



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

No. 07-18-00136-CR

ADRIANA LETICIA AVILA, APPELLANT

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE

On Appeal from the 244th District Court
Ector County, Texas
Trial Court No. C-16-0673-CR, Honorable James M. Rush, Presiding

August 17, 2018

MEMORANDUM OPINION

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

Adriana Leticia Avila, appellant, appeals the trial court's judgment adjudicating her guilty of aggregated theft, a state jail felony, 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 July 3, 2018, this Court also notified appellant of her right to file her own response by August 2, 2018. To date, appellant has not filed a *pro se* response.

In compliance with the principles enunciated in *Anders*, appellate counsel discussed potential areas for appeal, which included whether appellant's plea of true was voluntary, the trial court had jurisdiction, whether counsel was reasonably effective, and the evidence was sufficient to support the court's decision. However, counsel then explained why all the issues lacked merit. We also point out that appellant pled true to the single allegation found in the State's motion and that such a plea of true, alone, is sufficient to support revocation. See *Reyes v. State*, No. 07-17-00404-CR, 2018 Tex. App. LEXIS 3451 (Tex. App.—Amarillo May 16, 2018, no pet.) (mem. op., not designated for publication).

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 arguable error was uncovered.

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.