

**Affirmed and Opinion filed January 17, 2002.**



**In The**

**Fourteenth Court of Appeals**

---

**NO. 14-01-00253-CR**

---

**QUIENT LOVELL WOLFORD, Appellant**

**V.**

**THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee**

---

---

**On Appeal from the 338th District Court  
Harris County, Texas  
Trial Court Cause No. 842,963**

---

---

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Appellant entered a plea of guilty to the offense of aggravated robbery. On January 10, 2001, the trial court sentenced appellant to confinement for life in the Institutional Division of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice. No motion for new trial was filed. Appellant filed a pro se notice of appeal.

Appellant's appointed counsel filed a brief in which she concludes that the appeal is wholly frivolous and without merit. The brief meets the requirements of *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 87 S.Ct. 1396 (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 was delivered to appellant. Appellant was advised of the right to examine the appellate record and file a pro se response. On January 10, 2002, appellant filed a pro se response to the *Anders* brief, in which he alleged there were arguable grounds to appeal because he had received ineffective assistance of counsel. Appellant asserted his counsel failed to investigate thoroughly, failed to adequately prepare for trial, failed to give adequate legal advice, and allowed appellant to waive a jury for assessment of punishment. These claims are not supported by the record. *See Jackson v. State*, 877 S.W.2d 768, 771 (Tex. Crim. App. 1994) (because of lack of evidence in the record regarding claims of ineffective assistance, court could not conclude counsel's performance was deficient).

We have carefully reviewed the record, counsel's brief, and appellant's pro se response, and find that the appeal is wholly frivolous and without merit. Further, we find no reversible error in the record. Any further discussion of the briefs would add nothing to the jurisprudence of the state.

Accordingly, the judgment of the trial court is affirmed.

PER CURIAM

Judgment rendered and Opinion filed January 17, 2002.

Panel consists of Chief Justice Brister, Justices Fowler and Seymore.

Do not publish — TEX.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