

In The
Court of Appeals
Ninth District of Texas at Beaumont

NO. 09-09-00496-CR
NO. 09-09-00497-CR
NO. 09-09-00498-CR

CHARLOTTE LYNN REDMOND, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

On Appeal from the 75th District Court
Liberty County, Texas
Trial Cause Nos. CR27616, CR27617, CR27654

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Appellant Charlotte Lynn Redmond pled guilty in three consolidated cases to aggravated assault of a peace officer, possession of a controlled substance with intent to deliver, and unlawful possession of a firearm by a felon. Tex. Penal Code Ann. §§ 22.02, 46.04 (West Supp. 2010); Tex. Health & Safety Code Ann. § 481.112(d) (West 2010).¹

¹ Because the amendments do not change our analysis, we refer to the current versions of these statutes.

After hearing evidence, the trial court assessed punishment at ten years confinement for the third degree felony and sixty years on each first degree felony, sentences to run concurrently. Tex. Penal Code Ann. §§ 12.32, 12.34 (West Supp. 2010). Appellant filed a timely notice of appeal.

Redmond's appellate counsel filed an *Anders* brief. 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). Counsel's brief presents his professional evaluation of the record that there are no arguable grounds to be advanced in this appeal. Counsel provided Redmond with a copy of the brief. In response, Redmond filed a pro se brief, raising two issues on appeal.

The appellate court need not address the merits of issues raised in *Anders* briefs or pro se responses. *Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826-27 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005). In these circumstances, we "may determine that the appeal is wholly frivolous and issue an opinion explaining that [the appellate court] has reviewed the record and finds no reversible error. Or, [we] may determine that arguable grounds for appeal exist and remand the cause to the trial court so that new counsel may be appointed to brief the issues." *Id.* (citations omitted).

We have independently reviewed the clerk's record and the reporter's record, and we agree with Redmond's appellate counsel that no arguable issues support an appeal. Therefore, we find it unnecessary to order appointment of new counsel to re-brief

Redmond's appeal. *See id.*; compare *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 511 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991). We affirm the trial court's judgment.²

AFFIRMED.

CHARLES KREGER
Justice

Submitted on November 18, 2010
Opinion Delivered January 19, 2011
Do not publish

Before Gaultney, Kreger, and Horton, JJ.

² Redmond may challenge our decision in this case by filing a petition for discretionary review. Tex. R. App. P. 68.