

NO. 12-18-00124-CR

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT

TYLER, TEXAS

***RAUL DANIEL RODRIGUEZ-
MARTINEZ,
APPELLANT***

§ ***APPEAL FROM THE 7TH***

§ ***JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT***

V.

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

§ ***SMITH COUNTY, TEXAS***

***MEMORANDUM OPINION
PER CURIAM***

Raul Daniel Rodriguez-Martinez appeals following his conviction for “unlawful interception, use, or disclosure of wire, oral, or electronic communications.” 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 “unlawful interception, use, or disclosure of wire, oral, or electronic communications,” a second-degree felony. Appellant pleaded “guilty” without an agreement on punishment. Following evidence and argument, the trial court found Appellant “guilty” and sentenced him to fifteen years confinement. 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 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.¹ 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 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, Appellant’s counsel’s motion for leave to withdraw is hereby *granted* and the appeal is *affirmed*.

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 January 16, 2019.

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

(DO NOT PUBLISH)

¹ In compliance with *Kelly v. State*, Appellant’s counsel provided Appellant with a copy of the brief, notified Appellant of the 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. *See Kelly v. State*, 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

JANUARY 16, 2019

NO. 12-18-00124-CR

RAUL DANIEL RODRIGUEZ-MARTINEZ,

Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,

Appellee

Appeal from the 7th District Court

of Smith County, Texas (Tr.Ct.No. 007-1537-17)

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.