

NO. 12-17-00372-CR

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT

TYLER, TEXAS

GREGORY DONELL PORTER,
APPELLANT

§ ***APPEAL FROM THE 145TH***

V.

§ ***JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT***

THE STATE OF TEXAS,
APPELLEE

§ ***NACOGDOCHES COUNTY, TEXAS***

MEMORANDUM OPINION
PER CURIAM

Gregory Donell Porter appeals his conviction for tampering with evidence for which he was sentenced to imprisonment for twenty five years. Appellant’s counsel filed a brief asserting 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 tampering with evidence. He pleaded “not guilty” and the case proceeded to a jury trial. At the conclusion of the trial, the jury found Appellant “guilty” of the charged offense. Appellant pleaded “true” to the State’s enhancement allegations, and the jury sentenced Appellant to imprisonment for twenty five years.¹ This appeal followed.

¹ The State alleged that Appellant had two previous, sequential felony convictions, elevating the punishment range to twenty five to ninety nine years or life imprisonment. See TEX. PENAL CODE ANN. § 12.42(d) (West Supp. 2018).

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 diligently reviewed and evaluated the appellate record and found no error for our review. In compliance with *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807, 812 (Tex. Crim. App. [Panel Op.] 1978), counsel's brief contains a thorough professional evaluation of the record demonstrating why there are no arguable grounds to be advanced.²

We considered counsel's brief and conducted our own independent review of the record. *Id.* at 811. We found no reversible error.

CONCLUSION

As required by *Anders* and *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 511 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991), Appellant's counsel 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. We *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 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.

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.

Opinion delivered December 21, 2018.
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

DECEMBER 21, 2018

NO. 12-17-00372-CR

GREGORY DONELL PORTER,

Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,

Appellee

Appeal from the 145th District Court
of Nacogdoches County, Texas (Tr.Ct.No. F1722779)

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.