

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

---

**NO. 09-21-00313-CR**  
**NO. 09-21-00328-CR**

---

**CHRISTOPHER MICHAEL VOGLER, Appellant**

**V.**

**THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee**

---

---

**On Appeal from the 75th District Court**  
**Liberty County, Texas**  
**Trial Cause Nos. CR34650 and CR34651**

---

---

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Appellant Christopher Michael Vogler was charged by indictment in cause number CR34650 for the offense of failure to stop and render aid in an accident resulting in serious bodily injury. *See* Tex. Transp. Code Ann. § 550.021(c)(1)(B). Vogler pleaded “not guilty,” and a jury found Vogler guilty and assessed punishment at two years of confinement and recommended that the sentence be probated, and the trial court accepted the jury’s verdict and punishment.

Vogler was also charged by indictment in cause number CR34651 with two counts of aggravated assault stemming from the same accident. In count one, Vogler was charged with aggravated assault with a deadly weapon, and in count two, Vogler was charged with aggravated assault causing serious bodily injury. *See* Tex. Penal Code Ann. § 22.02(a)(1), (2). Vogler pleaded “not guilty,” and a jury found Vogler guilty on both counts. The trial court vacated the jury verdict on count one because both counts involved the same victim and arose out of the same act. The jury assessed punishment on count two at seven years of confinement and a fine of \$7500. The trial court accepted the jury’s verdict. Vogler appealed from both convictions.

On appeal, the court-appointed attorney for Vogler filed a brief in which the attorney stated that he has reviewed the records and, based on his professional evaluation of the records and applicable law, the appeals are frivolous and there are no arguable grounds for reversal. *See Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967); *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978). We granted an extension of time for Vogler to file a pro se brief, and we received no response from Vogler.

We have independently reviewed the entire appellate record in both cases, and we agree with Vogler’s counsel that no arguable grounds for reversal exist in either case and the appeals are frivolous. Therefore, we find it unnecessary to order

appointment of new counsel to re-brief Vogler's appeals. *Cf. Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 511 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991). We affirm the judgments of the trial court.<sup>1</sup>

AFFIRMED.

---

LEANNE JOHNSON  
Justice

Submitted on May 26, 2022  
Opinion Delivered June 8, 2022  
Do Not Publish

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

---

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