

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

---

**NO. 09-09-00500-CR**

---

**BRANDI NICOLE HEBERT A/K/A BRANDI NICOLE DAKOTA  
A/K/A BRANDI NICOLE PETITJEAN, Appellant**

**V.**

**THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee**

---

**On Appeal from the 252nd District Court  
Jefferson County, Texas  
Trial Cause No. 07-01079**

---

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Pursuant to a plea bargain agreement, appellant Brandi Nicole Hebert a/k/a Brandi Nicole Dakota a/k/a Brandi Nicole Petitjean pled guilty to aggravated robbery. The trial court found the evidence sufficient to find Hebert guilty, but deferred further proceedings, placed Hebert on community supervision for ten years, and assessed a fine of \$1,000. The State subsequently filed a motion to revoke Hebert's unadjudicated community supervision. Hebert pled "true" to one violation of the conditions of her community supervision. The trial court found that Hebert violated the conditions of her community

supervision, found Hebert guilty of aggravated robbery, and assessed punishment at twenty years of confinement.

Hebert's appellate 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 December 31, 2009, we granted an extension of time for appellant to file a *pro se* brief. We received no response from appellant. 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. *Compare 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 7, 2010  
Opinion Delivered April 21, 2010  
Do Not Publish

Before McKeithen, C.J., Gaultney and Horton, 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.