

In The
Court of Appeals
Ninth District of Texas at Beaumont

NO. 09-22-00276-CR

THAD ANTHONY MAY JR., Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

**On Appeal from the 75th District Court
Liberty County, Texas
Trial Cause No. 22DC-CR-00002**

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Thad Anthony May Jr. (Appellant or May) appeals his conviction for possession of a controlled substance. We affirm.

In 2022, May was charged by information for possession of a controlled substance, namely methamphetamine, in an amount of one gram or more but less than four grams, a third-degree felony. *See* Tex. Health & Safety Code Ann. § 481.115(c). In a plea agreement, May pleaded guilty to the offense and waived his right to indictment and a jury trial. The trial court found May guilty, deferred

adjudication, and placed May on community supervision for three years and assessed a \$3000 fine. On June 26, 2022, the State filed a Motion to Revoke Unadjudicated Community Supervision alleging May committed seven violations of his community supervision. At a hearing on August 18, 2022, the State abandoned three of the alleged violations, and May pleaded “not true” to the other four allegations in the motion to revoke. The trial court heard evidence on the alleged violations, found allegations 2 (failed to abstain from drug/alcohol use from 02/14/22 to 03/07/22), 3 (failed to abstain from drug/alcohol use from 03/07/22 to 04/08/22), and 7 (failed to complete monthly community service) true that May had violated the terms of his community supervision, found him guilty of the third-degree felony offense of possession of a controlled substance, and imposed punishment at four years. May appealed.

On appeal, the court-appointed attorney for May filed a brief wherein the attorney stated that he had 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 May to file a pro se brief, and we received no response from May.

We have independently reviewed the entire appellate record, and we agree with May’s counsel that no arguable issues support an appeal. Therefore, we find it

unnecessary to order appointment of new counsel to re-brief May's appeal. *Cf. Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 511 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991). We affirm the judgment of the trial court.¹

AFFIRMED.

LEANNE JOHNSON
Justice

Submitted on February 8, 2023
Opinion Delivered February 15, 2023
Do Not Publish

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

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