

TEXAS COURT OF APPEALS, THIRD DISTRICT, AT AUSTIN

NO. 03-01-00504-CR

Baso Earl Harper, Jr., Appellant

v.

The State of Texas, Appellee

**FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF BELL COUNTY, 264TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
NO. 50,373, HONORABLE JOE CARROLL, JUDGE PRESIDING**

Appellant Baso Earl Harper, Jr., was placed on deferred adjudication community supervision after pleading guilty to assault on a family member. *See* Tex. Pen. Code Ann. § 22.01 (West Supp. 2002). The district court later revoked supervision, adjudicated guilt, and imposed sentence of imprisonment for six years.

Appellant's court-appointed attorney filed a brief concluding that the appeal is frivolous and without merit. The brief meets the requirements of *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), by presenting a professional evaluation of the record demonstrating why there are no arguable grounds to be advanced. *See also* *Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75 (1988); *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978); *Currie v. State*, 516 S.W.2d 684 (Tex. Crim. App. 1974); *Jackson v. State*, 485 S.W.2d 553 (Tex. Crim. App. 1972); *Gainous v. State*, 436 S.W.2d 137 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969).

Appellant filed a pro se brief. In it, he addresses the allegations that he violated the conditions of supervision by failing to pay various fees and costs and by failing to participate in community service projects. The record reflects, however, that the court did not find these allegations to be true. The court revoked solely on the basis of appellant's commission of subsequent criminal offenses. In his pro se brief, appellant concedes the subsequent offenses.

We have reviewed the record, counsel's brief, and the pro se brief. We agree that the appeal is frivolous and without merit. Counsel's motion to withdraw is granted.

The judgment of conviction is affirmed.

Lee Yeakel, Justice

Before Justices Kidd, Yeakel and Patterson

Affirmed

Filed: January 10, 2002

Do Not Publish