

NO. 12-16-00169-CR

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT

TYLER, TEXAS

TIMOTHY BERNARD CHOICE,
APPELLANT

§ ***APPEAL FROM THE 114TH***

V.

§ ***JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT***

THE STATE OF TEXAS,
APPELLEE

§ ***SMITH COUNTY, TEXAS***

MEMORANDUM OPINION
PER CURIAM

Timothy Bernard Choice appeals his conviction for burglary of a habitation. 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 for burglary of a habitation, a first degree felony as alleged due to prior convictions.¹ Appellant made an open plea of “guilty” to the offense and pleaded “true” to the punishment enhancements. The trial court accepted Appellant’s plea, and the matter proceeded to a bench trial on punishment. The trial court sentenced Appellant to thirty-five years of imprisonment. 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 relates that he has reviewed the record, is well acquainted with the

¹ See TEX. PENAL CODE ANN. §§ 30.02(a), (c)(2) (West 2011) (burglary of a habitation); 12.42(d) (West Supp. 2016) (habitual offender enhancements).

facts of this case, and found no error to present for our review. 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.² We have likewise reviewed the record for reversible error and have found none.

CONCLUSION

As required by *Anders* and *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 511 (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, 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 judgment of the trial court.

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 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 pro se petition for discretionary review. 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(a). 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 Rule 68.4 of the Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure. *See In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 408 n.22.

Opinion delivered September 13, 2017.

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

(DO NOT PUBLISH)

² In compliance with *Kelly v. State*, Appellant’s counsel provided Appellant with a copy of the brief, notified Appellant of his motion to withdraw as counsel, informed Appellant of his right to file a pro se response, and took concrete measures to facilitate Appellant’s review of the appellate record. 436 S.W.3d 313, 319 (Tex. Crim. App. 2014). Appellant was given time to file his own brief. The time for filing such a brief has expired and no pro se brief has been filed.



COURT OF APPEALS

TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT OF TEXAS

JUDGMENT

SEPTEMBER 13, 2017

NO. 12-16-00169-CR

TIMOTHY BERNARD CHOICE,
Appellant
V.
THE STATE OF TEXAS,
Appellee

Appeal from the 114th District Court
of Smith County, Texas (Tr.Ct.No. 114-0194-16)

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.