## NO. 12-15-00253-CR

## IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

## TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT

# **TYLER, TEXAS**

EDWIN ROLANDO MEJIA-GARCIA, APPELLANT *S APPEAL FROM THE 2ND* 

V.

§ JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE

§ CHEROKEE COUNTY, TEXAS

### MEMORANDUM OPINION PER CURIAM

Edwin Rolando Mejia-Garcia appeals his conviction for continuous sexual abuse of a young child or children. 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 the offense of continuous sexual abuse of a young child or children, a first degree felony. Appellant pleaded "guilty" to the offense charged in the indictment. Appellant and his counsel signed a document entitled "Felony-Defendant's Jury Waiver on Plea of Guilty" in connection with his guilty plea, including a judicial confession in which Appellant swore, and judicially confessed, to the facts alleged in the indictment. The trial court accepted Appellant's plea and adjudged Appellant guilty of continuous sexual abuse of a child or children. Appellant elected for a jury to determine his punishment. At the conclusion of the punishment hearing, the jury assessed Appellant's punishment at life imprisonment and a \$10,000.00 fine. This appeal followed.

#### ANALYSIS PURSUANT TO ANDERS V. CALIFORNIA

Appellant's counsel filed a brief 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 brief, it is apparent that counsel is well acquainted with the facts in this case. 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 case, and further states that counsel is unable to raise any arguable issues for appeal. We have reviewed the record for reversible error and have found none. *See Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826-27 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005).

#### **CONCLUSION**

As required, Appellant's counsel has moved for leave to withdraw in the case. *See In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403, 407 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008) (orig. proceeding); *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 511 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991). 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 trial court's judgment. *See* Tex. R. App. P. 43.2.

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 further review of this case by the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals, he must either retain an attorney to file a petition for discretionary review or he must file a pro se petition for discretionary review. *See In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 408 n.22. Any petition for discretionary review must be filed within thirty days from the date of either this opinion or the day 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. Any petition for discretionary review should comply with the

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

requirements of Rule 68.4 of the Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 68.4; *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. 12-15-00253-CR

# EDWIN ROLANDO MEJIA-GARCIA,

Appellant V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,
Appellee

Appeal from the 2nd District Court of Cherokee County, Texas (Tr.Ct.No. 19384)

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.