

**NOS. 12-15-00215-CR
12-15-00217-CR
12-15-00218-CR**

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT
TYLER, TEXAS**

JACOB LEE ROPER, APPELLANT	§	APPEALS FROM THE 114TH
V.	§	JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE	§	SMITH COUNTY, TEXAS

**MEMORANDUM OPINION
PER CURIAM**

Jacob Lee Roper appeals his convictions for aggravated robbery and 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 was indicted in two cases for aggravated robbery and in a third case for burglary of a building. Appellant entered an open plea of “guilty” to the offenses. The trial court accepted the pleas. After a hearing on punishment, the trial court found Appellant guilty of all three offenses and sentenced him to two years of confinement in a state jail facility for the burglary of a building charge, and forty years of imprisonment on each of the aggravated robberies, to be served concurrently. These appeals followed.

ANALYSIS PURSUANT TO *ANDERS V. CALIFORNIA*

Appellant's counsel filed briefs 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 briefs, it is apparent that counsel is well acquainted with the facts in these cases. In compliance with *Anders*, *Gainous*, and *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807, 812 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978), counsel's briefs present a chronological summation of the procedural history of the cases, and further state that counsel is unable to raise any arguable issues for appeal. We have reviewed the record for reversible error and have found none.¹ See *Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826–27 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005).

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). We are in agreement with Appellant's counsel that the appeal are wholly frivolous. Accordingly, his motion for leave to withdraw are hereby **granted**, and the trial court's judgments are **affirmed**. See TEX. R. APP. P. 43.2.

As a result of our disposition of these cases, 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 in each case. 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 petition for discretionary review pro se. 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. 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

¹ Counsel for Appellant certified that he provided Appellant with a copy of his briefs and informed Appellant that he had the right to file his own briefs. Appellant was given time to file his own briefs, but the time for filing such briefs has expired and we have received no pro se brief.

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 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. 12-15-00215-CR

JACOB LEE ROPER,
Appellant
V.
THE STATE OF TEXAS,
Appellee

Appeal from the 114th District Court
of Smith County, Texas (Tr.Ct.No. 114-0321-15)

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.



COURT OF APPEALS

TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT OF TEXAS

JUDGMENT

JULY 29, 2016

NO. 12-15-00217-CR

JACOB LEE ROPER,
Appellant
V.
THE STATE OF TEXAS,
Appellee

Appeal from the 114th District Court
of Smith County, Texas (Tr.Ct.No. 114-0320-15)

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.



COURT OF APPEALS

TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT OF TEXAS

JUDGMENT

JULY 29, 2016

NO. 12-15-00218-CR

JACOB LEE ROPER,
Appellant
V.
THE STATE OF TEXAS,
Appellee

Appeal from the 114th District Court
of Smith County, Texas (Tr.Ct.No. 114-0322-15)

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.