**Affirmed and Opinion filed July 5, 2001.**

**In The**

# Fourteenth Court of Appeals

---

**NOS. 14-00-01058-CR;**
**14-00-01059-CR;**
**14-00-01060-CR**

---

**CHARLES TIMOTHY PRINCE, Appellant**

**V.**

**THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee**

---

**On Appeal from the 228th District Court**
**Harris County, Texas**
**Trial Court Cause Nos. 788, 501; 788,505 & 844,272**

---

## M E M O R A N D U M  O P I N I O N

In trial court cause number 788,501, appellant pled guilty on December 8, 1999, without an agreed recommendation from the State to the offense of aggravated sexual assault of a child. In trial court cause number 788,505, appellant also entered a plea of guilty on December 8, 1999, without an agreed recommendation from the State to the offense of sexual assault of a child. In each case, the trial court placed appellant on

deferred adjudication community supervision for a period of ten years.[1] The State subsequently moved to adjudicate guilt in these two cases. On July 13, 2000, the trial court entered judgment in each cause, assessing a sentence of confinement for 35 years in the Institutional Division of Texas Department of Criminal Justice (TDCJ-ID).

On the same date the trial court adjudicated appellant guilty of the two aggravated sexual assault offenses, appellant pled guilty to the offense of failing to register as a sex offender (trial court cause number 844,272). Appellant pled guilty without an agreed recommendation from the State as to sentencing. On July 13, 2000, the trial court entered judgment in this cause, and assessed punishment of a fine of $1000.00 and 5 year confinement in TDCJ-ID. Appellant filed a pro se notice of appeal in all three causes.

Appellant's appointed counsel filed one brief in trial court cause numbers 788,504 and 788,505, and filed a separate brief in trial court cause number 844,272. In these briefs, counsel concludes that the appeals are wholly frivolous and without merit. The briefs meet the requirements of *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 87 S.Ct. 1396, 18 L.Ed.2d 493 (1967), by presenting a professional evaluation of the record demonstrating why there are no arguable grounds to be advanced. *See High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978).

A copy of counsel's briefs were delivered to appellant. Appellant was advised of the right to examine the appellate record and file a pro se response. As of this date, no pro se response has been filed.

We have carefully reviewed the record and counsel's briefs and agree that the appeals are wholly frivolous and without merit. Further, we find no reversible error in the record. A discussion of the briefs would add nothing to the jurisprudence of the state.

Accordingly, the judgments of the trial court is affirmed.

---

[1] In trial court cause number 788, 501, the trial court also imposed a fine of $1000.

PER CURIAM

Judgment rendered and Opinion filed July 5,2001.

Panel consists of Justices Yates, Fowler, and Wittig.

Do not publish — TEX. R. APP. P. 47.3(b).