

Opinion filed July 9, 2020



In The
Eleventh Court of Appeals

No. 11-19-00352-CR

RANDALL DEE PRICE, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

**On Appeal from the 104th District Court
Taylor County, Texas
Trial Court Cause No. 21569B**

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Appellant, Randall Dee Price, pleaded guilty to the state jail felony offense of possession of methamphetamine. Pursuant to the terms of the plea agreement, the trial court convicted Appellant of the offense, assessed his punishment at confinement for two years and a \$1,000 fine, suspended the confinement portion of the sentence, and placed Appellant on community supervision for four years. Subsequently, the State filed a motion to revoke community supervision. At a contested hearing on revocation, Appellant admitted to two of the State's allegations.

The trial court revoked Appellant's community supervision and imposed the original sentence of confinement in a state jail facility for two years. We affirm.

Appellant's court-appointed counsel has filed a motion to withdraw. The motion is supported by a brief in which counsel professionally and conscientiously examines the record and applicable law and states that he has concluded that the appeal is frivolous and without merit. Counsel has provided Appellant with a copy of the brief, a copy of the motion to withdraw, an explanatory letter, and a copy of both the reporter's record and the clerk's record. Counsel advised Appellant of his right to review the record and file a response to counsel's brief. Counsel also advised Appellant of his right to file a pro se petition for discretionary review in order to seek review by the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 68. Court-appointed counsel has complied with the requirements of *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967); *Kelly v. State*, 436 S.W.3d 313 (Tex. Crim. App. 2014); *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008); and *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991).

Appellant has not filed a pro se response to counsel's *Anders* brief. Following the procedures outlined in *Anders* and *Schulman*, we have independently reviewed the record, and we agree that the appeal is without merit. The record from the revocation hearing shows that, as alleged in the State's application to revoke, Appellant twice refused to go to the substance abuse felony punishment facility as required. We note that proof of one violation of the terms and conditions of community supervision is sufficient to support revocation. *Smith v. State*, 286 S.W.3d 333, 342 (Tex. Crim. App. 2009). Furthermore, absent a void judgment, issues relating to an original plea proceeding may not be raised in a subsequent appeal from the revocation of community supervision. *Jordan v. State*, 54 S.W.3d 783, 785–86 (Tex. Crim. App. 2001); *Manuel v. State*, 994 S.W.2d 658, 661–62

(Tex. Crim. App. 1999). Based upon our review of the record, we agree with counsel that no arguable grounds for appeal exist.¹

The motion to withdraw is granted, and the judgment of the trial court is affirmed.

PER CURIAM

July 9, 2020

Do not publish. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 47.2(b).

Panel consists of: Bailey, C.J.,
Stretcher, J., and Wright, S.C.J.²

Willson, J., not participating.

¹We note that Appellant has a right to file a petition for discretionary review pursuant to Rule 68 of the Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure.

²Jim R. Wright, Senior Chief Justice (Retired), Court of Appeals, 11th District of Texas at Eastland, sitting by assignment.