

COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS AT BEAUMONT

Max Alexander Rodeman v. The State of Texas

Nos. 09-25-00177-CR, 09-25-00178-CR, 09-25-00179-CR, 09-25-00180-CR, 09-25-00181-CR (Tex. App.—Beaumont May 6, 2026) (mem. op.) · No. Nos. 09-25-00177-CR, 09-25-00178-CR, 09-25-00179-CR, 09-25-00180-CR, 09-25-00181-CR · Decided May 6, 2026

SUMMARY

The Ninth Court of Appeals of Texas at Beaumont reviewed Max Alexander Rodeman’s Anders appeal from five convictions for possession with intent to promote child pornography. Rodeman pleaded guilty and received concurrent fifteen-year sentences for each count. After independently reviewing the record and finding no reversible error or arguable grounds for appeal, the court affirmed the trial court’s judgments.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals for the Ninth District of Texas at Beaumont
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Kent Chambers; Golemon, C.J.; Wright, J.; Chambers, J.
JURISDICTION	Court of Appeals for the Ninth District of Texas at Beaumont
DECIDED	May 6, 2026
DOCKET	Nos. 09-25-00177-CR, 09-25-00178-CR, 09-25-00179-CR, 09-25-00180-CR, 09-25-00181-CR
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Rodeman appealed five convictions for second-degree felony possession with intent to promote child pornography after pleading guilty and receiving concurrent fifteen-year sentences. Appointed appellate counsel filed an Anders brief stating that the appeal was frivolous, and Rodeman did not file a pro se brief.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Upon receiving an Anders brief, the court of appeals must conduct a full examination of the record to determine whether the appeal is wholly frivolous and whether any reversible error or arguable grounds for appeal exist.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished memorandum opinion; designated Do Not Publish.
PARTIES	Max Alexander Rodeman v. The State of Texas

TOPICS

appellate procedure

criminal procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

criminal appellate practice

criminal procedure

Anders appeals

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the Anders review of the record revealed any reversible error or arguable grounds for appeal.
2. Whether appointment of new appellate counsel was required to rebrief the appeal.

HOLDINGS

1. After conducting a full examination of the record and reviewing appellate counsel's Anders brief, the court found no reversible error and nothing that would arguably support an appeal.
2. Appointment of new appellate counsel was unnecessary because the court found no arguable grounds for appeal.

KEY QUOTATIONS

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

“We have reviewed the entire record, counsel’s brief, and have found no reversible error and nothing that would arguably support an appeal.” (at 3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

A grand jury indicted Max Alexander Rodeman on five counts of second-degree felony possession with intent to promote child pornography. Rodeman pleaded guilty to all five counts while represented by counsel. Following a punishment hearing, the trial court imposed fifteen years' imprisonment on each count and ordered the sentences to run concurrently.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

A grand jury indicted Rodeman on five counts under Texas Penal Code section 43.26(g). He pleaded guilty to each count, and after a punishment hearing the 221st District Court of Montgomery County assessed fifteen years' imprisonment on each count, to run concurrently. The court of appeals reviewed the record, the Anders brief, and the absence of a pro se brief, found no reversible error or arguable grounds for appeal, and affirmed the judgments.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967)
- *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978)
- *Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826-28 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005)
- *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 511 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991)
- *Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 80 (1988)

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

In The Court of Appeals Ninth District of Texas at Beaumont _____ NO. 09-25-00177-CR NO. 09-25-00178-CR NO. 09-25-00179-CR NO. 09-25-00180-CR NO. 09-25-00181-CR _____ MAX ALEXANDER RODEMAN, Appellant V. THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

On
Appeal from the 221st District Court Montgomery County, Texas Trial Cause Nos. 23-08-11864, 23-08-11862, 23-08-11865, 23-08-11867, 23-08-11868

MEMORANDUM OPINION A grand jury indicted Max Alexander Rodeman on five counts for second- degree felony possession with intent to promote child pornography.

See Tex. Penal Code Ann. § 43.26(g). Rodeman pleaded “guilty” to each count and was represented by counsel. After hearing evidence on punishment, the trial court assessed a 1 punishment of fifteen years in the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Institutional Division, on each count and ordered the sentences to run concurrently. Rodeman timely filed a notice of appeal.

Rodeman’s court-appointed 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).

We granted an extension of time for Rodeman to file a *pro se* brief, and Rodeman did not file a *pro se* brief. The Court of Criminal Appeals has held that when a court of appeals receives an *Anders* brief, the appellate court has two choices. See *Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826-27 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005). “It may determine that the appeal is wholly frivolous and issue an opinion explaining that it has reviewed the record and finds no reversible error[;] [o]r, it may determine that arguable grounds for appeal exist and remand the cause to the trial court so that new counsel may be appointed to brief the issues.” *Id.* (citing *Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744; *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 511 (Tex.

Crim. App. 1991)). The Court of Criminal Appeals has held that we need not address the merits of issues raised in an *Anders* brief or a *pro se* response. *Bledsoe*, 178 S.W.3d at 826-27. Upon receiving an *Anders* brief, this Court must conduct a full examination of the record to determine

whether the appeal is wholly frivolous. *Penson v. Ohio*, 2 488 U.S. 75, 80 (1988) (citing *Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744).

We have reviewed the entire record, counsel's brief, and have found no reversible error and nothing that would arguably support an appeal. See *Bledsoe*, 178 S.W.3d at 827-28 ("Due to the nature of *Anders* briefs, by indicating in the opinion that it 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*, 813 S.W.2d at 511. We affirm the trial court's judgments. AFFIRMED. KENT CHAMBERS Justice Submitted on April 29, 2026 Opinion Delivered May 6, 2026 Do Not Publish Before Golemon, C.J., Wright and Chambers, JJ. 3