# NO. 12-15-00076-CR

# IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

### TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT

# TYLER, TEXAS

KADETRIC LATERION CARAWAY, APPELLANT *§ APPEAL FROM THE 145TH* 

V.

§ JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE

§ NACOGDOCHES COUNTY, TEXAS

# MEMORANDUM OPINION PER CURIAM

Kadetric Laterion Caraway appeals his conviction for burglary of a building. 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 pleaded guilty to the offense of burglary of a building. The trial court sentenced him to two years in a state jail facility and ordered restitution in the amount of \$165,170.

## 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 found 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 May 18, 2016.

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

#### (DO NOT PUBLISH)

<sup>&</sup>lt;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**

MAY 18, 2016

NO. 12-15-00076-CR

#### KADETRIC LATERION CARAWAY,

Appellant V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,
Appellee

Appeal from the 145th District Court of Nacogdoches County, Texas (Tr.Ct.No. F1320380)

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**, for which execution may issue, 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.