

In The

Eleventh Court of Appeals

No. 11-17-00191-CR

DONNA ZAMARRON, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

On Appeal from the 244th District Court Ector County, Texas Trial Court Cause No. C-40,352

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Appellant, Donna Zamarron, pleaded guilty to the offense of sexual assault of a child. Pursuant to the terms of the plea agreement, the trial court deferred a finding of guilt and placed Appellant on community supervision for eight years. Subsequently, the State filed a motion to adjudicate Appellant's guilt. At a hearing on the motion, Appellant pleaded true to all four of the State's allegations. The trial court found all of the allegations to be true, revoked Appellant's community

supervision, adjudicated her guilty of the charged offense, and assessed her punishment at confinement for twelve years. We dismiss the appeal.

Appellant's court-appointed counsel has filed a motion to withdraw. The motion is supported by a brief in which counsel professionally and conscientiously examines the record and applicable law and states that he has concluded that the appeal is frivolous and without merit. Counsel has provided Appellant with a copy of the brief, a copy of the motion to withdraw, an explanatory letter, and a copy of the reporter's record and the clerk's record. Counsel also advised Appellant of her right to review the record and file a response to counsel's brief. Court-appointed counsel has complied with the requirements of *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967); *Kelly v. State*, 436 S.W.3d 313 (Tex. Crim. App. 2014); *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008); *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991); *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807 (Tex. Crim. App. [Panel Op.] 1978); *Currie v. State*, 516 S.W.2d 684 (Tex. Crim. App. 1974); *Gainous v. State*, 436 S.W.2d 137 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969); and *Eaden v. State*, 161 S.W.3d 173 (Tex. App.—Eastland 2005, no pet.).

Following the procedures outlined in *Anders* and *Schulman*, we have independently reviewed the record, and we agree that the appeal is without merit and should be dismissed. *See Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 409. We note that proof of one violation of the terms and conditions of community supervision is sufficient to support revocation. *Smith v. State*, 286 S.W.3d 333, 342 (Tex. Crim. App. 2009). In this regard, a plea of true standing alone is sufficient to support a trial court's decision to revoke community supervision and proceed with an adjudication of guilt. *See Moses v. State*, 590 S.W.2d 469, 470 (Tex. Crim. App. [Panel Op.] 1979).

¹This court granted Appellant more than thirty days in which to exercise her right to file a response to counsel's brief. Appellant has not filed a response.

Furthermore, absent a void judgment, issues relating to an original plea proceeding

may not be raised in a subsequent appeal from the revocation of community

supervision and adjudication of guilt. *Jordan v. State*, 54 S.W.3d 783, 785–86 (Tex.

Crim. App. 2001); Manuel v. State, 994 S.W.2d 658, 661-62 (Tex. Crim. App.

1999). Based upon our review of the record, we agree with counsel that no arguable

grounds for appeal exist.

We note that counsel has the responsibility to advise Appellant that she may

file a petition for discretionary review with the clerk of the Texas Court of Criminal

Appeals seeking review by that court. TEX. R. APP. P. 48.4 ("In criminal cases, the

attorney representing the defendant on appeal shall, within five days after the

opinion is handed down, send his client a copy of the opinion and judgment, along

with notification of the defendant's right to file a pro se petition for discretionary

review under Rule 68."). Likewise, this court advises Appellant that she may file a

petition for discretionary review pursuant to Tex. R. App. P. 68.

The motion to withdraw is granted, and the appeal is dismissed.

PER CURIAM

December 14, 2017

Do not publish. See TEX. R. APP. P. 47.2(b).

Panel consists of: Wright, C.J.,

Willson, J., and Bailey, J.

3