

NO. 12-15-00002-CR

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT

TYLER, TEXAS

***Q'ANDREW LYNN SHELTON,
APPELLANT***

§ *APPEAL FROM THE 114TH*

V.

§ *JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT*

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

§ *SMITH COUNTY, TEXAS*

***MEMORANDUM OPINION
PER CURIAM***

Q'Andrew Lynn Shelton appeals his conviction for possession of a controlled substance in a drug free zone. 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 response. We affirm.

BACKGROUND

Appellant was charged by indictment with possession of a controlled substance in a drug free zone and pleaded "not guilty." The jury found Appellant "guilty" as charged, and the matter proceeded to a bench trial on punishment. Appellant pleaded "true" to two felony enhancement paragraphs, and the trial court assessed Appellant's punishment at imprisonment for fifty 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 record and concluded that it contains no jurisdictional defects and no reversible error to present for our review. In compliance with *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807, 812 (Tex. Crim. App. [Panel Op.] 1978), Appellant's brief

contains a professional evaluation of the record demonstrating why there are no arguable grounds to be advanced.

Appellant contends in his pro se response and supplemental pro se response that he is entitled to an acquittal or a new trial because (1) the police conducted an illegal search, (2) his trial counsel's assistance was ineffective, (3) the trial court erred by admitting irrelevant evidence, and (4) the evidence is insufficient to support the jury's drug free zone finding.

When faced with an *Anders* brief and a pro se response by an appellant, an appellate court can either (1) determine that the appeal is wholly frivolous and issue an opinion explaining that it has reviewed the record and finds no reversible error or (2) determine that arguable grounds for appeal exist and remand the cause to the trial court so that new counsel may be appointed to brief the issues. *Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826-27 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005).

CONCLUSION

After conducting an independent examination of the record, we find no reversible error and conclude that the appeal is wholly frivolous. Accordingly, we *affirm* the judgment of the trial court.

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 and now *grant* counsel's motion for leave to withdraw.

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 29, 2016.

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

(DO NOT PUBLISH)



COURT OF APPEALS

TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT OF TEXAS

JUDGMENT

JULY 29, 2016

NO. 12-15-00002-CR

Q'ANDREW LYNN SHELTON,
Appellant
V.
THE STATE OF TEXAS,
Appellee

Appeal from the 114th District Court
of Smith County, Texas (Tr.Ct.No. 114-0724-14)

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.