

**In The**  
***Court of Appeals***  
***Ninth District of Texas at Beaumont***

---

**NO. 09-09-00095-CR**  
**NO. 09-09-00096-CR**  
**NO. 09-09-00097-CR**

---

**DOROTHY CLARK CANFIELD, Appellant**

**V.**

**THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee**

---

---

**On Appeal from the 221st District Court**  
**Montgomery County, Texas**  
**Trial Cause Nos. 08-05-04528-CR, 08-05-04733-CR, and 08-05-04734-CR**

---

---

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Dorothy Clark Canfield entered non-negotiated guilty pleas to an indictment for theft of property or services of the value of at least \$1,500 but less than \$20,000. *See* TEX. PEN. CODE ANN. § 31.03(a), (e)(4)(A) (Vernon Supp. 2009); TEX. PEN. CODE ANN. § 31.04(a), (e)(4) (Vernon Supp. 2009). In each case, the trial court convicted Canfield and assessed punishment at two years of confinement in a state jail facility. The trial court ordered that the sentences be served concurrently.

On appeal, Canfield's counsel filed a brief that presents counsel's professional evaluation of the records and concludes the appeals are frivolous. *See Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 87 S.Ct. 1396, 18 L.Ed.2d 493 (1967); *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978). On December 17, 2009, we granted an extension of time for the appellant to file a *pro se* brief. The appellant filed a *pro se* response.

We reviewed the appellate records and the *pro se* response, and we agree with counsel's conclusion that no arguable issues support the appeals. Therefore, we find it unnecessary to order appointment of new counsel to re-brief the appeals. *Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826-27 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005); *cf. Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 511 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991). We affirm the trial court's judgments.<sup>2</sup>

AFFIRMED.

---

STEVE McKEITHEN  
Chief Justice

Submitted on April 26, 2010  
Opinion Delivered May 5, 2010  
Do Not Publish

Before McKeithen, C.J., Gaultney and Kreger, JJ.

---

<sup>2</sup> Appellant may challenge our decision in these cases by filing petitions for discretionary review. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 68.