

NO. 12-12-00101-CR

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT

TYLER, TEXAS

<i>TADASHA DONSHEE JONES,</i> <i>APPELLANT</i>	§	<i>APPEAL FROM THE 7TH</i>
<i>V.</i>	§	<i>JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT</i>
<i>THE STATE OF TEXAS,</i> <i>APPELLEE</i>	§	<i>SMITH COUNTY, TEXAS</i>

MEMORANDUM OPINION
PER CURIAM

Tadasha Donshee Jones appeals her conviction for possession of a controlled substance. Appellant's counsel has filed a brief asserting compliance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 87 S. Ct. 1396, 18 L. Ed. 2d 493 (1967) and *Gainous v. State*, 436 S.W.2d 137 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969). We affirm.

BACKGROUND

A Smith County grand jury indicted Appellant for the felony offense of possession of a controlled substance. Specifically, the grand jury alleged that Appellant possessed between one and four grams of cocaine, a third degree felony.¹ Pursuant to a plea agreement, Appellant pleaded guilty in July 2007. Upon the State's recommendation, the trial court deferred a finding of guilt and placed Appellant on deferred adjudication community supervision for a period of ten years.

In December 2008, the State filed an application to proceed to final adjudication. Appellant pleaded true to the allegations in the State's application, and the trial court ordered Appellant to be confined in a substance abuse treatment facility. In January 2010, Appellant

¹ See TEX. HEALTH & SAFETY CODE ANN. § 481.115(c) (West 2010).

successfully completed the course of treatment, and the trial court ordered her to be released. In January 2010, Appellant successfully completed the course of treatment, and the trial court ordered her to be released.

In December 2011, the State again filed an application to proceed to final adjudication. In its application, the State alleged that Appellant operated a motor vehicle while intoxicated and consumed an alcoholic beverage. The trial court held a hearing. Appellant admitted that she had consumed an alcoholic beverage but denied that she had driven while intoxicated. The trial court found that she had violated the terms of her community supervision, found her guilty as charged, and assessed a sentence of imprisonment for five years and a fine of \$400. This appeal followed.

ANALYSIS PURSUANT TO *ANDERS V. CALIFORNIA*

Appellant's counsel has filed a brief in compliance with *Anders* and *Gainous*. Counsel states that he has diligently reviewed the appellate record and that he is well acquainted with the facts of this case. In compliance with *Anders*, *Gainous*, and *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978), counsel's brief presents a thorough chronological summary of the procedural history of the case and further states that counsel is unable to present any arguable issues for appeal.² See *Anders*, 386 U.S. at 745, 87 S. Ct. at 1400; see also *Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 80, 109 S. Ct. 346, 350, 102 L. Ed. 2d 300 (1988).

We have considered counsel's brief and have conducted our own independent review of the record. We found no reversible error. See *Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826-27 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005).

CONCLUSION

As required, Appellant's counsel has moved for leave to withdraw. See *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403, 407 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008) (orig. proceeding); *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 511 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991). We are in agreement with Appellant's counsel that the appeal is wholly frivolous. Accordingly, his motion for leave to withdraw is hereby ***granted***, and we ***affirm*** the trial court's judgment. See TEX. R. APP. P. 43.2.

Counsel has a duty to, within five days of the date of this opinion, send a copy of the

² Counsel for Appellant states in his motion to withdraw that he provided Appellant with a copy of his brief and of the record. Appellant was given time to file her own brief in this cause. Appellant filed a three page letter explaining some of the difficulties in her life.

opinion and judgment to Appellant and advise her of her right to file a petition for discretionary review. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 48.4; ***In re Schulman***, 252 S.W.3d at 411 n.35. Should Appellant wish to seek further review of this case by the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals, she must either retain an attorney to file a petition for discretionary review or she must file a pro se petition for discretionary review. *See In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 408 n.22. Any petition for discretionary review must be filed within thirty days after the date of this opinion or after the date this court overrules the last timely motion for rehearing. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 68.2(a). Any petition for discretionary review must be filed with the clerk of the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 68.3(a). Any petition for discretionary review should comply with the requirements of Rule 68.4 of the Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 68.4; ***In re Schulman***, 252 S.W.3d at 408 n.22.

Opinion delivered September 12, 2012.

Panel consisted of Worthen, C.J., Griffith, J., and Hoyle, J.

(DO NOT PUBLISH)



**COURT OF APPEALS
TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT OF TEXAS
JUDGMENT**

SEPTEMBER 12, 2012

NO. 12-12-00101-CR

TADASHA DONSHEE JONES,
Appellant
V.
THE STATE OF TEXAS,
Appellee

Appeal from the 7th Judicial District Court
of Smith County, Texas. (Tr.Ct.No. 007-0115-07)

THIS CAUSE came to be heard on the appellate record and briefs filed herein, and the same being considered, it is the opinion of this court that there was no error in the judgment.

It is therefore ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED that Appellant's counsel's motion to withdraw is **granted**, the judgment of the court below **be in all things affirmed**, and that this decision be certified to the court below for observance.

*By per curiam opinion.
Panel consisted of Worthen, C.J., Griffith, J., and Hoyle, J.*