

NO. 12-15-00265-CR

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT

TYLER, TEXAS

***RONALD LEE KIRBY,
APPELLANT***

§ ***APPEAL FROM THE 114TH***

V.

§ ***JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT***

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

§ ***SMITH COUNTY, TEXAS***

***MEMORANDUM OPINION
PER CURIAM***

Ronald Lee Kirby appeals his conviction for driving while intoxicated, third or more. 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 driving while intoxicated, third or more. The trial court sentenced Appellant to imprisonment for ten years, but suspended imposition of sentence and placed Appellant on community supervision. The State subsequently moved to revoke Appellant’s community supervision for violating several conditions of his community supervision. Appellant pleaded “true” to violating the conditions of his community supervision. The trial court revoked Appellant’s community supervision and sentenced him to imprisonment for six 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.¹ 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). 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 24, 2016.

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

(DO NOT PUBLISH)

¹Appellant'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 24, 2016

NO. 12-15-00265-CR

RONALD LEE KIRBY,
Appellant
V.
THE STATE OF TEXAS,
Appellee

Appeal from the 114th District Court
of Smith County, Texas (Tr.Ct.No. 114-0516-15)

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.