TEXAS COURT OF APPEALS, THIRD DISTRICT, AT AUSTIN

NO. 03-12-00672-CR

Stacey Bo Williamson, Appellant

v.

The State of Texas, Appellee

FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF BELL COUNTY, 27TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
NO. 68423, HONORABLE JOE CARROLL, JUDGE PRESIDING

M E M O R A N D U M   O P I N I O N

Appellant Stacey Bo Williamson pleaded guilty to credit-card abuse and was placed on deferred-adjudication community supervision for five years. *See* Tex. Code Crim. Proc. art. 42.12 (community supervision); Tex. Penal Code §32.31(credit-card and debit-card abuse). Shortly thereafter, the State filed a motion to proceed with adjudication of guilt based on appellant's failure to comply with the terms and conditions of his deferred-adjudication community supervision. Appellant pleaded true to two violations involving use of methamphetamine, and the State abandoned the remaining allegations of violations.

After hearing testimony from appellant's mother and grandmother concerning the appropriate punishment, the trial court revoked appellant's probation, adjudicated him guilty on the credit-card abuse charge, sentenced him to two years in prison, and suspended his sentence for five years. As part of the terms of community supervision, the court ordered appellant to enter and

remain in a substance abuse felony punishment facility for no more than one year. *See* Tex. Code Crim. Proc. art. 42.12, §§ 15 (procedures relating to state jail felony community supervision), 22 (continuation or modification of community supervision after violation of condition of community supervision); Tex. Gov't Code § 493.009 (governing substance abuse felony punishment facilities).

Appellant's court-appointed attorney has filed a motion to withdraw supported by a brief concluding that the appeal is frivolous and without merit. The brief meets the requirements of *Anders v. California* by presenting a professional evaluation of the record demonstrating why there are no arguable grounds to be advanced. *See Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 744 (1967); *Garner v. State*, 300 S.W.3d 763, 766 (Tex. Crim. App. 2009); *see also Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75 (1988).

Appellant was served a copy of counsel's brief and was advised of his right to examine the appellate record and to file a pro se brief. *See Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744; *Garner*, 300 S.W.3d at 766. No pro se brief or other written response has been filed.

We have reviewed the record, including appellate counsel's brief, and find no reversible error. *See Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744; *Garner*, 300 S.W.3d at 766; *Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826-27 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005). We agree with counsel that the record presents no arguably meritorious grounds for review and the appeal is frivolous. Counsel's motion to withdraw is granted. The judgment of conviction is affirmed.

J. Woodfin Jones, Chief Justice

Before Chief Justice Jones, Justices Goodwin and Field

Affirmed

Filed: May 22, 2013

Do Not Publish