

TEXAS COURT OF APPEALS, THIRD DISTRICT, AT AUSTIN

NO. 03-17-00108-CR

Jamie Christian Jordan, Appellant

v.

The State of Texas, Appellee

**FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF BELL COUNTY, 27TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
NO. 69548, THE HONORABLE JOHN GAUNTT, JUDGE PRESIDING**

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Appellant Jamie Christian Jordan was placed on deferred adjudication community supervision after she pled guilty to forgery by passing. *See* Tex. Penal Code § 32.21; Tex. Code Crim. Proc. art. 42A.101(a). Subsequently, the trial court granted the State’s motion to adjudicate after finding that appellant had violated the conditions of supervision.¹ The court adjudicated appellant guilty, revoked her community supervision, and assessed her punishment at 12 months confinement in a State Jail Facility. *See* Tex. Code Crim. Proc. arts. 42A.108, .110; Tex. Penal Code § 12.35.

¹ The State’s motion to adjudicate contained one allegation, asserting that appellant failed to report to the community supervision officer as directed by the trial court. At the adjudication hearing, appellant pled true to the allegation. The trial court found the evidence sufficient to support a finding of true but withheld the finding, ordered an updated PSI report, and reset the case for sentencing. At the sentencing hearing, the court found the allegation was true.

Appellant’s court-appointed attorney has filed a motion to withdraw supported by a brief concluding that the appeal is frivolous and without merit. The brief meets the requirements of *Anders v. California* by presenting a professional evaluation of the record demonstrating why there are no arguable grounds to be advanced. *See Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 744 (1967); *Garner v. State*, 300 S.W.3d 763, 766 (Tex. Crim. App. 2009); *see also Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 81–82 (1988).

Appellant’s counsel has certified to this Court that he sent copies of the motion and brief to appellant, advised appellant of her right to examine the appellate record and file a pro se response, and provided a motion to assist appellant in obtaining the record. *See Kelly v. State*, 436 S.W.3d 313, 319–20 (Tex. Crim. App. 2014); *see also Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744. To date, appellant has not filed a pro se response or requested an extension of time to file a response.

We have conducted an independent review of the record—including the record of the adjudication proceedings and appellate counsel’s brief—and find no reversible error. *See Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744; *Garner*, 300 S.W.3d at 766; *Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826–27 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005). We agree with counsel that the record presents no arguably meritorious grounds for review and the appeal is frivolous. Counsel’s motion to withdraw is granted. The trial court’s judgment adjudicating guilt is affirmed.

Melissa Goodwin, Justice

Before Justices Puryear, Pemberton, and Goodwin

Affirmed

Filed: May 16, 2017

Do Not Publish