**Affirmed and Opinion filed July 13, 2000.**

**In The**

# Fourteenth Court of Appeals

**———————————**

**NO. 14-99-01114-CR**

**———————————**

**LARRY WAYNE PARAMELY, Appellant**

**V.**

**THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee**

---

**On Appeal from the 174th District Court**
**Harris County, Texas**
**Trial Court Cause No. 806,732**

---

## O P I N I O N

Appellant entered a plea of guilty to the felony offense of driving while intoxicated. Appellant also entered a plea of true to two enhancement paragraphs for previous driving while intoxicated offenses, and to another enhancement paragraph for possessing an open container of an alcoholic beverage in the passenger compartment of his motor vehicle. Appellant signed a waiver of constitutional rights, agreement to stipulate, and judicial confession, and signed and initialed, where necessary, admonishments waiving certain rights. Appellant declared that he was mentally competent to understand the nature of the charge against him. The trial court found the appellant guilty and found the enhancement paragraphs true, and sentenced the

appellant to five years in the Texas Department of Criminal Justice-Institutional Division and a fine of $223.00. The trial court held an indigency hearing, found the appellant indigent, and asked the appellant if he wanted to appeal and to have counsel appointed for him. Appellant answered in the affirmative. The trial court made no findings that the appeal was legitimate or that the appeal had not been waived. Appellant filed a pro se notice of appeal specifically raising that there was a jurisdictional defect. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 25.2(b)(3).

Appellant's appointed counsel filed a 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), 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 to file a pro se brief. As of this date, no pro se response has been filed.

We agree 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.

PER CURIAM

Judgment rendered and Opinion filed July 13, 2000.
Panel consists of Justices Murphy, Hudson, and Wittig.
Do Not Publish — TEX. R. APP. P. 47.3(b).