TEXAS COURT OF APPEALS, THIRD DISTRICT, AT AUSTIN

NO. 03-00-00229-CR

Gerald Mayo, Appellant

v.

The State of Texas, Appellee

FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF DALLAS COUNTY, 195TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
NO. F-9402790-SN, HONORABLE JOHN NELMS, JUDGE PRESIDING

In December 1994, appellant Gerald Mayo was placed on deferred adjudication community supervision after pleading guilty to retaliation. *See* Tex. Penal Code Ann. § 36.06 (West Supp. 2001). In March 2000, appellant pleaded true to the allegations in the State's motion to adjudicate. The district court revoked supervision and adjudicated appellant guilty. The court then assessed punishment, enhanced by two previous felony convictions, at imprisonment for twenty-five years.

Appellant's court-appointed attorney filed a brief concluding that the appeal is frivolous and without merit. The brief meets the requirements of *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), by presenting a professional evaluation of the record demonstrating why there are no arguable grounds to be advanced. *See also Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75 (1988); *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978); *Currie v. State*, 516 S.W.2d 684 (Tex. Crim. App.

1974); *Jackson v. State*, 485 S.W.2d 553 (Tex. Crim. App. 1972); *Gainous v. State*, 436 S.W.2d 137 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969). A copy of counsel's brief was delivered to appellant, and appellant was advised of his right to examine the appellate record and to file a pro se brief. No pro se brief has been filed.

We have reviewed the record and counsel's brief and agree that the appeal is frivolous and without merit. We find nothing in the record that might arguably support the appeal.

The judgment of conviction is affirmed.

Lee Yeakel

Before Chief Justice Aboussie, Justices Yeakel and Patterson

Affirmed

Filed: February 1, 2001

Do Not Publish