

**Affirmed and Opinion filed April 6, 2000.**



**In The**

**Fourteenth Court of Appeals**

---

**NO. 14-99-00014-CR  
NO. 14-99-00015-CR  
NO. 14-99-00016-CR**

---

**EDWARD CHARLES NICHOLS, Appellant**

**V.**

**THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee**

---

**On Appeal from the 180<sup>th</sup> District Court  
Harris County, Texas  
Trial Court Cause Nos. 672,214; 672,215; and 672,216**

---

**OPINION**

Appellant was charged by indictment in three causes with the felony offense of indecency with a child. Appellant entered a guilty plea in each case with an agreed recommendation from the State regarding punishment. In accordance with the plea bargain agreement, the court assessed punishment at probation for a term of ten years and assessed a fine of \$1500.00 in cause number 672,214. The State subsequently filed a motion to revoke probation in each cause. Following appellant's plea of true, the court assessed punishment in each case in accordance with a plea bargain agreement at confinement in the Institutional Division of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice for seven years.

Appellant's court-appointed attorney 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 brief meets the requirements of *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 87 S.Ct. 1396, 18 L.Ed.2d 493 (1967). The brief presents a professional evaluation of the record demonstrating why there are no arguable points of error to be advanced. *See High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807, 811 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978).

A copy of counsel's brief was delivered to appellant. Appellant was advised of his right to examine the appellate record and to file a *pro se* response. As of this date, appellant has not responded.

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 brief 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 April 6, 2000.

Panel consists of Justices Yates, Fowler, and Edelman.

Do Not Publish — TEX.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