

In The
Court of Appeals
Ninth District of Texas at Beaumont

NO. 09-15-00082-CR

JACK BLAINE GLASS, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

On Appeal from the 253rd District Court
Liberty County, Texas
Trial Cause No. CR29988

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Jack Blaine Glass (Glass) pleaded guilty under a plea agreement to aggravated robbery. *See* Tex. Penal Code Ann. § 29.03 (West 2011). The trial court deferred the adjudication of Glass’s guilt, placed Glass on community supervision for ten years, and assessed a \$2,000 fine. Subsequently, the State filed a motion to revoke community supervision. During the hearing on the State’s motion to revoke, Glass pleaded “true” to some of the alleged violations of the terms of his community supervision, and the trial court found that Glass had also

violated other terms of his community supervision as alleged in the motion to revoke. Finding that Glass violated the terms of his community supervision, the trial court revoked Glass's community supervision, found that a deadly weapon was used in commission of the original offense, adjudicated Glass's guilt, and sentenced him to twenty years in prison. Glass timely filed a notice of appeal.

Glass'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 August 6, 2015, we granted an extension of time for Glass to file a *pro se* brief. Glass filed a *pro se* brief in response.

The Texas Court of Criminal Appeals has explained that we need not address the merits of issues raised in *Anders* briefs or *pro se* responses. *See Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826-27 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005). Rather, we may determine that (1) "the appeal is wholly frivolous and issue an opinion explaining that [the appellate court] has reviewed the record and finds no reversible error[]" or that (2) "arguable grounds for appeal exist and remand the cause to the trial court so that new counsel may be appointed to brief the issues." *Id.* We have determined that this appeal is wholly frivolous. We have independently examined the entire appellate record in this matter, as well as all briefs, and we agree 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.¹

AFFIRMED.

LEANNE JOHNSON
Justice

Submitted on November 9, 2015
Opinion Delivered November 12, 2015
Do Not Publish

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

¹ Glass may challenge our decision in this case by filing a petition for discretionary review. *See* Tex. R. App. P. 68.