

In The
Court of Appeals
Ninth District of Texas at Beaumont

NO. 09-14-00335-CR

SUMMER LEANNE STRICKLAND, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

On Appeal from the 75th District Court
Liberty County, Texas
Trial Cause No. CR28774

MEMORANDUM OPINION

In this appeal, court-appointed appellate counsel representing Summer Leanne Strickland submitted a brief that contends no arguable grounds can be advanced to support arguments that would result in our reversing the trial court's judgment. The judgment being appealed reflects that Strickland was convicted of negligently endangering a child. *See* Tex. Penal Code Ann. § 22.041(c) (West 2011). Based on our review of the records, we agree with appellate counsel that no

arguable issues exist to support Strickland's appeal. *See Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967).

Strickland pled guilty to negligently endangering a child, a state jail felony. *See* Tex. Penal Code Ann. § 22.041(f) (West 2011). The trial court found Strickland guilty of endangering a child, sentenced her to two years in state jail, and assessed a \$500 fine. After pronouncing sentence, the trial court suspended the sentence and placed Strickland on community supervision for five years.

Subsequently, the State filed a motion alleging that Strickland violated the order governing the terms of her community supervision. Strickland pled "true" to the allegations in the State's motion, and the trial court revoked its order of community supervision. After setting aside the order of community supervision, the trial court rendered judgment, which requires Strickland to serve a sentence of two years in state jail.

In her appeal, Strickland's appellate counsel filed a brief presenting counsel's professional evaluation of the record. In the brief, Strickland's counsel concludes that Strickland's appeal is frivolous. *See Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744; *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978). We granted an extension to allow Strickland additional time to file a *pro se* brief; however, she did not respond.

After reviewing the appellate records and the *Anders* brief filed by Strickland's counsel, we agree with counsel's conclusions that any appeal would be frivolous. Consequently, we need not order the appointment of new counsel to re-brief Strickland's appeal. *Cf. Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 511 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991). We affirm the trial court's judgment.¹

AFFIRMED.

HOLLIS HORTON
Justice

Submitted on January 30, 2015
Opinion Delivered March 25, 2015
Do Not Publish

Before Kreger, Horton, and Johnson, JJ.

¹Strickland may challenge our decision in her appeal by filing a petition for discretionary review. *See* Tex. R. App. P. 68.