

In The
Court of Appeals
Ninth District of Texas at Beaumont

**NO. 09-07-386 CR
NO. 09-07-387 CR**

CHRISTOPHER FLORES, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

**On Appeal from the Criminal District Court
Jefferson County, Texas
Trial Cause Nos. 86213 and 86446**

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Pursuant to plea bargain agreements, appellant Christopher Flores pled guilty to burglary of a building and burglary of a habitation. In each case, the trial court found the evidence was sufficient to find Flores guilty, but deferred finding him guilty. In the burglary of a building case, the trial court placed Flores on community supervision for five years, and in the burglary of a habitation case, the trial court placed Flores on community supervision

for ten years and assessed a fine of \$500. The State subsequently filed a motion to revoke Flores's unadjudicated community supervision in each case. Flores pled "true" in both cases to several of the alleged violations of the terms of his community supervision. In each case, the trial court found that Flores violated the conditions of his community supervision and found him guilty. In the burglary of a building case, the trial court assessed punishment at two years of confinement in a state jail facility, and in the burglary of a habitation case, the trial court assessed punishment at five years of confinement in TDCJ. The trial court ordered that the sentences were to run concurrently.

Flores's appellate counsel filed a brief in each case that presents counsel's professional evaluation and concludes the appeal is 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 January 10, 2008, we granted an extension of time for appellant to file a *pro se* brief in each case. We received no response from the 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.¹

¹Appellant may challenge our decision in these cases by filing a petition for discretionary review. *See TEX. R. APP. P. 68.*

AFFIRMED.

DAVID GAULTNEY
Justice

Submitted on April 8, 2008
Opinion Delivered April 23, 2008
Do Not Publish

Before Gaultney, Kreger, and Horton, JJ.