

In The

Eleventh Court of Appeals

No. 11-18-00220-CR

TISHA LANETTE BURWELL, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

On Appeal from the 244th District Court Ector County, Texas Trial Court Cause No. C-42,078

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Appellant, Tisha Lanette Burwell, originally pleaded guilty to the third-degree felony offense of tampering with or fabricating physical evidence. *See* TEX. PENAL CODE ANN. § 37.09(a)(1), (d) (West 2016). Pursuant to the terms of a plea agreement, the trial court assessed Appellant's punishment at confinement for five years and a fine of \$1,000, suspended the sentence of confinement, and placed Appellant on community supervision for five years. The State subsequently filed a motion to revoke Appellant's community supervision. At the contested hearing on

the State's motion to revoke, Appellant pleaded true to the State's allegations that Appellant had violated the terms of her community supervision. The trial court found the State's allegations to be true, revoked Appellant's community supervision, and assessed Appellant's punishment at imprisonment for five years. We affirm.

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 concludes that this appeal is frivolous and without merit. Counsel has provided Appellant with a copy of the brief, a copy of the motion to withdraw, a copy of the clerk's record and the reporter's record, and an explanatory letter. Counsel advised Appellant of her right to review the record and file a response to counsel's brief. Counsel also advised Appellant of her right to file a petition for discretionary review in order to seek review by the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals. *See* Tex. R. App. P. 68. 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); and *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991). Appellant has not filed a pro se response to counsel's *Anders* brief.

In addressing an *Anders* brief, a court of appeals may only determine (1) that the appeal is wholly frivolous and issue an opinion explaining that it has reviewed the record and finds no reversible error or (2) that arguable grounds for appeal exist and remand the cause to the trial court so that new counsel may be appointed to brief the issues. *Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 409; *Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826–27 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005). Following the procedures outlined in *Anders* and *Schulman*, we have independently reviewed the record, and we agree that the appeal is without merit.¹ The State presented evidence in support of the allegations in its

¹We note that Appellant has a right to file a petition for discretionary review pursuant to Rule 68 of the Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure.

motion to revoke community supervision. Further, Appellant both pleaded true to the alleged violations and testified that she had committed the alleged violations. In this regard, a plea of true standing alone is sufficient to support a trial court's decision to revoke community supervision. *See Moses v. State*, 590 S.W.2d 469, 470 (Tex. Crim. App. [Panel Op.] 1979). Further, absent a void judgment, issues relating to the original conviction may not be raised in an appeal from a revocation proceeding. *Wright v. State*, 506 S.W.3d 478, 481 (Tex. Crim. App. 2016). Based on our review of the record, we agree with counsel that no arguable grounds for appeal exist.

We grant counsel's motion to withdraw, and we affirm the judgment of the trial court.

PER CURIAM

August 1, 2019

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

Panel consists of: Bailey, C.J., Stretcher, J., and Wright, S.C.J.²

Willson, J., not participating.

²Jim R. Wright, Senior Chief Justice (Retired), Court of Appeals, 11th District of Texas at Eastland, sitting by assignment.