

TEXAS COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIRST DISTRICT

Guadalupe Navarro v. The State of Texas

Navarro · No. 01-25-00384-CR · Decided January 13, 2026

SUMMARY

The First Court of Appeals of Texas reviewed Guadalupe Navarro’s murder conviction and 75-year sentence following her guilty plea and a jury assessment of punishment. Applying Anders procedures, the court independently found no reversible error or arguable grounds for review, affirmed the trial court’s judgment, and granted appointed counsel’s motion to withdraw.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Texas Court of Appeals for the First District
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Chief Justice Adams; Justice Gunn; Justice Johnson
JURISDICTION	Court of Appeals for the First District of Texas
DECIDED	January 13, 2026
DOCKET	01-25-00384-CR
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Navarro appealed her murder conviction and punishment after pleading guilty to first-degree felony murder and receiving a 75-year sentence and a \$10,000 fine. Appointed appellate counsel filed a motion to withdraw and an Anders brief asserting that the appeal was frivolous. Navarro filed a pro se response raising ineffective-assistance claims.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	In an Anders appeal, the reviewing court independently examines the entire record to determine whether reversible error or any arguable ground for review exists; counsel's conclusion that the appeal is frivolous is not controlling.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Guadalupe Navarro v. The State of Texas

TOPICS

- appellate procedure
- criminal procedure
- right to counsel
- ineffective assistance
- appellate jurisdiction

PRACTICE AREAS

Texas criminal law

criminal appellate procedure

Anders appeals

ineffective assistance of counsel

party liability for murder

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the Anders brief and motion to withdraw satisfied the applicable requirements and whether independent review of the record disclosed any reversible error or arguable ground for review.
2. Whether Navarro's pro se ineffective-assistance claims demonstrated reversible error on the appellate record.
3. Whether Navarro could be convicted of murder as a party even though she was not the shooter.

HOLDINGS

1. Counsel's Anders brief satisfied the applicable requirements because it professionally evaluated the record and provided record references and legal authority, and counsel informed Navarro of her rights concerning the appellate record and a pro se response.
2. Independent review of the entire record disclosed no reversible error and no arguable ground for review; the appeal was frivolous.
3. The fact that Navarro was not the shooter did not prevent her conviction for murder because the jury was charged on the law of parties.
4. Navarro's claims that counsel promised a sentence of no more than 40 years and that the Brazoria County court system was biased were unsupported by the appellate record and did not establish reversible error.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"We have independently reviewed the entire record in this appeal." (3)

"We conclude that no reversible error exists in the record, that there are no arguable grounds for review, and that the appeal is frivolous." (3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Navarro participated with other armed assailants in a home invasion at a beach house in Brazoria County that resulted in the death of Larry Ortiz, Jr. She pleaded guilty to first-degree felony murder, and a jury assessed punishment at 75 years' confinement and a \$10,000 fine. Navarro asserted in her pro se response that trial counsel was ineffective for allowing her to plead guilty, allegedly promising a sentence of no more than 40 years, and failing to address alleged local bias.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Navarro participated in a home invasion that resulted in Larry Ortiz, Jr.'s death, pleaded guilty to murder, and was sentenced by a jury to 75 years' confinement and a \$10,000 fine. On appeal, appointed counsel filed an

Anders brief and motion to withdraw. The Court of Appeals independently reviewed the record, found no reversible error or arguable grounds for review, affirmed the trial court's judgment, granted counsel's motion to withdraw, and dismissed other pending motions as moot.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738, 744 (1967)
- In re Schulman, 252 S.W.3d 403, 406-09 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008)
- Mitchell v. State, 193 S.W.3d 153, 155 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2006, no pet.)
- High v. State, 573 S.W.2d 807, 812 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978)
- Kelly v. State, 436 S.W.3d 313, 319-20 (Tex. Crim. App. 2014)
- Garner v. State, 300 S.W.3d 763, 767 (Tex. Crim. App. 2009)
- Bledsoe v. State, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826-28 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005)

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

Opinion issued January 13, 2026 In The Court of Appeals For The First District of Texas NO. 01-25-00384-CR GUADALUPE NAVARRO, Appellant V. THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee On Appeal from the 239th District Court Brazoria County, Texas Trial Court Case No. 98177-CR MEMORANDUM OPINION This appeal arises from a home invasion at a beach house in Brazoria County that resulted in the death of Larry Ortiz, Jr. Guadalupe Navarro, who participated in the home invasion with other armed assailants, pleaded guilty to the first-degree felony offense of murder.¹ And a jury assessed her punishment at 75-years' confinement and a \$10,000 fine.

Navarro appealed. On appeal, Navarro's appointed counsel has filed a motion to withdraw, along with an Anders brief, stating that the record presents no reversible error and that the appeal is without merit and is frivolous. See Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738, 744 (1967).

In his Anders brief, counsel states that he has thoroughly reviewed the record and is unable to advance any ground of error that warrants reversal. See *id.*; In re Schulman, 252 S.W.3d 403, 406–09 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008); Mitchell v. State, 193 S.W.3d 153, 155 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2006, no pet.). Counsel's brief meets the Anders requirements because it presents a professional evaluation of the record and supplies this Court with references to the record and legal authority.

See Anders, 386 U.S. at 744; see also High v. State, 573 S.W.2d 807, 812 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978). Further, Navarro's counsel informed this Court that he mailed a copy of the motion to withdraw

and Anders brief to Navarro and informed her of her right to access the appellate record and file a pro se response. See *Kelly v. State*, 436 S.W.3d 313, 319–20 (Tex. Crim.

App. 2014); *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 408–09. 1 See TEX. PENAL CODE ANN. § 19.01(B) (1), (2). 2 Navarro received a copy of the clerk’s record and the reporter’s record, and this Court granted her a 30-day extension of time in which to file a pro se response. Navarro filed a response to the Anders brief, in which she contends that trial counsel was ineffective because “he allowed me to plead guilty on a murder I did not commit.” However, the jury was charged on the law of parties.

That Navarro was not the shooter does not prevent her conviction for murder. See TEX. PENAL CODE § 7.02. Navarro also contends that she received ineffective assistance of counsel because (1) trial counsel promised that she would receive “no more than 40 years” if she pleaded guilty, and (2) the court system in Brazoria County was biased against her because the victim’s brother was an “authoritive [sic] figure of some sort” there.

Neither of these claims have any support in the record. The State filed a waiver of its right to file a response to the Anders brief. We have independently reviewed the entire record in this appeal. See *Mitchell*, 193 S.W.3d at 155.

We conclude that no reversible error exists in the record, that there are no arguable grounds for review, and that the appeal is frivolous. See *Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744 (emphasizing that reviewing court—and not counsel—determines, after full examination of proceedings, whether appeal is wholly frivolous); *Garner v. State*, 300 S.W.3d 763, 767 (Tex. Crim. App.

2009); *Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826–28 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005). 3 We affirm the judgment of the trial court and grant counsel’s motion to withdraw.² See TEX. R. APP. P. 43.2(a). Attorney Perry Stevens must immediately send the required notice and file a copy of that notice with the Clerk of this Court. See TEX. R. APP. P. 6.5(c).

We dismiss any other pending motions as moot. PER CURIAM Panel consists of Chief Justice Adams and Justices Gunn and Johnson. Do not publish. TEX. R. APP. P. 47.2(b). 2 Appointed counsel still has a duty to inform Navarro of the result of this appeal and that she may, on her own, pursue discretionary review in the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals. See *Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 827 (Tex.

Crim. App. 2005). An appellant may challenge a holding that there are no arguable grounds for appeal by filing a petition for discretionary review. See *id.* at 827 & n.6. 4