

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

---

**NO. 09-09-00226-CR**

---

**RANDY DOYLE SNOW, Appellant**

**V.**

**THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee**

---

---

**On Appeal from the 221st District Court  
Montgomery County, Texas  
Trial Cause No. 09-01-00099-CR**

---

---

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

A jury found Randy Doyle Snow to be guilty of aggravated assault with a deadly weapon. *See* TEX. PEN. CODE ANN. § 22.02(a)(2) (Vernon Supp. 2009). After Snow pled true to habitual offender enhancement allegations, the trial court assessed punishment at twenty-five years of incarceration in the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Correctional Institutions Division.

On appeal, Snow's counsel filed a brief that presents counsel's professional evaluation of the record and concludes the appeal is 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 November 19, 2009, we granted an extension of time for the appellant to file a *pro se* brief. Snow filed a *pro se* brief in which he complains that, by refusing to file and consider the merits of a *pro se* motion for new trial received after new counsel had been appointed to represent Snow on appeal, the trial court deprived Snow of his right to represent himself and deprive Snow of the effective representation of counsel at a critical stage of the proceedings.

We reviewed the appellate record, and we agree with counsel's conclusion that no arguable issues support an appeal. Therefore, we find it unnecessary to order appointment of new counsel to re-brief the appeal. *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 judgment.<sup>1</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Do Not Publish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>1</sup> Appellant may challenge our decision in this case by filing a petition for discretionary review. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 68.