

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

---

**NO. 09-10-00453-CR**

---

**JEREMY BOND ZBRANEK, Appellant**

**V.**

**THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee**

---

---

**On Appeal from the 252nd District Court**  
**Jefferson County, Texas**  
**Trial Cause No. 91502**

---

---

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Appellant Jeremy Bond Zbranek appeals from the trial court’s revocation of his community supervision. We affirm the trial court’s judgment.

Zbranek entered a plea of guilty to the offense of credit or debit card abuse. The trial court found Zbranek guilty, sentenced him to two years of confinement, but suspended imposition of sentence and placed Zbranek on community supervision for five years, and assessed a fine of \$1,000. The State subsequently filed a motion to revoke Zbranek’s community supervision. Zbranek pled “true” to four violations of the

conditions of his community supervision. The trial court found that Zbranek violated the conditions of his community supervision, revoked Zbranek's community supervision, and assessed punishment at two years of confinement in a state jail facility.

Zbranek'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 and concludes there are no arguable grounds to be advanced in this appeal. Counsel provided Zbranek with a copy of this brief. On December 9, 2010, we granted an extension of time for appellant to file a pro se brief. In response, Zbranek 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 Zbranek's appellate counsel that no arguable issues support an appeal. See *id.* Therefore, we find it unnecessary to order appointment of new counsel to re-brief

Zbranek'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.<sup>1</sup>

AFFIRMED.

---

CHARLES KREGER  
Justice

Submitted on July 8, 2011  
Opinion Delivered July 27, 2011  
Do not publish

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

---

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