

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

---

**NO. 09-11-00051-CR**

---

**JEROME NED, Appellant**

**V.**

**THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee**

---

---

**On Appeal from the 252nd District Court**  
**Jefferson County, Texas**  
**Trial Cause No. 09-06091**

---

---

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Pursuant to a plea bargain agreement, Jerome Ned pleaded guilty to burglary of a habitation. The trial court found the evidence sufficient to find Ned guilty, but deferred further proceedings, placed Ned on community supervision for seven years, and assessed a fine of \$1,000. The State subsequently filed a motion to revoke Ned's unadjudicated community supervision. Ned pleaded "true" to three violations of the conditions of his community supervision. The trial court found that Ned violated the conditions of his community supervision, found Ned guilty of burglary of a habitation, and assessed punishment at twenty years in prison.

Ned'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 June 9, 2011, we granted an extension of time for Ned to file a *pro se* brief. We received no response from Ned. 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.<sup>1</sup>

AFFIRMED.

---

STEVE McKEITHEN  
Chief Justice

Submitted on September 28, 2011  
Opinion Delivered October 5, 2011  
Do Not Publish

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

---

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