

COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AT FORT WORTH

Ex parte Brayden Channing Coin

No. 02-25-00470-CR (Tex. App.—Fort Worth May 21, 2026) (mem. op., not designated for publication) · No.
No. 02-25-00470-CR · Decided May 21, 2026

SUMMARY

The Texas Court of Appeals for the Second District affirmed the denial of Brayden Channing Coin’s application for habeas relief from deferred adjudication community supervision. The court held that the habeas court’s factual findings supported its conclusions that counsel’s alleged failures to investigate Fortnite’s release availability, challenge adult-court jurisdiction, and advise Coin about the significance of his age did not establish ineffective assistance or prejudice.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals for the Second Appellate District of Texas at Fort Worth
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Bonnie Sudderth, Chief Justice; Elizabeth Kerr, Justice; Brian Birdwell, Justice
JURISDICTION	Texas Court of Appeals, Second Appellate District, Fort Worth
DECIDED	May 21, 2026
DOCKET	No. 02-25-00470-CR
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Appeal from the denial of an application for writ of habeas corpus challenging restraints imposed by deferred adjudication community supervision and asserting ineffective assistance of trial counsel.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The denial of habeas relief is reviewed for an abuse of discretion. The habeas court is the sole finder of fact, and its supported factual findings, particularly credibility-based findings, receive almost total deference, even when the evidence consists solely of affidavits, depositions, or interrogatories. An ineffective-assistance applicant bears the burden of proving prejudice by a preponderance of the evidence.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential; memorandum opinion designated not for publication.

PARTIES

Brayden Channing Coin v. The State of Texas

TOPICS

habeas corpus

ineffective assistance

plea bargaining

appellate procedure

criminal procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

criminal procedure

habeas corpus

ineffective assistance of counsel

plea bargaining

juvenile jurisdiction

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether trial counsel was ineffective for failing to investigate Fortnite's prerelease availability.
2. Whether trial counsel was ineffective for failing to move to transfer the case from adult criminal court to juvenile court based on the alleged weakness of the State's evidence concerning the offense date and Coin's age.
3. Whether trial counsel was ineffective for failing to advise Coin about the jurisdictional and evidentiary significance of his age, allegedly rendering his guilty plea involuntary.
4. Whether the habeas court abused its discretion by denying relief based on factual findings credited from the record and trial counsel's verifications.

HOLDINGS

1. Coin failed to establish prejudice from counsel's alleged failure to investigate because he did not show that the investigation would have produced evidence reasonably capable of changing the result.
2. Coin failed to establish ineffective assistance based on counsel's failure to seek a transfer because he did not show that a transfer motion would have been meritorious or granted.
3. Coin failed to establish that counsel's advice was deficient or that any alleged failure prejudiced his guilty plea.
4. The court of appeals was required to defer to the habeas court's supported factual findings, which were dispositive of Coin's ineffective-assistance claims.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“When, as here, a habeas applicant claims that his trial counsel provided ineffective assistance, the applicant bears the burden to show by a preponderance of the evidence that among other things, his trial counsel’s allegedly deficient performance prejudiced his defense.” (7)

*“The habeas court is the “sole finder of fact,” Sanchez, 625 S.W.3d at 144; Johnson, 2025 WL 2736522, at *2, and its fact findings are both supported by the record and fatal to Coin’s appellate complaints.” (14)*

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Coin admitted to law enforcement that he sexually assaulted the victim when he was 13 or 14, but the State also had evidence suggesting assaults occurred after Coin turned 17. The victim described an assault occurring near

her eighth-grade STAAR testing and another while she and Coin played Fortnite on an Xbox; the latter game was not publicly released for Xbox until after Coin's seventeenth birthday. Coin pleaded guilty to sexual assault in exchange for deferred adjudication community supervision, later asserting that counsel's failure to investigate Fortnite's prerelease availability and the age issue caused him to accept an involuntary plea.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Coin pleaded guilty to sexual assault in exchange for deferred adjudication community supervision, and the State dismissed related adult criminal charges. After approximately one year of supervision, he filed an application for habeas corpus under Texas Code of Criminal Procedure article 11.072, alleging that trial counsel failed to investigate Fortnite's release history, failed to challenge the adult criminal court's jurisdiction, and failed to advise him about the significance of his age. The habeas court credited the State's evidence and trial counsel's verifications, adopted findings of fact and conclusions of law, and denied relief. The court of appeals affirmed.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Ex parte Roberts, No. 02-25-00308-CR, 2025 WL 3683998, at *4-6 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth Dec. 18, 2025, no pet.) (mem. op., not designated for publication)
- Ex parte Juara, 643 S.W.3d 702, 712 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2021, pet. ref'd)
- Ex parte Johnson, No. 02-25-00242-CR, 2025 WL 2736522, at *2 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth Sept. 25, 2025, no pet.) (mem. op., not designated for publication)
- Rench v. State, No. 02-23-00143-CR, 2024 WL 482232, at *4-5 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth Feb. 8, 2024, no pet.) (mem. op., not designated for publication)
- Jackson v. State, 973 S.W.2d 954, 957 (Tex. Crim. App. 1998)
- Brown v. State, No. 02-10-00452-CR, 2012 WL 335851, at *11 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth Feb. 2, 2012, no pet.) (per curiam) (mem. op., not designated for publication)
- Deaver v. State, 314 S.W.3d 481, 484-87 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2010, no pet.)
- Ex parte Chandler, 182 S.W.3d 350, 356 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005) (order)
- Ex parte Moody, 991 S.W.2d 856, 857-58 (Tex. Crim. App. 1999)
- Ex parte Sanchez, 625 S.W.3d 139, 144 (Tex. Crim. App. 2021)
- State v. Guerrero, 400 S.W.3d 576, 583 (Tex. Crim. App. 2013)