed.



## COURT OF APPEALS

### TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT OF TEXAS

#### JUDGMENT

JULY 22, 2015

NO. 12-14-00290-CR

**FREDERICK PERKINS,**

Appellant

V.

**THE STATE OF TEXAS,**

Appellee

---

Appeal from the 114th District Court  
of Smith County, Texas (Tr.Ct.No. 114-0932-14)

---

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., Hoyle, J. and Neeley, J.*