

Affirmed and Opinion filed September 14, 2000.



In The

Fourteenth Court of Appeals

NO. 14-00-00167-CR

NO. 14-00-00168-CR

ARMANDO EUGENE HICKS, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

**On Appeal from the 262nd District Court
Harris County, Texas
Trial Court Cause Nos. 743,623 and 825,320**

OPINION

In cause number 743,623, appellant was charged by indictment with the felony offense of aggravated robbery. Appellant entered a plea of guilty without an agreed recommendation from the State on punishment and the court deferred the adjudication of guilt and placed appellant on probation for ten years. The State subsequently filed a motion to adjudicate guilt alleging that appellant violated the terms and conditions of probation by committing the new offense of possession of a controlled substance. In cause number 825,320, appellant was charged by indictment with the felony offense of possession of more than four and less than

two hundred grams of cocaine. The appellant entered a plea of true to the allegations in the motion to adjudicate guilt and entered a plea of guilty to possession of a controlled substance. The court adjudicated guilt in cause number 743623 and found appellant guilty in cause number 825320. In accordance with a plea bargain agreement, the court assessed punishment in each case at confinement for fifteen years in the Institutional Division of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice.

In each case, appellant's appointed counsel filed a motion to withdraw from representation of appellant 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 counsel's brief in each case 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 and agree that the appeal is wholly frivolous and without merit. Further, we find no reversible error in the record. A discussion of the briefs would add nothing to the jurisprudence of the State.

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

PER CURIAM

Judgment rendered and Opinion filed September 14, 2000.

Panel consists of Justices Yates, Fowler and Edelman.

Do Not Publish — TEX.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