

**In The**  
***Court of Appeals***  
***Ninth District of Texas at Beaumont***

---

**NO. 09-16-00039-CR**

---

**PAUL AL GUILLORY III, Appellant**

**V.**

**THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee**

---

---

**On Appeal from the Criminal District Court**  
**Jefferson County, Texas**  
**Trial Cause No. 13-16462**

---

---

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

In this appeal, Paul Al Guillory III's court-appointed appellate counsel filed a brief in which he contends that no arguable grounds can be advanced to support a decision reversing Guillory's sexual assault of a child conviction. *See* Tex. Penal Code Ann. § 22.011(a)(2) (West 2011). We have reviewed the record, and we agree

with Guillory's counsel that no arguable issues exist to support an appeal. *See Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 744 (1967).

Pursuant to a plea agreement, Guillory pled guilty to sexually assaulting a child. Based on Guillory's plea, the trial court deferred adjudication and placed Guillory on community supervision for ten years. Subsequently, the State filed a motion to revoke, arguing that Guillory had violated five conditions of the trial court's community supervision order. In the hearing on the motion, Guillory pleaded "true" to two of the violations the State raised in its motion to revoke. Following a hearing on the State's motion, the trial court found that Guillory had violated two of the conditions required of him under the trial court's community-supervision order. Based on those findings, together with the evidence that Guillory had pled guilty to sexually assaulting a child, the trial court then found the evidence sufficient to prove that Guillory was guilty, beyond reasonable doubt, of the offense of sexual assault of a child. At the conclusion of the hearing, the court sentenced Guillory to confinement in the Institutional Division of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice for a term of ten years.

In connection with Guillory's appeal, Guillory's counsel filed a brief that presents counsel's professional evaluation of the record. In the brief, Guillory's counsel concludes that no arguable errors exist to support the filing of a merits-based

brief. *See Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744; *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978). After receiving the *Anders* brief, we granted an extension of time to allow Guillory to file a *pro se* response. However, he did not file a response.

After reviewing the appellate record and the *Anders* brief filed by Guillory's counsel, we agree with counsel's conclusion that any appeal would be frivolous. Consequently, we further conclude that no further briefing is required to dispose of Guillory's appeal. *Cf. Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 511 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991) (requiring the court of appeals to appoint other counsel only if it determines that there were arguable grounds for the appeal). Given our conclusion that no arguable error supports Guillory's appeal, we affirm the trial court's judgment.<sup>1</sup>

AFFIRMED.

---

HOLLIS HORTON  
Justice

Submitted on August 8, 2016  
Opinion Delivered June 21, 2017  
Do Not Publish

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

---

<sup>1</sup> Guillory may challenge our decision in this case by filing a petition for discretionary review. Tex. R. App. P. 68.