

In The
Court of Appeals
Ninth District of Texas at Beaumont

NO. 09-11-00574-CR
NO. 09-11-00575-CR
NO. 09-11-00576-CR

BLAKE WILLIAM POST, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

On Appeal from the 252nd District Court
Jefferson County, Texas
Trial Cause Nos. 10-08399, 10-08777, and 10-09315

MEMORANDUM OPINION

After entering plea-bargain agreements in three cases,¹ Blake William Post pled guilty to burglary of a building, burglary of a habitation, and forgery. *See* Tex. Penal Code Ann. §§ 30.02, 32.21 (West 2011).² Under the terms of separate plea-bargain

¹Each of Post's cases was appealed separately to this Court. As all three cases present an identical reporter's record and briefs, we address them in one opinion.

²We cite to the current version of section 32.21 of the Texas Penal Code because the subsequent 2009 amendment does not affect the outcome of this appeal.

agreements, the trial court, in each of the cases, deferred the adjudication of Post's guilt and placed Post on community supervision.

Subsequently, the State filed motions to revoke the trial court's community supervision orders. Each motion to revoke alleges that Post had violated certain terms of the trial court's pertinent community supervision orders. In each of the cases, Post pled "true" to violating terms in the community supervision order. The trial court accepted Post's pleas, found the violations alleged by the respective motions to revoke to be true, revoked each of the community supervision orders, and then found Post guilty of having committed each respective underlying offense, forgery, burglary of a building, and burglary of a habitation. On the forgery conviction, the trial court sentenced Post to ten years in prison. For burglarizing a building, the trial court sentenced Post to serve two years in state jail. On Post's conviction for burglarizing a habitation, the trial court assessed a sentence of twenty years in prison. The respective judgments allow Post to serve his sentences concurrently.

On appeal, Post'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 19, 2012, we granted an extension of time for the appellant to file a *pro se* brief. Post has not filed a response.

We have 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.³

AFFIRMED.

HOLLIS HORTON
Justice

Submitted on April 13, 2012
Opinion Delivered April 25, 2012
Do Not Publish

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

³Appellant may challenge our decision in these cases by filing a petition for discretionary review. *See* Tex. R. App. P. 68.