

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

---

**NO. 09-18-00135-CR**  
**NO. 09-18-00136-CR**

---

**KADARIUS KRISSHAWN ROYSTON, Appellant**

**V.**

**THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee**

---

---

**On Appeal from the 435th District Court**  
**Montgomery County, Texas**  
**Trial Cause Nos. 17-06-07964-CR, 17-06-07965-CR**

---

---

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

In an open plea, Kadarius Krisshawn Royston pleaded guilty to two charges of aggravated robbery, and in each case, the trial court found that the evidence substantiated Royston's guilt. After conducting a sentencing hearing, the trial court assessed punishment at sixty years of confinement in each case and ordered that the sentences would run concurrently.

Royston's appellate counsel filed *Anders* briefs that present counsel's professional evaluation of the records and conclude 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 November 1, 2018, and on December 13, 2018, we granted an extension of time for Royston to file *pro se* briefs. Royston filed a *pro se* brief in response. The Court of Criminal Appeals has held that we need not address the merits of issues raised in *Anders* briefs or *pro se* responses. *Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826-27 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005). Rather, an appellate court may determine either: (1) "that the appeal is wholly frivolous and issue an opinion explaining that it has reviewed the record and finds no reversible error[;]" or (2) "that 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 these appeals are wholly frivolous. We have independently reviewed the clerk's records and the reporter's records, and we agree with counsel's conclusion that no arguable issues support the appeals. *See id.* Therefore, we find it unnecessary to order appointment of new counsel to re-brief

the appeals. *Cf. Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 511 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991). We affirm the trial court's judgments.<sup>1</sup>

AFFIRMED.

---

STEVE McKEITHEN  
Chief Justice

Submitted on March 12, 2019  
Opinion Delivered March 27, 2019  
Do Not Publish

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

---

<sup>1</sup>Royston may challenge our decision in these cases by filing a petition for discretionary review. *See* Tex. R. App. P. 68.