

Affirmed and Opinion filed October 14, 1999.



In The

Fourteenth Court of Appeals

NO. 14-99-00442-CR

PETTIS DUNGE NIX, JR., Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

**On Appeal from the 122nd District Court
Galveston County, Texas
Trial Court Cause No. 90CR1575**

O P I N I O N

Pettis Dunge Mix, Jr. (Appellant) was indicted for the felony offense of possession of a controlled substance. Appellant pleaded guilty, the judge deferred further proceedings and placed appellant on community supervision for seven years. Based upon alleged violations of the conditions of Appellant's community supervision, the State filed a motion to revoke and adjudicate guilt. The trial court denied the State's motion to adjudicate guilt but modified the conditions by extending Appellant's period of deferred adjudication by one year. Later, the State filed another motion to adjudicate Appellant's guilt. Following a hearing, the trial court revoked Appellant's deferred adjudication, found him guilty and sentenced him to two years' confinement in the Institutional Division of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice. Appellant gave timely notice of appeal.

Appellant's appointed appellate counsel filed a brief in which he concludes that the appeal is wholly frivolous and without merit. The brief meets 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, 809 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978).

A copy of counsel's brief was delivered to appellant. Appellant was advised of the right to examine the appellate record and to file a *pro se* brief. As of this date, no *pro se* brief has been filed and the time permitted to file such a brief has expired.

We agree the appeal is wholly frivolous and without merit. Further, we find no reversible error in the record. A discussion of the brief would add nothing to the jurisprudence of the State.

Accordingly, the judgment of the trial court is affirmed.

PER CURIAM

Judgment rendered and Opinion filed October 14, 1999.

Panel consists of Chief Justice Murphy and Justices Anderson and Hudson.

Do not publish — TEX.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