

**TEXAS COURT OF APPEALS, THIRD DISTRICT, AT AUSTIN**

---

---

**NO. 03-05-00687-CR**

---

---

**Charles Troy Hudgens, Appellant**

**v.**

**The State of Texas, Appellee**

---

---

**FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF BELL COUNTY, 264TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT  
NO. 56451, HONORABLE MARTHA J. TRUDO, JUDGE PRESIDING**

---

---

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Appellant Charles Troy Hudgens was placed on deferred adjudication supervision after he pleaded guilty to indecency with a child by contact. *See* Tex. Pen. Code Ann. § 21.11 (West 2003). He was subsequently adjudged guilty and sentenced to fifteen years' imprisonment after admitting that he violated the conditions of his supervision. This appeal followed.

Appellant's court-appointed attorney filed a brief concluding that the appeal is frivolous and without merit. The brief meets the requirements of *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), by presenting a professional evaluation of the record demonstrating why there are no arguable grounds to be advanced. *See also* *Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75 (1988); *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978); *Currie v. State*, 516 S.W.2d 684 (Tex. Crim. App. 1974); *Jackson v. State*, 485 S.W.2d 553 (Tex. Crim. App. 1972); *Gainous v. State*, 436 S.W.2d 137 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969). Appellant received a copy of counsel's brief and was advised of his right to examine the appellate record and to file a pro se brief. No pro se brief has been filed.

We have reviewed the record and counsel's brief and agree that the appeal is frivolous and without merit. We find nothing in the record that might arguably support the appeal. Counsel's motion to withdraw is granted.

The judgment of conviction is affirmed.

---

Jan P. Patterson, Justice

Before Chief Justice Law, Justices Patterson and Pemberton

Affirmed

Filed: April 6, 2006

Do Not Publish