



COURT OF APPEALS  
EIGHTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
EL PASO, TEXAS

JONATHAN GEIGER,	§	No. 08-15-00213-CR
	§	
Appellant,	§	Appeal from the
	§	
V.	§	194th District Court
	§	
THE STATE OF TEXAS,	§	of Dallas County, Texas
	§	(TC# F09-56878-M)
	§	
Appellee.	§	

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Jonathan Geiger appeals the trial court's judgment revoking community supervision. In 2009, Appellant waived his right to a jury trial and entered a plea of guilty to the offense of robbery, and the trial court placed Appellant on deferred adjudication community supervision. The trial court subsequently entered an adjudication of guilt and sentenced Appellant to prison for ten years. The trial court later granted Appellant's motion for shock probation and placed him on regular community supervision for a term of seven years. The State filed a motion to revoke the shock probation based on allegations that Appellant had violated the terms and conditions of community supervision. Appellant entered a plea of true to some of the allegations. The trial court found all but one of the allegations true, revoked community supervision, and sentenced Appellant to serve seven years in prison. We affirm.

**FRIVOLOUS APPEAL**

Appellant's court-appointed counsel has filed a brief in which he has concluded that the

appeal is wholly frivolous and without merit. The brief meets the requirements of *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 87 S.Ct. 1396, 18 L.Ed.2d 493 (1967), by presenting a professional evaluation of the record demonstrating why, in effect, there are no arguable grounds to be advanced. See *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403, 407 n.9 (Tex.Crim.App. 2008) (“In Texas, an *Anders* brief need not specifically advance ‘arguable’ points of error if counsel finds none, but it must provide record references to the facts and procedural history and set out pertinent legal authorities.”); *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807 (Tex.Crim.App. 1978). Counsel has notified the Court in writing that he has delivered a copy of counsel’s brief and the motion to withdraw to Appellant, and he has advised Appellant of his right to review the record, file a *pro se* brief, and to seek discretionary review. *Kelly v. State*, 436 S.W.3d 313, 318-20 (Tex.Crim.App. 2014)(setting forth duties of counsel). Counsel also provided Appellant with a copy of the appellate record. Appellant has filed a *pro se* brief.

We have carefully reviewed the record, counsel’s brief, and the *pro se* brief. We agree that the appeal is wholly frivolous and without merit and we find nothing in the record that might arguably support the appeal. A further discussion of the issues advanced in Appellant’s *pro se* brief would add nothing to the jurisprudence of the state. The judgment of the trial court is affirmed.

May 11, 2016

YVONNE T. RODRIGUEZ, Justice

Before McClure, C.J., Rodriguez, and Hughes, JJ.

(Do Not Publish)