

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

---

**NO. 09-09-00212-CR**  
**NO. 09-09-00213-CR**

---

**SHAD LEE ROMERO, Appellant**

**V.**

**THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee**

---

---

**On Appeal from the 252nd District Court**  
**Jefferson County, Texas**  
**Trial Cause Nos. 07-01150, 07-01151**

---

---

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Pursuant to plea bargain agreements, appellant Shad Lee Romero pled guilty to unauthorized use of a vehicle and burglary of a habitation. In each case, the trial court found the evidence sufficient to find Romero guilty, but deferred further proceedings, placed Romero on community supervision for five years, and assessed a fine of \$500. The State subsequently filed a motion to revoke Romero’s unadjudicated community supervision in both cases. Romero pled “true” in both cases to six violations of the conditions of his

community supervision. In each case, the trial court found that Romero violated the conditions of his community supervision and found him guilty. In the unauthorized use of a motor vehicle 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 twenty years of confinement. The trial court ordered that the sentences were to run concurrently.

Romero's appellate counsel filed briefs that present counsel's professional evaluation of the records and conclude the 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 October 8, 2009, we granted an extension of time for appellant to file a *pro se* brief. We received no response from 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.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Appellant may challenge our decision in this case by filing a petition for discretionary review. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 68.

AFFIRMED.

---

DAVID GAULTNEY  
Justice

Submitted on February 9, 2010  
Opinion Delivered February 17, 2010  
Do Not Publish

Before McKeithen, C.J., Gaultney and Kreger, JJ.