

**NO. 12-15-00009-CR**

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS**

**TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT**

**TYLER, TEXAS**

***JOE LYNN PITTMAN,  
APPELLANT***

§ ***APPEAL FROM THE 114TH***

***V.***

§ ***JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT***

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

§ ***SMITH COUNTY, TEXAS***

---

---

***MEMORANDUM OPINION  
PER CURIAM***

Joe Lynn Pittman appeals his conviction for aggravated assault with a deadly weapon. 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**

The indictment in this case alleged that Appellant caused bodily injury to the victim by striking her with his hand and kicking her with his foot. The indictment further alleged that Appellant used a firearm during the assault. A jury found Appellant guilty of aggravated assault with a deadly weapon and assessed a punishment of imprisonment for fifteen years.

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

Appellant's counsel filed a brief in compliance with *Anders* and *Gainous*. Appellant's counsel states that he has reviewed the record and concluded that it reflects no jurisdictional defects or reversible error. In compliance with *Anders*, *Gainous*, and *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807 (Tex. Crim. App. [Panel Op.] 1978), Appellant's brief presents a chronological procedural history of the case and a professional evaluation of the record demonstrating why there are no

arguable issues for appeal.<sup>1</sup> 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 conducted an independent review of the record and have found no reversible error. See *Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826-27 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005). Accordingly, we conclude the appeal is wholly frivolous.

### CONCLUSION

As required by *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503 (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). Having concluded that this appeal is wholly frivolous, we *grant* counsel's motion for leave to withdraw and *affirm* the trial court's judgment.

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 this case by the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals, he must either retain an attorney to file a petition for discretionary review on his behalf or file a petition for discretionary review *pro se*. Any petition for discretionary review must be filed with Texas Court of Criminal Appeals 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; 68.3(a). Any petition for discretionary review should comply with the requirements of Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 68.4. See *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 408 n.22.

Opinion delivered June 15, 2016.

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

(DO NOT PUBLISH)

---

<sup>1</sup>Appellant's counsel states that he provided Appellant with a copy of the *Anders* brief. Appellant was given time to file his own brief in this cause. The time for filing such a brief has expired and we have received no pro se brief.



## COURT OF APPEALS

### TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT OF TEXAS

#### JUDGMENT

JUNE 15, 2016

NO. 12-15-00009-CR

JOE LYNN PITTMAN,  
Appellant  
V.  
THE STATE OF TEXAS,  
Appellee

---

Appeal from the 114th District Court  
of Smith County, Texas (Tr.Ct.No. 114-1053-14)

---

THIS CAUSE came to be heard on the appellate record and brief 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.