

**In The**  
***Court of Appeals***  
***Ninth District of Texas at Beaumont***

---

**NO. 09-08-146 CR**  
**NO. 09-08-147 CR**

---

**NATHAN EDWARD HAWTHORN, Appellant**

**V.**

**THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee**

---

**On Appeal from the Criminal District Court**  
**Jefferson County, Texas**  
**Trial Court Nos. 07-01467 & 07-01468**

---

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Appellant Nathan Edward Hawthorn pled guilty to evading detention with a motor vehicle and unauthorized use of a vehicle. In each case, the trial court found Hawthorn guilty and placed Hawthorn on community supervision for five years. On December 12, 2007, the State filed motions to revoke Hawthorn’s community supervision. Hawthorn pled “true” to two violations of the terms of his community supervision order in each case. The trial court found that Hawthorn violated the terms of the community supervision orders, revoked

Hawthorn's community supervision, and imposed a sentence of two years of confinement in a state jail facility in each case, with the terms to run concurrently.

Hawthorn's appellate counsel filed a brief that presents counsel's professional evaluation of the records and concludes these appeals are 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 June 19, 2008, we granted an extension of time for appellant to file *pro se* briefs. We received no response from the appellant.

We reviewed the appellate records, and we agree with counsel's conclusion that no arguable issues support these 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 judgment.<sup>1</sup>

AFFIRMED.

---

DAVID GAULTNEY  
Justice

Submitted on September 24, 2008  
Opinion Delivered October 8, 2008  
Do not publish

Before Gaultney, Kreger, and Horton, JJ.

---

<sup>1</sup>Appellant may challenge our decision in these cases by filing petitions for discretionary review. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 68.