



**In The
Court of Appeals
Seventh District of Texas at Amarillo**

No. 07-17-00361-CR

ALICIA MARGARET MINTER, APPELLANT

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE

On Appeal from the 100th District Court
Carson County, Texas
Trial Court No. 5936, Honorable Stuart Messer, Presiding

March 13, 2018

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Before QUINN, C.J., and PIRTLE, and PARKER, JJ.

Alicia Margaret Minter, appellant, appeals the trial court's judgment adjudicating her guilty of burglary of a habitation after finding she had violated her community supervision. Appellant timely appealed and was appointed counsel.

Appointed counsel filed a motion to withdraw and an *Anders*¹ brief in the cause. Through those documents, counsel certified that, after diligently searching the record, the appeal was without merit. Accompanying the brief and motion is a copy of a letter

¹ See *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 744–45, 87 S. Ct. 1396, 18 L. Ed. 2d 493 (1967).

informing appellant of her counsel's belief that there was no reversible error and of appellant's right to file a response, *pro se*. So too did the letter indicate that a copy of the appellate record was provided to appellant. By letter dated January 29, 2018, this Court also notified appellant of her right to file her own response by February 28, 2018. To date, appellant has not filed a *pro se* response.

In compliance with the principles enunciated in *Anders*, appellate counsel discussed one potential area for appeal, which included whether the trial court had abused its discretion in finding that appellant had violated the terms and conditions of probation. However, counsel then explained why the issue lacked merit.

In addition, we conducted our own review of the record to assess the accuracy of counsel's conclusions and to uncover any arguable error pursuant to *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008), and *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 508 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991) (en banc). No such error was uncovered. Furthermore, only one condition of probation need be violated warranting revocation. See *Ex parte Lea*, 505 S.W.3d 913, 915 (Tex. Crim. App. 2016) (stating that "a defendant's community supervision can be revoked based on a sole violation of one condition"). Appellant admitted to having ingested methamphetamine. Such violated a condition of her probation, as alleged by the State.

Accordingly, the motion to withdraw is granted, and the judgment is affirmed.²

Brian Quinn
Chief Justice

Do not publish.

² Appellant has the right to file a petition for discretionary review with the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals.