

Affirmed and Opinion filed March 28, 2002.



In The
Fourteenth Court of Appeals

NO. 14-01-00705-CV

IN THE MATTER OF C. S. E., Appellant

**On Appeal from the County Court at Law No. 2
Brazoria County, Texas
Trial Court Cause No. 7952B**

MEMORANDUM OPINION

A petition alleging delinquent conduct was filed against appellant, a juvenile, charging him with conduct constituting a violation of section 22.07 of the Texas Penal Code, terroristic threat. On February 8, 2002, appellant stipulated to the alleged conduct and was placed on probation for twelve months. On June 4, 2001, the State filed a motion to modify disposition and for commitment to the Texas Youth Commission (“TYC”). The motion alleged appellant violated certain conditions of his probation. Appellant stipulated to the conduct alleged in the State’s motion, but opposed placement in the TYC. After a hearing, the trial court entered an order modifying appellant’s probation and committing him to the TYC for an indeterminate period not to exceed his twenty-first birthday. Appellants appeals the modification.

Appellant's appointed 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 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978).

A copy of counsel's brief was delivered to appellant and his guardian, his grandmother. See *In re D.A.S.*, 973 S.W.2d 296 (Tex. 1998) (requiring attorney in who files *Anders* brief in juvenile case to notify client and guardian of right to file pro se response). Appellant and his guardian were advised of the right to examine the appellate record and file a pro se response. *Id.* As of this date, no pro se response has been filed.

We have carefully reviewed the record and counsel's brief and agree that 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 March 28, 2002.

Panel consists of Justices Hudson, Fowler, and Edelman.

Do not publish — TEX.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