

In The
Court of Appeals
Ninth District of Texas at Beaumont

NO. 09-10-00390-CR
NO. 09-10-00391-CR

SHEILA RENEE SIAS, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

On Appeal from the 252nd District Court
Jefferson County, Texas
Trial Cause Nos. 97710 and 98785

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Pursuant to plea bargain agreements, appellant Sheila Renee Sias pleaded guilty in two cases to delivery of a controlled substance. In each case, the trial court found Sias guilty and assessed punishment at two years of confinement in a state jail facility, then suspended imposition of sentence, placed Sias on community supervision for five years, and assessed a fine of \$250. The State subsequently filed a motion to revoke Sias's community supervision in both cases. In each case, Sias pleaded "true" to one violation of

the terms of the community supervision order. In both cases, the trial court found that Sias violated the terms of the community supervision orders, revoked Sias's community supervision, and imposed a sentence of two years of confinement in a state jail facility. The trial court ordered that the cases would run concurrently.

Sias'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 January 20, 2011, we granted an extension of time for appellant to file *pro se* briefs. We received no response from the appellant.

We have 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

AFFIRMED.

CHARLES KREGER
Justice

Submitted on April 29, 2011
Opinion Delivered May 11, 2011
Do not publish

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

¹ Appellant may challenge our decision in this case by filing a petition for discretionary review. *See Tex. R. App. P. 68.*