

TEXAS COURT OF APPEALS, THIRD DISTRICT, AT AUSTIN

Chandler Keith Rodgers v. The State of Texas

No. 03-25-00443-CR (Tex. App.—Austin May 5, 2026) (mem. op.) · No. 03-25-00443-CR · Decided May 5, 2026

SUMMARY

The Texas Court of Appeals, Third District, reviewed an Anders appeal from Chandler Keith Rodgers’s conviction for possessing more than 400 grams of methamphetamine with intent to deliver. The court granted appointed counsel’s motion to withdraw, concluded that the appeal was frivolous and without merit, and affirmed the judgment of conviction imposing a seventy-year prison sentence.

OPINION

Chandler Keith Rodgers v. the State of Texas

PER CURIAM.

TEXAS COURT OF APPEALS, THIRD DISTRICT, AT AUSTIN

NO. 03-25-00443-CR

Chandler Keith Rodgers, Appellant v. The State of Texas, Appellee

FROM THE 424TH DISTRICT COURT OF BURNET COUNTY

NO. 57837, THE HONORABLE EVAN C. STUBBS, JUDGE PRESIDING

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Chandler Keith Rodgers was charged with the felony offense of possessing with intent to deliver more than 400 grams of methamphetamine. See Tex. Health & Safety Code § 481.112(f). He pleaded guilty to the charged offense and requested that a jury assess his punishment. See Tex. Code Crim. Proc. art. 37.07, § 2. Following the punishment hearing, the jury sentenced him to seventy years’ imprisonment, and the trial court rendered its judgment of conviction consistent with the jury’s verdict. See Tex. Health & Safety Code § 481.112(f). He appealed the trial court’s judgment of conviction. Rodgers’s court-appointed attorney on appeal filed a motion to withdraw supported by an Anders brief contending that the appeal is frivolous and without merit. See *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 744-45 (1967). Rodgers’s court-appointed attorney’s brief meets the requirements of Anders by presenting a professional evaluation of the record and demonstrating that there are no arguable grounds to be advanced. See *id.*; *Garner v. State*, 300 S.W.3d 763, 766 (Tex. Crim. App. 2009); see also *Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 81-82 (1988) (explaining that Anders briefs serve purpose of “assisting the court in determining both that counsel in fact conducted the required detailed review of the case and that the appeal is . . . frivolous”). Rodgers’s counsel represented to the Court that he provided copies of the motion and brief to Rodgers; advised Rodgers of his right to examine the appellate record, file a pro se brief,

and pursue discretionary review following the resolution of the appeal in this Court; and provided Rodgers with a form motion for pro se access to the appellate record along with the mailing address of this Court. See *Kelly v. State*, 436 S.W.3d 313, 319-20 (Tex. Crim. App. 2014). Rodgers filed a pro se brief after his counsel filed the Anders brief. We have independently reviewed the record and considered Rodgers's appellate brief filed by counsel and his pro se brief, and we have found nothing that might arguably support the appeal. See *Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744; *Garner*, 300 S.W.3d at 766. We agree with counsel that the appeal is frivolous and without merit. Accordingly, we grant counsel's motion to withdraw and affirm the trial court's judgment of conviction. _____ Karin Crump, Justice Before Chief Justice Byrne, Justices Theofanis and Crump Affirmed Filed: May 5, 2026 Do Not Publish 2