

In The
Court of Appeals
Ninth District of Texas at Beaumont

NO. 09-14-00408-CR
NO. 09-14-00409-CR

BRANDY NICOLE JOHNSON, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

On Appeal from the Criminal District Court
Jefferson County, Texas
Trial Cause Nos. 08-04379, 09-05852

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Pursuant to plea bargain agreements, appellant Brandy Nicole Johnson¹ pleaded guilty to aggravated assault with a deadly weapon and possession of a controlled substance. In the aggravated assault case, the trial court found the evidence sufficient to find Johnson guilty, but deferred finding her guilty, placed her on community supervision for ten years, and assessed a \$500 fine. In the

¹In trial cause number 09-05852, the judgment refers to appellant as “Brandy Nicole Ooten a/k/a Brandy Nicole Johnson[.]”

possession of a controlled substance case, the trial court found Johnson guilty, assessed punishment at ten years of confinement, suspended the imposition of her sentence, and placed Johnson on community supervision for ten years.

The State subsequently filed motions to revoke Johnson's community supervision in both cases. In both cases, Johnson pleaded "true" to two violations of the conditions of her community supervision. In the aggravated assault case, the trial court revoked Johnson's unadjudicated community supervision, found her guilty, and assessed punishment at ten years of confinement. In the possession of a controlled substance case, the trial court revoked Johnson's community supervision and assessed punishment at ten years of confinement. The trial court ordered that the sentences would run concurrently. .

Johnson's appellate counsel filed briefs that present counsel's professional evaluation of the records and has concluded that the appeals are frivolous. *See Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967); *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978). On December 1, 2014, we granted an extension of time for Johnson to file a *pro se* brief in both cases. Johnson did not file a *pro se* brief in either of the cases. We have reviewed the appellate records, and we agree with counsel's conclusion that no arguable issues support these 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.²

AFFIRMED.

STEVE McKEITHEN
Chief Justice

Submitted on March 3, 2015
Opinion Delivered March 18, 2015
Do Not Publish

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

²Johnson may challenge our decision in these cases by filing petitions for discretionary review. *See* Tex. R. App. P. 68.