

COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS AT BEAUMONT

Mary Genevive Bond v. The State of Texas

No. 09-25-00482-CR · No. 09-25-00482-CR · Decided May 27, 2026

SUMMARY

The Ninth Court of Appeals of Texas affirmed the revocation of Mary Genevive Bond’s community supervision and her resulting two-year state-jail sentence for fraudulent use of identifying information. In an Anders appeal, the court independently reviewed the record and counsel’s brief, found no arguable grounds for reversal, and concluded that the appeal was frivolous.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals for the Ninth District of Texas at Beaumont
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jay Wright; Golemon, C.J.; Johnson, J.; Wright, J.
JURISDICTION	Court of Appeals for the Ninth District of Texas at Beaumont
DECIDED	May 27, 2026
DOCKET	09-25-00482-CR
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Appeal from the revocation of community supervision following Bond's guilty plea and her plea of true to violations of the conditions of community supervision; appointed appellate counsel filed an Anders brief asserting that the appeal was frivolous.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Upon receipt of an Anders brief, the court of appeals must conduct a full examination of the proceedings to determine whether the appeal is wholly frivolous.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished memorandum opinion; the opinion states 'Do Not Publish.'
PARTIES	Mary Genevive Bond v. The State of Texas

TOPICS

- appellate procedure
- criminal procedure
- probation
- right to counsel

PRACTICE AREAS

- criminal appellate practice
- community supervision revocation
- Anders appeals

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the appeal presented any arguably meritorious issue requiring reversal after appellate counsel filed an Anders brief.
2. Whether the court was required to appoint new appellate counsel to re-brief the appeal.

HOLDINGS

1. After reviewing the entire record and counsel's Anders brief, the court found nothing that arguably would support the appeal and determined that the appeal was wholly frivolous.
2. The court found it unnecessary to order the appointment of new counsel to re-brief the appeal.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Upon receiving an Anders brief, this Court must conduct a full examination of all the proceedings to determine whether the appeal is wholly frivolous.” (at 2)

“We have reviewed the entire record and counsel’s brief, and we have found nothing that arguably would support the appeal.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Bond pleaded guilty pursuant to a plea bargain to the state jail felony offense of fraudulent use of identifying information. The trial court found her guilty, assessed two years in state jail, ordered restitution, suspended the confinement portion of the sentence, and placed her on five years of community supervision subject to express conditions. Before the supervision term expired, the State sought revocation; Bond pleaded true to certain violations, and the trial court revoked community supervision and imposed the two-year state-jail sentence.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Bond pleaded guilty pursuant to a plea bargain to fraudulent use of identifying information. The trial court assessed two years in state jail, suspended the confinement portion, and placed her on community supervision for five years. After the State filed motions to revoke, Bond pleaded true to specified violations, the trial court revoked community supervision and sentenced her to two years in state jail, and Bond appealed. Appellate counsel filed an Anders brief; Bond was notified of her right to file a pro se brief but did not respond. The court of appeals independently reviewed the record and affirmed.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967)
- High v. State, 573 S.W.2d 807 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978)
- Penson v. Ohio, 488 U.S. 75, 80 (1988)
- Bledsoe v. State, 178 S.W.3d 824, 827-28 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005)

- *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 511 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991)

OPINION

Mary Genevive Bond v. the State of Texas

PER CURIAM.

In The Court of Appeals Ninth District of Texas at Beaumont _____

NO. 09-25-00482-CR

_____ MARY GENEVIVE BOND, Appellant V. THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

On

Appeal from the Criminal District Court Jefferson County, Texas Trial Cause No. F22-40508

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Pursuant to a plea bargain agreement, Appellant Mary Genevive Bond (“Bond”) pleaded guilty to the state jail felony offense of fraudulent use of identifying information. See Tex. Penal Code Ann. § 32.51(b)(1), (c)(1). The trial court found Bond guilty and assessed her punishment at two years in state jail and ordered her to pay restitution but suspended the confinement portion of Bond’s 1 sentence and placed her on community supervision for five years, with express conditions. Subsequently, prior to the expiration of the term of community supervision, the State filed motions to revoke Bond’s community supervision. At the hearing on the State’s second amended motion, Bond pleaded “true” to violating certain terms of her community supervision order, and after hearing evidence, the trial court found that Bond had violated the terms of her community supervision. The trial court revoked Bond’s community supervision and sentenced her to two years in state jail. On appeal, Bond’s appellate counsel filed an Anders brief that presents counsel’s professional evaluation of the record and concludes the appeal is frivolous. See *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967); *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978). On February 3, 2026, we notified Bond of her right to file a pro se brief and notified her of the deadline for doing so, but we received no response from Bond. Upon receiving an Anders brief, this Court must conduct a full examination of all the proceedings to determine whether the appeal is wholly frivolous. *Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 80 (1988) (citing *Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744). We have reviewed the entire record and counsel’s brief, and we have found nothing that arguably would support the appeal. *Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 827–28 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005) (“Due to the nature of Anders briefs, by indicating in the opinion that it 2 considered the issues raised in the briefs and reviewed the record for reversible error but found none, the court of appeals met the requirements of Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 47.1.”). Therefore, we find it unnecessary to order appointment of new counsel to re-brief the appeal. Cf. *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 511 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991). We affirm the trial court’s judgment.¹ AFFIRMED.

JAY WRIGHT

Justice Submitted on May 18, 2026 Opinion Delivered May 27, 2026 Do Not Publish Before

Golemon, C.J., Johnson and Wright, JJ. 1 Bond may challenge our decision in this case by filing a petition of discretionary review with the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals. See Tex. R. App. P. 68.
3

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/court-of-appeals-for-the-ninth-district-of-texas-at-beaumont-court-of-appeals-for-the-ninth-district/2026/mary-genevive-bond-v-the-state-of-texas-vd3wyq00>