

NO. 07-08-0058-CR

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE SEVENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS

AT AMARILLO

PANEL A

SEPTEMBER 4, 2008

---

CORRINE FRAIDE, APPELLANT

v.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE

---

FROM THE 242ND DISTRICT COURT OF HALE COUNTY;

NO. B17197-0704; HONORABLE ED SELF, JUDGE

---

Before CAMPBELL and HANCOCK and PIRTLE, JJ.

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Appellant, Corrine Fraide, pleaded guilty to the offense of driving while intoxicated with a child under the age of 15 years and was assessed a term of confinement in the State Jail Division of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice for one year and a fine of \$1,000 with the state jail time being probated. Appellant was placed on community supervision for two years. Subsequently, the State filed a motion to revoke community supervision alleging a number of violations of the appellant's terms and conditions of probation. Appellant pleaded "Not True" to the allegations contained in the State's motion

to revoke community supervision. After hearing the evidence, the trial court found that appellant had violated the terms and conditions of her community supervision and revoked her probation and sentenced her to serve the original term of one year in a state jail facility. This appeal followed. We affirm.

Appellant's attorney has filed an Anders brief and a motion to withdraw. Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738, 87 S.Ct. 1396, 18 L.Ed. 2d 498 (1967). In support of his motion to withdraw, counsel certifies that he has diligently reviewed the record, and in his opinion, the record reflects no reversible error upon which an appeal can be predicated. Id. at 744-45. In compliance with High v. State, 573 S.W.2d 807, 813 (Tex.Crim.App. 1978), counsel has candidly discussed why, under the controlling authorities, there is no error in the trial court's judgment. Additionally, counsel has certified that he has provided appellant a copy of the Anders brief and motion to withdraw and appropriately advised appellant of his right to file a *pro se* response in this matter. Stafford v. State, 813 S.W.2d 503, 510 (Tex.Crim.App. 1991). The court has also advised appellant of his right to file a *pro se* response. Appellant has not filed a response.

By his Anders brief, counsel raises grounds that could possibly support an appeal, but concludes the appeal is frivolous. We have reviewed these grounds and made an independent review of the entire record to determine whether there are any arguable grounds which might support an appeal. See Penson v. Ohio, 488 U.S. 75, 109 S.Ct. 346, 102 L.Ed.2d 300 (1988); Bledsoe v. State, 178 S.W.3d 824 (Tex.Crim.App. 2005). We have found no such arguable grounds and agree with counsel that the appeal is frivolous.

Accordingly, counsel's motion to withdraw is hereby granted and the trial court's judgment is affirmed.<sup>1</sup>

Mackey K. Hancock  
Justice

Do not publish.

---

<sup>1</sup> Counsel shall, within five days after this opinion is handed down, send his client a copy of the opinion and judgment, along with notification of appellant's right to file a *pro se* petition for discretionary review. See TEX. R. APP. P. 48.4.