Affirmed and Memorandum Opinion filed August 5, 2010.

In The

Fourteenth Court of Appeals

NO. 14-10-00012-CR

RONNIE EARL FIELDS, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

On Appeal from the 262nd District Court
Harris County, Texas
Trial Court Cause No. 1147492

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Appellant entered a plea of guilty to aggravated sexual assault of a child. The trial court deferred adjudication of guilt and placed appellant under community supervision for a period of ten years. Subsequently, the State moved to adjudicate guilt. The trial court found appellant had violated the terms of his community supervision and proceeded to adjudicate guilt. The trial court sentenced appellant to confinement for five years in the Institutional Division of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice and assessed a $500 fine. Appellant filed a timely notice of appeal.

Appellant's appointed counsel filed a brief in which he concludes the appeal is wholly frivolous and without merit. The brief meets the requirement of *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 87 S.Ct. 1396 (1967), by presenting a professional evaluation of the record and 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. *See Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 510 (Tex. (Tex. Crim. App.1991). Appellant received a copy of his record on May 25, 2010. As of this date, no pro se response has been filed.

We have carefully reviewed the record and counsel's brief and agree the appeal is wholly frivolous and without merit. Further, we find no reversible error in the record. We are not to address the merits of each claim raised in an *Anders* brief or a pro se response when we have determined there are no arguable grounds for review. *See Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 827–28 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005).

However, there is an error in the judgment. The judgment finds "Defendant violated the terms and conditions of community supervision as set out in the State's ORIGINAL Motion to Adjudicate Guilt as follows: HE FAILED TO REPORT, OBTIAN [sic] EMPLOYMENT, NOTIFY SUP. OFFICER OF CHANGE OF ADDRESS, SUBMIT RANDOM URINE SPCIMEN ANLAYSIS, PARTICIPATE IN CSRP, SUP. FINE COST, PAY LAB. FEE, PAY SEX ASSAULT PROGRAM FUND, PAY HABITAT FOR HUMANITY, SUBMIT TO POLYGRAPH." The record reflects appellant pled true to two allegations in the State's motion to adjudicate: (1) failure to report; and (2) failure to stay at his registered address. No evidence was presented that would support the trial court's finding of any other violations.

An appellate court has the power to correct and reform a trial court judgment to make the record speak the truth when it has the necessary data and information to do so. *Nolan v. State*, 39 S.W.3d 697, 698 (Tex. App. -- Houston [1st Dist.] 2001, no pet.) (citing *Asberry v.*

State, 813 S.W.2d 526, 529 (Tex. App. -- Dallas 1991, pet. ref'd)); *see also* Tex. R. App. P. 43.2(b). Similar errors have been corrected in other *Anders* cases. *See Jackson v. State*, No. 06-03-00076-CR, 2003 WL 22332149, *2 (Tex. App. – Texarkana 2003, no pet.) (mem.. op., not designated for publication); and *Bogda v. State*, No. 05-91-01327, 1996 WL 682470, *1 (Tex. App. – Dallas 1996, no pet.) (not designated for publication).

Accordingly, we reform the judgment of conviction to delete the trial court's findings that appellant violated the terms and conditions of community supervision as follows: HE FAILED TO OBTIAN [sic] EMPLOYMENT, SUBMIT RANDOM URINE SPCIMEN ANLAYSIS, PARTICIPATE IN CSRP, SUP. FINE COST, PAY LAB. FEE, PAY SEX ASSAULT PROGRAM FUND, PAY HABITAT FOR HUMANITY, SUBMIT TO POLYGRAPH." As reformed, the judgment of the trial court is affirmed.

PER CURIAM

Panel consists of Justices Brown, Sullivan, and Christopher.
Do Not Publish — Tex. R. App. P. 47.2(b).