

**Affirmed and Opinion filed February 8, 2001.**



**In The**

**Fourteenth Court of Appeals**

---

**NO. 14-00-00164-CR**

**NO. 14-00-00165-CR**

---

**EUFRACIO JIMENEZ, Appellant**

**V.**

**THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee**

---

**On Appeal from the 176th District Court  
Harris County, Texas  
Trial Court Cause Nos. 812,619 and 812,620**

---

**OPINION**

In cause number 812,619, appellant was charged with aggravated assault, enhanced with two prior felony convictions. After the State abandoned the second enhancement allegation, appellant entered a plea of no contest with a recommendation of fifteen years from the State on punishment. In cause number 812,620, appellant was charged with possession of cocaine, enhanced with two prior felony convictions. Appellant entered a plea of no contest to the allegations. The court followed the plea bargain agreement in each case and assessed punishment at confinement for fifteen 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 along with a supporting brief in each case in which she 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).

Copies of counsel's briefs were delivered to appellant. Appellant was advised of the right to examine the appellate records and to file a *pro se* response. As of this date, no *pro se* response has been filed in either case.

We have carefully reviewed the records and counsel's briefs and agree that the appeals are wholly frivolous and without merit. Further, we find no reversible error in the records. 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 February 8, 2001.

Panel consists of Justices Anderson, Fowler and Edelman.

Do Not Publish — TEX.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