Affirmed and Opinion filed October 14, 1999.

In The

Fourteenth Court of Appeals

NO. 14-97-00306-CR

LAWRENCE C. GLASS, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

On Appeal from the 337th District Court
Harris County, Texas
Trial Court Cause No. 710622

O P I N I O N

Appellant was charged by indictment with the offense of aggravated assault. Pursuant to a plea bargain agreement, appellant pleaded guilty to the charged offense and punishment was assessed at confinement for ten years, probated for ten years. The State subsequently moved to revoke appellant's community supervision. The trial court granted the motion and assessed punishment at ten years confinement in the Texas Department of Criminal Justice—Institutional Division. In three points of error, appellant contends the evidence is insufficient to support the decision to revoke the community supervision. We affirm.

I.

The State's Amended Motion to Revoke Community Supervision alleged four specific violations of appellant's community supervision. At the hearing on the State's motion, appellant pleaded "not true" to three of the allegations, but pleaded true to the fourth allegation that he failed to participate in a domestic violence treatment program as directed by the trial court. Following the hearing, the trial court found the allegations true and revoked the community supervision. Appellant contends the evidence is insufficient to support the findings of the trial court.

II.

We will begin with the second point of error which contends the evidence is insufficient to prove that appellant failed to participate in a domestic violence treatment program as directed. As noted in part I, *supra*, appellant pleaded true to this allegation. A plea of true alone is sufficient to support the revocation of probation. *See Moses v. State*, 590 S.W.2d 469, 470 (Tex. Crim. App. [Panel Op.] 1979); *Cole v. State*, 578 S.W.2d 127, 128 (Tex. Crim. App. [Panel Op.] 1979); *Hays v. State*, 933 S.W.2d 659, 661 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1996, no pet.). Moreover, once a plea of true has been entered, a defendant may not challenge the sufficiency of the evidence to support the subsequent revocation. *See Rincon v. State*, 615 S.W.2d 746, 747 (Tex. Crim. App. [Panel Op.] 1981); *Cole*, 578 S.W.2d at 128; *Hays*, 933 S.W.2d at 661. Accordingly, we overrule the second point of error.

III.

The first and third points of error challenge the sufficiency of the evidence to support the remaining allegations in the State's motion to revoke appellant's community supervision. However, in light of our resolution of the second point of error, we need not reach the merits of these points of error because proof of any violation of the terms of probation will support an order revoking probation. *See O'Neal v. State*, 623 S.W.2d 660, 661 (Tex. Crim. App. 1981) (citing *Roberson v. State*, 485 S.W.2d 795 (Tex. Crim. App.1972); *Champion v. State*, 590 S.W.2d 495, 498 (Tex. Crim. App.1979); *Gobell v. State*, 528 S.W.2d 223, 224 (Tex. Crim. App.1975). Consequently, the first and third points of error are overruled.

The judgment of the trial court is affirmed.

/s/ Charles F. Baird
Justice

Judgment rendered and Opinion filed October 14, 1999.

Panel consists of Justices Amidei, Edelman, and Baird.[1]

Do Not Publish — TEX. R. APP. P. 47.3(b).

[1] Former Judge Charles F. Baird sitting by assignment.