

**Affirmed and Opinion filed January 18, 2001.**



**In The**

**Fourteenth Court of Appeals**

-----  
**NO. 14-00-01061-CR**

**NO. 14-00-01062-CR**  
-----

**PETER MENDOZA III, Appellant**

**V.**

**THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee**

---

**On Appeal from the 230th District Court  
Harris County, Texas  
Trial Court Cause Nos. 833,911 and 833,912**

---

**O P I N I O N**

Appellant entered pleas of guilty in two separate cases of deadly conduct, without an agreed recommendation on punishment from the State. Following the return of a pre-sentence investigation report, the court assessed punishment in each case at confinement for four years in the Institutional Division of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice.

Appellant's appointed counsel filed a motion to withdraw from representation of appellant in each case along with a supporting brief in which he concludes that the appeal is wholly frivolous and without

merit. The briefs meet the requirements of *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 87 S.Ct. 1396, 18 L.Ed.2d 493 (1967), by presenting a professional evaluation of the record demonstrating why there are no arguable grounds to be advanced. *See High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978).

A copy of each of counsel's briefs was delivered to appellant. Appellant was advised of the right to examine the appellate record and to file a *pro se* response. As of this date, no *pro se* response has been filed.

We have carefully reviewed the record and counsel's brief in each case and agree that the appeals are wholly frivolous and without merit. Further, we find no reversible error in either record. A discussion of the briefs would add nothing to the jurisprudence of the State.

Accordingly, in each case the judgment of the trial court is affirmed and the motion to withdraw is granted.

PER CURIAM

Judgment rendered and Opinion filed January 18, 2001.

Panel consists of Justices Yates, Wittig, and Frost.

Do Not Publish — TEX. R. APP. P. 47.3(b).