

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

---

**NO. 09-11-00572-CR**

---

**DRIKE A. CORMIER a/k/a DRIKE ANTHONY CORMIER**  
**a/k/a DRIKE CORMIER, Appellant**

**V.**

**THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee**

---

---

**On Appeal from the 252nd District Court**  
**Jefferson County, Texas**  
**Trial Cause No. 10-10337**

---

---

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

In carrying out a plea bargain agreement, Drike A. Cormier, a/k/a Drike Anthony Cormier, a/k/a Drike Cormier, pled guilty to felony theft. *See* Tex. Penal Code Ann. § 31.03 (West Supp. 2011).<sup>1</sup> The trial court assessed Cormier's punishment at two years in state jail, but then suspended Cormier's sentence and placed him on community supervision for five years.

---

<sup>1</sup>We cite to the current version of the Texas Penal Code because the amendments to the cited section does not affect the outcome of this appeal.

Before Cormier had completed serving community supervision, the State filed a motion asking the trial court to revoke its community supervision order. At the hearing on the motion to revoke, Cormier pled “true” to having violated three conditions established by the trial court’s community supervision order. At the conclusion of the hearing, the trial court found that Cormier violated the community supervision order, revoked the community supervision order, and sentenced Cormier to serve two years in state jail.

On appeal, Cormier’s 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 January 5, 2012, we granted an extension of time for the appellant to file a *pro se* brief. Cormier has not filed a response.

After having reviewed the appellate record, 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 judgment.<sup>2</sup>

AFFIRMED.

---

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

---

HOLLIS HORTON  
Justice

Submitted on April 3, 2012  
Opinion Delivered April 11, 2012  
Do Not Publish

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