

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

---

**NO. 09-11-00360-CR**  
**NO. 09-11-00361-CR**

---

**JOSHUA ALLEN SHANE WILLIAMS**  
**A/K/A JOSHUA ALLEN WILLIAMS, Appellant**

**V.**

**THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee**

---

---

**On Appeal from the 252nd District Court**  
**Jefferson County, Texas**  
**Trial Cause Nos. 07-99646 and 07-00595**

---

---

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Pursuant to plea bargain agreements, appellant Joshua Allen Shane Williams<sup>1</sup> pleaded guilty to burglary of a habitation and possession of a controlled substance. In each case, the trial court found the evidence sufficient to find Williams guilty, but deferred further proceedings, placed Williams on community supervision for six years, and assessed a fine of \$1000. The State subsequently filed a motion to revoke Williams's

---

<sup>1</sup> In the appellate record of trial cause number 07-00595, Williams is identified as "Joshua Allen Williams[.]"

unadjudicated community supervision in each case. In each case, Williams pleaded “true” to three violations of the terms of his community supervision. In both cases, the trial court found that Williams violated the conditions of his community supervision and found him guilty. In the burglary of a habitation case, the trial court assessed punishment at twenty years of confinement, and in the possession of a controlled substance case, the trial court assessed punishment at ten years of confinement. The trial court ordered that the sentence in the possession of a controlled substance case would run consecutively to the sentence in the burglary of a habitation case.

Williams’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 November 17, 2011, we granted an extension of time for Williams to file *pro se* briefs. We received no response from Williams.

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.<sup>2</sup>

AFFIRMED.

---

<sup>2</sup> Williams may challenge our decision in these cases by filing a petition for discretionary review. *See* Tex. R. App. P. 68.

---

STEVE McKEITHEN  
Chief Justice

Submitted on February 23, 2012  
Opinion Delivered March 7, 2012  
Do Not Publish

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