

Dismissed and Opinion filed October 18, 2001.



In The
Fourteenth Court of Appeals

**NOS. 14-00-01493-CR;
14-00-01494-CR**

CHARLES FRANK MASSEY, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

**On Appeal from the 180th District Court
Harris County, Texas
Trial Court Cause Nos. 792,292 & 792,293**

OPINION

On January 11, 1999, appellant pled guilty in both causes without an agreed recommendation as to punishment to the offense of possession with intent to manufacture or deliver a controlled substance. In both causes, the trial judge deferred adjudication of guilt, assessed a fine of \$5,000, and placed appellant on community supervision for 10 years. The State filed a motion to adjudicate guilt. After a hearing, the trial court found appellant guilty in both causes and assessed punishment at confinement for nine years. Appellant filed a timely general notice of appeal from the judgment adjudicating guilt..

On appeal, appellant challenges the sufficiency of the evidence to support a finding of violation of appellant's probationary conditions.

Given the plain meaning of Article 42.12, section 5(b) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, an appellant whose deferred adjudication probation has been revoked and who has been adjudicated guilty of the original charge, may not raise on appeal contentions of error in the adjudication of guilt process. *Connolly v. State*, 983 S.W.2d 738, 741 (Tex. Crim. App. 1999); TEX. CODE CRIM. PROC. ANN. Art. 42.12 § 5(b) (Vernon Supp. 2000). Appellant may only raise issues that occur after adjudication of guilt and assessment of punishment. *See Ditto v. State*, 988 S.W.2d 236, 238 (Tex. Crim. App. 1999). Because appellant's sole complaint concerns error in the adjudication of guilt process, we are without jurisdiction to consider this appeal.

Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal for want of jurisdiction.

PER CURIAM

Judgment rendered and Opinion filed October 18, 2001.

Panel consists of Justices Anderson, Hudson, and Frost.

Do Not Publish — TEX. R. APP. P. 47.3(b).