

In The
Court of Appeals
Ninth District of Texas at Beaumont

NO. 09-14-00460-CR

CALVIN JONES JR., Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

On Appeal from the 163rd District Court
Orange County, Texas
Trial Cause No. B080617-R

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Pursuant to a plea bargain agreement, appellant Calvin Jones Jr. (Jones) pleaded guilty to the offense of felony possession of a controlled substance, enhanced by a prior felony conviction. *See* Tex. Health & Safety Code Ann. § 481.117(a), (e) (West 2010); Tex. Penal Code Ann. § 12.42(c)(1) (West Supp.

2014).¹The trial court found the evidence sufficient to find Jones guilty, but deferred further proceedings and placed Jones on community supervision for ten years and assessed a \$1,440.00 fine. The State subsequently filed its First Amended Motion to Impose Guilt, to revoke Jones's unadjudicated community supervision. Jones pleaded "true" to certain alleged violations of the conditions of his community supervision. After conducting an evidentiary hearing, the trial court found that Jones violated the conditions of his community supervision, found Jones guilty of possession of a controlled substance, and assessed punishment at fifteen years in prison.

Jones's appellate 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 (1967); *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978). On March 3, 2015, and June 15, 2015, we granted an extension of time for Jones to file a *pro se* brief. Jones filed a *pro se* Brief. The Court of Criminal Appeals has held that an appellate court may determine that (1) "the appeal is wholly frivolous and issue an opinion explaining that it has reviewed the record and finds no reversible error"; or (2) "arguable grounds for appeal exist and

¹We cite to the current version of the statute as the subsequent amendments do not affect the outcome of this appeal.

remand the cause to the trial court so that new counsel may be appointed to brief the issues.” *Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826-27 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005).

We have reviewed the entire appellate record, as well as all briefs, 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. *Compare Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 511 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991). We affirm the trial court’s judgment.²

AFFIRMED.

LEANNE JOHNSON
Justice

Submitted on June 4, 2015
Opinion Delivered July 29, 2015
Do Not Publish

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

²Jones may challenge our decision in this case by filing a petition for discretionary review. *See* Tex. R. App. P. 68.