

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

---

**NO. 09-10-00581-CR**  
**NO. 09-10-00582-CR**

---

**ISAAC HUDSON, Appellant**

**V.**

**THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee**

---

---

**On Appeal from the County Court at Law No. 2**  
**Orange County, Texas**  
**Trial Cause Nos. E-101571, E-101496**

---

---

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

A jury found Isaac Hudson guilty of criminal trespass and possession of marihuana and assessed punishment at five days in county jail for the trespass offense and 120 days in county jail for the possession offense. We affirm the judgments.

On appeal, Hudson's counsel filed a brief that presents counsel's professional evaluation of the record and that concludes the appeal is 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 30, 2011, we granted an extension of time for the appellant to file a *pro se* brief. Hudson has not filed a response.

We reviewed the appellate record, and we agree with counsel's conclusion that no arguable issues support an appeal. Therefore, we find it unnecessary to order appointment of new counsel to re-brief the appeal. *Cf. Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 511 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991). We affirm the trial court's judgments.<sup>1</sup>

AFFIRMED.

---

HOLLIS HORTON  
Justice

Submitted on September 28, 2011  
Opinion Delivered October 12, 2011  
Do Not Publish

Before McKeithen, C.J., 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.