

**NO. 12-16-00015-CR**

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS**

**TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT**

**TYLER, TEXAS**

***GERALD RAY MCHAM,  
APPELLANT***

§ ***APPEAL FROM THE 241ST***

***V.***

§ ***JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT***

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

§ ***SMITH COUNTY, TEXAS***

---

---

***MEMORANDUM OPINION  
PER CURIAM***

Gerald Ray McHam appeals his conviction for aggravated sexual assault of a child, for which he was sentenced to imprisonment for life. 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 aggravated sexual assault of a child and pleaded “guilty.” The matter proceeded to a bench trial on punishment. Ultimately, the trial court found Appellant “guilty” as charged and assessed his punishment at imprisonment for life. This appeal followed.

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

Appellant’s counsel filed a brief in compliance with *Anders v. California* and *Gainous v. State*. Appellant’s counsel states 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. He further relates that he is well acquainted with the facts in this case. 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 summation of the procedural history of the case and further states that Appellant’s counsel is unable to raise any arguable issues for appeal.<sup>1</sup> We have likewise reviewed the record for reversible error and have found none.

### 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 carried the motion for consideration with the merits. Having done so and finding no reversible error, we *grant* Appellant’s counsel’s motion for leave to withdraw and *affirm* the trial court’s judgment.

As a result of our disposition of this case, 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 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 either this opinion or the last timely motion for rehearing that 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 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 September 14, 2016.

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

(DO NOT PUBLISH)

---

<sup>1</sup> Counsel for Appellant certified in his brief that he provided Appellant with a copy of the 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**

**SEPTEMBER 14, 2016**

**NO. 12-16-00015-CR**

**GERALD RAY MCHAM,**  
Appellant  
V.  
**THE STATE OF TEXAS,**  
Appellee

---

Appeal from the 241st District Court  
of Smith County, Texas (Tr.Ct.No. 241-0469-15)

---

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.*