

In The
Court of Appeals
Sixth Appellate District of Texas at Texarkana

No. 06-16-00070-CR

WILLIAM WAYNE STRAWSER, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

On Appeal from the 52nd District Court
Coryell County, Texas
Trial Court No. FDM-11-20634

Before Morriss, C.J., Moseley and Burgess, JJ.
Memorandum Opinion by Justice Moseley

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Pursuant to a plea agreement, William Wayne Strawser pled guilty to possession of the chemical precursor, pseudoephedrine, with the intent to manufacture methamphetamine and was placed on deferred adjudication community supervision for a period of five years. After Strawser pled true to the State's motion to adjudicate guilt, which alleged he had tested positive for methamphetamine, the trial court revoked Strawser's community supervision, adjudicated him guilty of the underlying offense, and sentenced him to eight years' imprisonment. Strawser appeals.[1]

Strawser's attorney on appeal has filed a brief which states that he has reviewed the record and has found no genuinely arguable issues that could be raised. The brief sets out the procedural history and summarizes the evidence elicited during the course of the proceeding. Meeting the requirements of *Anders v. California*, counsel has provided a professional evaluation of the record demonstrating why there are no arguable grounds to be advanced. *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 743–44 (1967); *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403, 406 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008) (orig. proceeding); *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 509–10 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991); *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807, 812–13 (Tex. Crim. App. [Panel Op.] 1978). Counsel also filed a motion with this Court seeking to withdraw as counsel in this appeal.

On September 30, 2016, counsel mailed to Strawser a copy of the brief, the appellate record, and the motion to withdraw. Strawser was also informed of his right to review the record

[1]Originally appealed to the Tenth Court of Appeals in Waco, this case was transferred to this Court by the Texas Supreme Court pursuant to its docket equalization efforts. *See* TEX. GOV'T CODE ANN. § 73.001 (West 2013). We follow the precedent of the Tenth Court of Appeals in deciding this case. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 41.3.

and file a pro se response.[2] On October 3, 2016, this Court informed Strawser that any pro se response was due on or before November 2, 2016. Strawser did not file a pro se response.

We have determined that this appeal is wholly frivolous. We have independently reviewed the clerk's record and the reporter's record, and we agree with counsel that no arguable issues support an appeal. *See Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826–27 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005).

We affirm the trial court's judgment.[3]

Bailey C. Moseley
Justice

Date Submitted: December 27, 2016
Date Decided: January 25, 2017

Do Not Publish

[2]An October 8, 2016, letter written by Strawser to this Court indicated that he had received counsel's letter.

[3]Since we agree that this case presents no reversible error, we also, in accord with *Anders*, grant counsel's request to withdraw from further representation of appellant in this case. *See Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744. No substitute counsel will be appointed. Should appellant desire to seek further review of this case by the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals, she must either retain an attorney to file a petition for discretionary review or file a pro se petition for discretionary review. Any petition for discretionary review (1) must be filed within thirty days from either the date of this opinion or the date on which the last timely motion for rehearing was overruled by this Court, *see* TEX. R. APP. P. 68.2, (2) must be filed with the clerk of the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals, *see* TEX. R. APP. P. 68.3, and (3) should comply with the requirements of Rule 68.4 of the Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure, *see* TEX. R. APP. P. 68.4.