

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

---

**NO. 09-23-00157-CR**

---

**CHRISTIAN POINDEXTER, Appellant**

**V.**

**THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee**

---

**On Appeal from the 356th District Court**  
**Hardin County, Texas**  
**Trial Cause No. 26717**

---

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

A grand jury indicted appellant Christian Poindexter for the offense of indecency with a child by contact, a second-degree felony. *See* Tex. Penal Code Ann. § 21.11(a)(1), (d). Pursuant to a plea bargain agreement, Poindexter pleaded guilty to the lesser included offense of indecency with a child by exposure, a third-degree felony. *See id.* § 21.11(a)(2), (d). The trial court found the evidence sufficient to find

Poindexter guilty of the lesser included offense of indecency with a child by exposure, but deferred adjudication, placed Poindexter on community supervision for ten years, and assessed a \$500 fine. Subsequently, the State filed a Motion to Revoke Unadjudicated Community Supervision. Poindexter pleaded “true” to violating four terms of the community supervision order. After conducting a sentencing hearing, the trial court found that Poindexter violated the terms of his community supervision, revoked Poindexter’s community supervision, found Poindexter guilty of the lesser included offense of indecency with a child by exposure, and imposed a sentence of ten years of confinement.

Poindexter’s appellate counsel filed an *Anders* brief that presents counsel’s professional evaluation of the record and concludes that the appeal is frivolous. *See Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967); *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807 (Tex. Crim. App. [Panel Op.] 1978). On August 9, 2023, we granted an extension of time for Poindexter to file a *pro se* brief. We received no response from Poindexter.

We reviewed the appellate record, and we agree with counsel’s conclusion that no arguable issues support the appeal. 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.<sup>1</sup>

AFFIRMED.

W. SCOTT GOLEMON  
Chief Justice

Submitted on November 14, 2023  
Opinion Delivered November 29, 2023  
Do Not Publish

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

---

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