#### In The

# Court of Appeals

## Ninth District of Texas at Beaumont

NO. 09-10-00043-CR NO. 09-10-00044-CR

### MARCUS ANTHONY HAMILTON, Appellant

V.

## THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

On Appeal from the 252nd District Court Jefferson County, Texas Trial Cause Nos. 86000 and 86295

#### MEMORANDUM OPINION

Pursuant to plea bargain agreements, appellant Marcus Anthony Hamilton pled guilty to two charges of robbery. In each case, the trial court found the evidence sufficient to find Hamilton guilty, but deferred further proceedings, placed Hamilton on community supervision for ten years, and assessed a fine of \$2,500. The State subsequently filed a motion to revoke Hamilton's unadjudicated community supervision in both cases. Hamilton pled "true" in both cases to two violations of the conditions of his community

supervision. In each case, the trial court found that Hamilton violated the conditions of his community supervision, found him guilty, and assessed punishment at fifteen years of confinement. The trial court ordered that the sentences were to run concurrently.

Hamilton's appellate 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 April 15, 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.

AFFIRMED.

CHARLES KREGER Justice

Submitted on August 5, 2010 Opinion Delivered August 18, 2010 Do not publish

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

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