

COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE TENTH APPELLATE DISTRICT OF TEXAS

Robert Brian Hendrickson v. The State of Texas

No. 10-24-00043-CR · No. 10-24-00043-CR · Decided March 26, 2026

SUMMARY

The Texas Court of Appeals affirmed Robert Brian Hendrickson’s conviction for indecency with a child by sexual contact and his thirty-year sentence. The court held that the trial court did not abuse its discretion by admitting testimony from a counselor concerning the Child and Adolescent Trauma Screen, and it concluded that Hendrickson’s bolstering arguments were not preserved for appellate review.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals for the Tenth Appellate District of Texas
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Matt Johnson; Chief Justice Matt Johnson; Justice Smith; Justice Harris
JURISDICTION	Court of Appeals for the Tenth Appellate District of Texas
DECIDED	March 26, 2026
DOCKET	10-24-00043-CR
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Hendrickson appealed his jury conviction for felony indecency with a child by sexual contact and thirty-year sentence, challenging the admission of expert testimony and asserting improper bolstering.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The admission and qualification of expert testimony are reviewed for abuse of discretion. The appellate court will not disturb the ruling if it falls within the zone of reasonable disagreement.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Robert Brian Hendrickson v. The State of Texas

TOPICS

- expert testimony
- criminal procedure
- evidence
- preservation of error
- appellate procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- criminal procedure
- criminal evidence
- appellate procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the trial court abused its discretion under Texas Rule of Evidence 702 by admitting Hodgdon's expert testimony despite an alleged lack of qualification, training, and experience to administer and interpret the Child and Adolescent Trauma Screen.
2. Whether Hendrickson preserved and established a claim that Hodgdon's testimony improperly bolstered I.H.'s testimony.

HOLDINGS

1. The trial court did not abuse its discretion by admitting Hodgdon's expert testimony because the record supported a finding that she had appropriate training and experience in administering and interpreting the Child and Adolescent Trauma Screen.
2. Hendrickson's appellate bolstering arguments were not preserved because they did not comport with the general bolstering and availability objection made at trial; the court therefore overruled the issue.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A trial judge makes three separate inquiries, which must all be met before admitting expert testimony: “(1) the witness qualifies as an expert by reason of his knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education; (2) the subject matter of the testimony is an appropriate one for expert testimony; and (3) admitting the expert testimony will actually assist the fact-finder in deciding the case.”” (at 3)

““Bolstering” could refer to several evidentiary rules.” (at 5)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

In 2020, eleven-year-old I.H. reported to her mother that her father had molested her. I.H. disclosed that when she was nine, Hendrickson moved his hand under her waistband and undergarment and rubbed between her legs while they watched television. At trial, licensed professional counselor associate Rachel Hodgdon testified as an expert regarding I.H.'s PTSD diagnosis, the Child and Adolescent Trauma Screen, and treatment goals.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

A jury found Hendrickson guilty and assessed punishment at thirty years' confinement. The trial court sentenced him accordingly. The Texas Court of Appeals affirmed the judgment.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Lagrone v. State, 942 S.W.2d 602, 616 (Tex. Crim. App. 1997)
- Wolfe v. State, 509 S.W.3d 325, 335 (Tex. Crim. App. 2017)
- State v. Hill, 499 S.W.3d 853, 865 (Tex. Crim. App. 2016)

- Vela v. State, 209 S.W.3d 128, 131 (Tex. Crim. App. 2006)
- Beatley v. State, No. 10-02-118-CR, 2003 WL 21780952, at *3 (Tex. App.—Waco July 30, 2003, pet. ref'd)
- Rivas v. State, 275 S.W.3d 880, 886 (Tex. Crim. App. 2009)
- Wilson v. State, 71 S.W.3d 346, 349 (Tex. Crim. App. 2002)
- Cohn v. State, 849 S.W.2d 817, 819–21 (Tex. Crim. App. 1993)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/court-of-appeals-for-the-tenth-appellate-district-of-texas-court-of-appeals-for-the-tenth-appellate/2026/robert-brian-hendrickson-v-the-state-of-texas-2r8if3rm>