

**NOS. 12-14-00180-CR  
12-14-00181-CR**

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS**

**TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT**

**TYLER, TEXAS**

<i>ANGELA DENISE HARDIN, APPELLANT</i>	§	<i>APPEALS FROM THE 114TH</i>
<i>V.</i>	§	<i>JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT</i>
<i>THE STATE OF TEXAS, APPELLEE</i>	§	<i>SMITH COUNTY, TEXAS</i>

---

***MEMORANDUM OPINION  
PER CURIAM***

Angela Hardin appeals following the revocation of her deferred adjudication community supervision. Appellant’s counsel filed a brief in 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**

Appellant was charged by separate indictments with theft of material and burglary of a habitation. She pleaded “guilty” in each cause. The trial court deferred finding Appellant “guilty” and placed her on community supervision for five years for theft of material and ten years for burglary of a habitation.

Subsequently, the State filed motions to revoke Appellant’s community supervision in each cause alleging that Appellant had violated certain terms and conditions thereof. A hearing was conducted on the State’s motions, and Appellant pleaded “true” to at least one of the violations alleged in each cause. At the conclusion of the hearing, the trial court found that Appellant violated the terms and conditions of her community supervisions as alleged in the State’s motions. Thereafter, the trial court revoked Appellant’s community supervisions,

adjudicated her “guilty” of theft of material and burglary of a habitation, and sentenced her to imprisonment for two years and twenty years respectively. This appeal followed.

#### ANALYSIS PURSUANT TO *ANDERS V. CALIFORNIA*

Appellant’s counsel filed a brief in compliance with *Anders v. California* and *Gainous v. State*. Appellant’s counsel states that he has diligently reviewed the appellate record and is of the opinion that the record reflects no reversible error and that there is no error upon which an appeal can be predicated. He further relates that he is well acquainted with the facts in this case. In compliance with *Anders*, *Gainous*, and *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807 (Tex. Crim. App. [Panel Op.] 1978), Appellant’s brief presents a chronological summation of the procedural history of the case and further states that Appellant’s counsel is unable to raise any arguable issues for appeal.<sup>1</sup> We have likewise reviewed the record for reversible error and have found none.

#### CONCLUSION

As required by *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991), Appellant’s counsel has moved for leave to withdraw. *See also In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403, 407 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008) (orig. proceeding). We carried the motion for consideration with the merits. Having done so and finding no reversible error, we **grant** Appellant’s counsel’s motion for leave to withdraw and **affirm** the trial court’s judgment.

As a result of our disposition of this case, Appellant’s counsel has a duty to, within five days of the date of this opinion, send a copy of the 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 review of this case by the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals, she must either retain an attorney to file a petition for discretionary review on her behalf or she must file a petition for discretionary review pro se. Any petition for discretionary review must be filed within thirty days from the date of either this opinion or the last timely motion for rehearing that was overruled by this court. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 68.2. Any petition for discretionary review must be filed with the Texas Court of Criminal

---

<sup>1</sup> Counsel for Appellant states in his motion to withdraw that he provided Appellant with a copy of this brief. Appellant was given time to file her own brief in this cause. The time for filing such a brief has expired, and no pro se brief has been filed.

Appeals. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 68.3(a). Any petition for discretionary review should comply with the requirements of Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 68.4. *See In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 408 n.22.

Opinion delivered July 8, 2015.

*Panel consisted of Worthen, C.J., Hoyle, J., and Neeley, J.*

(DO NOT PUBLISH)



## COURT OF APPEALS

### TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT OF TEXAS

#### JUDGMENT

JULY 8, 2015

NO. 12-14-00180-CR

ANGELA DENISE HARDIN,  
Appellant  
V.  
THE STATE OF TEXAS,  
Appellee

---

Appeal from the 114th District Court  
of Smith County, Texas (Tr.Ct.No. 114-1270-12)

---

THIS CAUSE came to be heard on the appellate record and brief 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 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., Hoyle, J. and Neeley, J.



**COURT OF APPEALS**

**TWELFTH COURT OF APPEALS DISTRICT OF TEXAS**

**JUDGMENT**

**JULY 8, 2015**

**NO. 12-14-00181-CR**

**ANGELA DENISE HARDIN,**  
Appellant  
V.  
**THE STATE OF TEXAS,**  
Appellee

---

Appeal from the 114th District Court  
of Smith County, Texas (Tr.Ct.No. 114-1271-12)

---

THIS CAUSE came to be heard on the appellate record and brief 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 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., Hoyle, J. and Neeley, J.*