

COURT OF APPEALS SIXTH APPELLATE DISTRICT OF TEXAS AT
TEXARKANA

Edwardo Morrow v. the State of Texas

No. 06-25-00100-CR (Tex. App.—Texarkana May 22, 2026) (mem. op.) · No. No. 06-25-00100-CR · Decided
May 22, 2026

SUMMARY

The Sixth Court of Appeals of Texas at Texarkana affirmed Edwardo Morrow’s conviction and twenty-seven-year sentence for possession of four grams or more but less than 200 grams of methamphetamine. Applying *Anders v. California*, the court independently reviewed the record, found no reversible error, and granted appellate counsel’s motion to withdraw.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals Sixth Appellate District of Texas at Texarkana
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jeff Ramin; Stevens, C.J.; van Cleef, J.; Ramin, J.
JURISDICTION	Court of Appeals Sixth Appellate District of Texas at Texarkana
DECIDED	May 22, 2026
DOCKET	No. 06-25-00100-CR
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Morrow appealed his conviction and sentence following a guilty plea. Appellate counsel filed an <i>Anders</i> brief asserting that the appeal presented no meritorious or reversible error and moved to withdraw.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	In an <i>Anders</i> appeal, the appellate court independently reviews the entire record to determine whether reversible error exists.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished memorandum opinion; marked Do Not Publish.
PARTIES	Edwardo Morrow v. The State of Texas

TOPICS

- appellate procedure
- criminal procedure
- standard of review

PRACTICE AREAS

- criminal appellate procedure
- criminal procedure
- Anders appeals

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether independent review of the record in accordance with Anders disclosed any reversible error requiring reversal of Morrow's conviction or sentence.
2. Whether appellate counsel should be permitted to withdraw after filing an Anders brief.

HOLDINGS

1. After independently reviewing the entire appellate record and the Anders brief, the court determined that no reversible error existed and affirmed the trial court's judgment.
2. Counsel's professional evaluation of the record satisfied the requirements of Anders.
3. The court granted appellate counsel's motion to withdraw after determining that the case presented no reversible error.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"We have reviewed the entire appellate record and have independently determined that no reversible error exists."

"In the Anders context, once we determine that no reversible error exists, we must affirm the trial court's judgment."

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Morrow pleaded guilty to second-degree felony possession of methamphetamine in an amount of four grams or more but less than 200 grams. Following closing arguments by both parties without the presentation of evidence, the trial court accepted the plea and assessed a twenty-seven-year prison sentence.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Morrow pleaded guilty in the 124th District Court of Gregg County to second-degree felony possession of methamphetamine weighing four grams or more but less than 200 grams. After closing arguments without the presentation of evidence, the trial court accepted the plea and assessed twenty-seven years' imprisonment. On appeal, counsel filed an Anders brief and motion to withdraw; Morrow was notified of his right to file a pro se response but filed none. The Court of Appeals independently reviewed the record, found no reversible error, affirmed the judgment, and granted counsel's motion to withdraw.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967)
- Kelly v. State, 436 S.W.3d 313, 319–20 (Tex. Crim. App. 2014)
- Bledsoe v. State, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826–27 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005)

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

In the Court of Appeals Sixth Appellate District of Texas at Texarkana No. 06-25-00100-CR EDUARDO MORROW, Appellant V. THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee On Appeal from the 124th District Court Gregg County, Texas Trial Court No. 56481-B Before Stevens, C.J., van Cleef and Rambin, JJ. Memorandum Opinion by Justice Rambin MEMORANDUM OPINION Edwardo Morrow pled guilty to second-degree felony offense of possession of a controlled substance, methamphetamine, in an amount of four grams or more but less than 200 grams.

See TEX. HEALTH & SAFETY CODE ANN. § 481.115(a), (d) (Supp.). After both parties made closing arguments without presenting evidence, the trial court accepted Morrow's plea and assessed him twenty-seven years' imprisonment. Morrow appeals. Morrow's appellate counsel filed a brief pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), asserting that the appeal is without merit and that no reversible error appears in the record.

We have conducted an independent review of the entire record and the *Anders* brief. We affirm the trial court's judgment. Morrow's trial counsel has filed a brief stating that he reviewed the record and found no genuinely arguable issues that could be raised on appeal.

The brief outlines the procedural history of the case and summarizes the evidence presented during the trial court proceedings. Since counsel has provided a professional evaluation of the record demonstrating why there are no arguable grounds to be advanced, that evaluation meets the requirements of *Anders*. *Anders*, 386 U.S. at 743; *Kelly v. State*, 436 S.W.3d 313, 319–20 (Tex.

Crim. App. 2014). Counsel also filed a motion with this Court seeking to withdraw as counsel in this appeal. On March 16, 2026, appellate counsel mailed to Morrow copies of the brief, the motion to withdraw, and a copy of the appellate record. Morrow was informed of his right to review the record and file a pro se response. 2 By this Court's letter dated March 16, 2026, this Court informed Morrow that his pro se response was due on or before April 15, 2026.

On April 29, 2026, we further informed Morrow that the case would be set for submission on May 20, 2026. We received neither a pro se response from Morrow nor a motion requesting an extension of time in which to file such a response.

We have reviewed the entire appellate record and have independently determined that no reversible error exists. See *Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826–27 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005). In the *Anders* context, once we determine that no reversible error exists, we must affirm the trial court's judgment. *Id.* We affirm the trial court's judgment.¹ Jeff Rambin Justice Date Submitted: May 20, 2026 Date Decided: May 22, 2026 Do Not Publish 1 Since we agree that this case presents no reversible error, we also, in accordance with *Anders*, grant counsel's request to withdraw from further representation of appellant in this case.

See *Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744. No substitute counsel will be appointed. Should appellant desire to seek further review of this case by the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals, appellant must either retain an attorney to file a petition for discretionary review or file a pro se petition for discretionary review. Any petition for discretionary review (1) must be filed within thirty days from either the date of this opinion or the date on which the last timely motion for rehearing was overruled by this Court, see TEX. R. APP.

P. 68.2, (2) must be filed with the clerk of the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals, see TEX. R. APP. P. 68.3, and (3) should comply with the requirements of Rule 68.4 of the Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure, see TEX. R. APP. P. 68.4. 3