



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

---

No. 07-22-00189-CR

---

**WILLIAM AUSTIN YOUNG, APPELLANT**

**V.**

**THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE**

---

On Appeal from the 46th District Court  
Wilbarger County, Texas  
Trial Court No. 12,377, Honorable Dan Mike Bird, Presiding

---

November 15, 2022

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

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

Before this Court is a motion to withdraw supported by a brief filed pursuant to *Anders v. California*.<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to a plea agreement, in March 2019, Appellant, William Austin Young, was placed on deferred adjudication community supervision for five years for burglary of a habitation. In June 2022, the State moved to proceed with adjudication for violations of certain conditions of community supervision. The trial court heard testimony on the alleged violations and subsequently ruled that Appellant had violated

---

<sup>1</sup> *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 87 S. Ct. 1396, 18 L. Ed. 2d 493 (1967).

some conditions, revoked his community supervision, adjudicated him guilty of the charged offense, and sentenced him to eighteen years' confinement.

In support of his motion to withdraw, counsel certifies he has conducted a conscientious examination of the record, and in his opinion, it reflects no potentially plausible basis for reversal of Appellant's conviction. *Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744–45; *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403, 406 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008). Counsel candidly discusses why, under the controlling authorities, the record supports that conclusion. *See High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807, 813 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978). Counsel has demonstrated that he has complied with the requirements of *Anders* and *In re Schulman* by (1) providing a copy of the brief to Appellant, (2) notifying him of the right to file a pro se response if he desired to do so, and (3) informing him of the right to file a pro se petition for discretionary review. *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 408. By letter, this Court granted Appellant an opportunity to exercise his right to file a response to counsel's brief, should he be so inclined. *Id.* at 409 n.23. Appellant did not file a response.

When reviewing an order revoking community supervision imposed under an order of deferred adjudication, the sole question before this Court is whether the trial court abused its discretion. *Hacker v. State*, 389 S.W.3d 860, 865 (Tex. Crim. App. 2013). The finding of a single violation of community supervision is sufficient to support revocation. *Garcia v. State*, 387 S.W.3d 20, 26 (Tex. Crim. App. 2012). Additionally, a plea of true standing alone is sufficient to support a trial court's revocation order. *Moses v. State*, 590 S.W.2d 469, 470 (Tex. Crim. App. 1979).

By the *Anders* brief, counsel presents a thorough evaluation of the record and concedes that reversible error is not present. He acknowledges that Appellant's pleas of

true standing alone were sufficient for the trial court to revoke Appellant's community supervision.

We too have independently examined the record to determine whether there are any non-frivolous issues which might support the appeal. See *Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 80, 109 S. Ct. 346, 102 L. Ed. 2d 300 (1988); *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 409; *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 511 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991). We have found no such issues. See *Gainous v. State*, 436 S.W.2d 137, 138 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969). After reviewing the record and counsel's brief, we agree with counsel that there is no plausible basis for reversal of Appellant's conviction. See *Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826–27 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005).

The trial court's *Judgment Adjudicating Guilt* is affirmed and counsel's motion to withdraw is granted.<sup>2</sup>

Alex L. Yarbrough  
Justice

Do not publish.

---

<sup>2</sup> Notwithstanding that Appellant was informed of his right to file a pro se petition for discretionary review upon execution of the *Trial Court's Certification of Defendant's Right of Appeal*, counsel must comply with Rule 48.4 of the Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure which provides that counsel shall within five days after this opinion is handed down, send Appellant a copy of the opinion and judgment together with notification of his right to file a pro se petition for discretionary review. *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 408 n.22, 411 n.35. The duty to send the client a copy of this Court's decision is an informational one, not a representational one. It is ministerial in nature, does not involve legal advice, and exists after the court of appeals has granted counsel's motion to withdraw. *Id.* at 411 n.33