

2011, as the deadline to respond. To date, appellant has filed neither a response, brief, nor request for an extension of time.

In compliance with the principles of *Anders*, appellate counsel discussed three potential areas for appeal. They involved 1) the original plea of guilty, 2) the sufficiency of the evidence supporting the revocation of appellant's community supervision, and 3) the propriety of the trial court's, on its own motion, granting a new trial regarding appellant's plea of guilty and holding a new guilty plea hearing.² Counsel then explained why each argument lacked merit since appellant had plead guilty to the amended indictment, the subject of the new trial, and had plead true to the allegations found in the State's motion to revoke his community supervision.

We also conducted our own review of the record to assess the accuracy of counsel's conclusions and to uncover any error pursuant to *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991). That review failed to reveal any reversible error.

Accordingly, the motion to withdraw is granted, and the judgment is affirmed.

Brian Quinn
Chief Justice

Do not publish.

²Apparently, the trial court held a hearing wherein appellant pled guilty to the charge as alleged in the indictment on March 23, 2007, and entered a judgment on the same day. At the March 23rd hearing, the State advised and defense counsel agreed to an amendment to the indictment which the trial court granted. Later, on March 28, 2007, the trial court granted a new trial and signed an order granting the amendment of the indictment so that the indictment correctly stated the charged offense and so that the stipulation of evidence signed by appellant supported the indictment. Furthermore, the trial court orally pronounced appellant's sentence on the 28th. However, we note that the judgment signed on March 28th, the day of the new trial, incorrectly reflected that appellant was sentenced on March 23, 2007, which was the date of the earlier hearing. This is of import because appellant's probation was extended for another three years and the order extending the probation was signed on March 26, 2010, which would have been past the original three-year probated sentence if the March 23rd date was the correct date to be used in calculating the date appellant's probation terminated.