

Affirmed and Opinion filed January 4, 2001.



In The

## Fourteenth Court of Appeals

-----  
NO. 14-99-00097-CR  
-----

**PAUL ESTEVAN MEDRANO, Appellant**

**V.**

**THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee**

---

**On Appeal from the 351st District Court  
Harris County, Texas  
Trial Court Cause No. 757,660**

---

### **OPINION**

After a guilty plea, appellant was convicted of the offense of unauthorized use of a motor vehicle, and sentenced to two years in a state jail facility, probated for four years. On December 16, 1998, the court entered an order revoking appellant's community supervision, and sentencing him to twenty-four months in a state jail facility.

Appellant's counsel is retained. He filed a brief in which, after reviewing the record, he concludes that the appeal is wholly frivolous and without merit, purportedly under the authority of *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 87 S.Ct. 1396 (1967). The *Anders* procedural safeguards are not

applicable, however, to an appellant who is represented by a retained attorney. *Nguyen v. State*, 11 S.W.3d 376, 379 (Tex. App.–Houston [14th Dist.] 2000, no pet.).

The Court ordered the *Anders* brief stricken and gave appellant thirty days to obtain new counsel to file a brief on his behalf or file a pro se brief. More than sixty days have elapsed, and appellant has not filed a pro se brief or had an attorney file a new brief on his behalf.

We have reviewed the record on appeal and agree that the appeal lacks merit.

Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of the trial court. *See Nguyen*, 11 S.W. 3d at 379-80.

PER CURIAM

Judgment rendered and Opinion filed January 4, 2001.

Panel consists of Chief Justice Murphy, Justices Amidei and Hudson.<sup>1</sup>

Do not publish — TEX. R. APP. P. 47.3(b).

---

<sup>1</sup> Former Justice Maurice Amidei sitting by assignment.