In The

Court of Appeals

Ninth District of Texas at Beaumont

NO. 09-11-00623-CR
NO. 09-11-00624-CR

CHRISTOPHER E. CEVILLA, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

On Appeal from the 252nd District Court
Jefferson County, Texas
Trial Cause Nos. 09-07324 and 09-07327

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Pursuant to a plea agreement, appellant Christopher E. Cevilla[1] pleaded guilty in cause number 07324 to the second degree felony offense of possession of a controlled substance, phencyclidine, in an amount of 4 grams or more but less than 200 grams. In cause number 07327, Cevilla pleaded guilty to the second degree felony offense of possession of a controlled substance, cocaine, in an amount of 4 grams or more but less than 200 grams.

[1] Christopher E. Cevilla is also known as Christopher Eric Cevilla.

The trial court found the evidence sufficient to find Cevilla guilty of both offenses, but deferred finding him guilty, and placed him on community supervision for 3 years. The State subsequently filed a motion to revoke Cevilla's unadjudicated community supervision in both cases. At the hearing on the motion to revoke, Cevilla pleaded "true" to one violation of the terms of his community supervision. In cause number 07324, the trial court found that Cevilla violated the terms of the community supervision order, found Cevilla guilty of possession of a controlled substance, revoked Cevilla's community supervision, and imposed a sentence of 15 years of confinement. In cause number 07327, the trial court found that Cevilla violated the terms of his community supervision order, found Cevilla guilty of possession of a controlled substance, revoked Cevilla's community supervision, and imposed a sentence of 15 years confinement. The court ordered both sentences to run concurrently.

Cevilla's appellate counsel filed a brief that presents counsel's professional evaluation of the record and concludes the appeals in both cases 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 April 26, 2012, we granted an extension of time for appellant to file *pro se* briefs. We received no response from the appellant.

We have reviewed the appellate records, and we agree with counsel's conclusion that no arguable issues support an appeal in either cause. 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.[2]

_____

CHARLES KREGER
Justice

Submitted on August 6, 2012
Opinion Delivered September 5, 2012
Do not publish

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

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