

COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SIXTH APPELLATE DISTRICT OF TEXAS AT
TEXARKANA

Matthew Riddle v. the State of Texas

Matthew Riddle v. State of Texas, No. 06-25-00089-CR (Tex. App.—Texarkana Jan. 30, 2026) (mem. op.) · No. 06-25-00089-CR · Decided January 30, 2026

SUMMARY

The Sixth Court of Appeals of Texas at Texarkana affirmed Matthew Riddle’s conviction for child grooming and the sentence of ten years’ imprisonment and a \$10,000 fine. The court overruled his constitutional challenge to Texas Penal Code Section 15.032 as inadequately briefed, consistent with its reasoning in a companion appeal.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals for the Sixth Appellate District of Texas at Texarkana
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Chief Justice Scott E. Stevens; Justice van Cleef; Justice Rambin
JURISDICTION	Court of Appeals for the Sixth Appellate District of Texas at Texarkana
DECIDED	January 30, 2026
DOCKET	06-25-00089-CR
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Riddle appealed his Bowie County jury conviction for child grooming and the resulting ten-year prison sentence and \$10,000 fine.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Matthew Riddle v. The State of Texas

TOPICS

- criminal procedure
- first amendment
- void for vagueness
- overbreadth doctrine
- appellate procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- criminal law
- criminal procedure
- constitutional law
- appellate practice

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Riddle adequately briefed his constitutional challenge asserting that Texas Penal Code section 15.032 violated the First Amendment and was vague and overbroad.

HOLDINGS

1. Riddle's constitutional challenge was inadequately briefed and therefore was overruled.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

A Bowie County jury convicted Matthew Riddle of child grooming under Texas Penal Code section 15.032. The jury assessed punishment at ten years' imprisonment and a \$10,000 fine.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

A jury in the 202nd District Court of Bowie County convicted Riddle of child grooming under Texas Penal Code section 15.032 and assessed punishment. On appeal, Riddle argued that section 15.032 was unconstitutional under the First Amendment and was vague and overbroad; the court overruled the issue as inadequately briefed and affirmed the judgment.

DISPOSITION

affirmed