

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

---

**NO. 09-09-00501-CR**  
**NO. 09-09-00502-CR**

---

**CHARLES EDWARD ALLEN, JR., Appellant**

**V.**

**THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee**

---

---

**On Appeal from the 252nd District Court**  
**Jefferson County, Texas**  
**Trial Cause No. 07-02047 & No. 08-03827**

---

---

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Pursuant to plea bargain agreements, appellant Charles Edward Allen, Jr. pled guilty to evading arrest or detention by using a vehicle, and to possession of a prohibited weapon. In the evading arrest case, the trial court found Allen guilty and assessed punishment at two years of confinement in a state jail facility, then suspended imposition of sentence, placed Allen on community supervision for five years, and assessed a fine of \$750. In the possession of a prohibited weapon case, the trial court found the evidence

sufficient to find Allen guilty, but deferred further proceedings, placed Allen on community supervision for five years, and assessed a fine of \$1000.

The State subsequently filed a motion to revoke Allen's community supervision in each case. Allen pled "true" in both cases to one violation of the conditions of his community supervision, and the trial court found that Allen violated the conditions of his community supervision in each case. In the evading arrest case, the trial court revoked Allen's community supervision and imposed a sentence of two years of confinement in a state jail facility. In the possession of a prohibited weapon case, the trial court found Allen guilty of possession of a prohibited weapon and imposed a sentence of five years of confinement. The trial court ordered that Allen's sentence in the possession of a prohibited weapon case would run consecutively to his sentence in the evading arrest case.

Allen's appellate counsel filed briefs presenting counsel's professional evaluation of the records and stating 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 January 28, 2010, we granted an extension of time in each case for appellant to file a *pro se* brief. We received no response from appellant. We reviewed the appellate records, 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. *Compare Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 511 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991). We affirm the trial court's judgments.<sup>1</sup>

AFFIRMED.

---

DAVID GAULTNEY  
Justice

Submitted on June 8, 2010  
Opinion Delivered July 7, 2010  
Do Not Publish

Before Gaultney, Kreger, and Horton, JJ.

---

<sup>1</sup>Appellant may challenge our decision in these cases by filing a petition for discretionary review. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 68.