

In The
Court of Appeals
Ninth District of Texas at Beaumont

NO. 09-21-00412-CR

TREVEON SHELLDRICK POOLE, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

**On Appeal from the 435th District Court
Montgomery County, Texas
Trial Cause No. 20-02-01852-CR**

MEMORANDUM OPINION

A grand jury indicted Appellant Treveon Shelldrick Poole (“Appellant” or “Poole”) for aggravated robbery, and the indictment also alleged that during the commission of the offense or immediate flight therefrom Poole used or exhibited a deadly weapon, namely a firearm. *See* Tex. Penal Code Ann. § 29.03(a)(2). Poole pleaded “not guilty,” but the jury found Poole guilty as charged in the indictment. After hearing evidence at the punishment phase of the trial, the jury assessed punishment at fifty years of confinement. Poole filed a notice of appeal.

On appeal, Appellant’s court-appointed attorney filed a brief stating that he has reviewed the case and, based on his professional evaluation of the record and applicable law, 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 Poole to file a pro se brief, and we received no response from Poole.

Upon receiving an *Anders* brief, this Court must conduct a full examination of the record of all the proceedings to determine whether the appeal is wholly frivolous. *Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 80 (1988) (citing *Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744). We have reviewed the entire record and counsel’s brief, and we have found nothing that would arguably support an appeal. *See Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 827-28 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005) (“Due to the nature of *Anders* briefs, by indicating in the opinion that it considered the issues raised in the briefs and reviewed the record for reversible error but found none, the court of appeals met the requirements of Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 47.1.”) Therefore, we find it unnecessary to order appointment of new counsel to re-brief the appeal. *Cf. Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 511 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991). We affirm the trial court’s judgment.¹

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

AFFIRMED.

LEANNE JOHNSON
Justice

Submitted on August 23, 2022
Opinion Delivered August 24, 2022
Do Not Publish

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