

In The
Court of Appeals
Ninth District of Texas at Beaumont

NO. 09-10-00595-CR
NO. 09-10-00596-CR

KENDRICK TODD ZENO, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

On Appeal from the 252nd District Court
Jefferson County, Texas
Trial Cause Nos. 09-06097 and 09-06099

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Pursuant to plea bargain agreements, Kendrick Todd Zeno pleaded guilty to two cases of aggravated robbery. In each case, the trial court found the evidence sufficient to find Zeno guilty, but deferred further proceedings and placed Zeno on community supervision for ten years, and, in one case, assessed a fine of \$1,000. The State subsequently filed a motion to revoke Zeno’s unadjudicated community supervision in both cases. In each case, Zeno pleaded “true” to two violations of the conditions of his community supervision. In both cases, the trial court found that Zeno violated the

conditions of his community supervision, revoked Zeno's community supervision, found Zeno guilty of aggravated robbery, and assessed punishment at twenty years of confinement in the institutional division. The trial court ordered Zeno's sentences to run concurrently.

Zeno's appellate counsel filed a brief that presents counsel's professional evaluation of the record and 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 March 10, 2011, we granted an extension of time for Zeno to file a *pro se* brief. We received no response from Zeno. 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. *Compare Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 511 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991). We affirm the trial court's judgment.¹

AFFIRMED.

STEVE McKEITHEN
Chief Justice

Submitted on June 21, 2011
Opinion Delivered July 13, 2011
Do Not Publish

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

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