

TEXAS COURT OF APPEALS, THIRD DISTRICT, AT AUSTIN

NO. 03-01-00505-CR

Norman Ray Driska, Appellant

v.

The State of Texas, Appellee

**FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF BELL COUNTY, 264TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
NO. 46,674, HONORABLE JOE CARROLL, JUDGE PRESIDING**

Appellant Norman Ray Driska was placed on deferred adjudication community supervision after pleading no contest to indecency with a child by contact. *See* Tex. Pen. Code Ann. § 21.11 (West Supp. 2002). At a subsequent hearing on the State's motion to adjudicate, appellant admitted four of the alleged violations of his supervisory conditions. The court adjudged him guilty and imposed a sentence of twenty years' imprisonment.

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). A copy of counsel's brief was delivered to appellant, and appellant was advised of his right to examine the appellate record and to file a pro se brief. No pro se brief has been filed.

We have reviewed the record and counsel's brief and agree that the appeal is frivolous and without merit. We find nothing in the record that might arguably support the appeal. Counsel's motion to withdraw is granted.

The judgment of conviction is affirmed.

Mack Kidd, Justice

Before Justices Kidd, Patterson and Puryear

Affirmed

Filed: March 28, 2001

Do Not Publish