

COURT OF APPEALS OF TEXAS, SIXTH APPELLATE DISTRICT AT
TEXARKANA

Ruby Dee Isaacs v. The State of Texas

No. 06-25-00048-CR · No. 06-25-00048-CR · Decided January 5, 2026

SUMMARY

The Sixth Court of Appeals of Texas at Texarkana reviewed Ruby Dee Isaacs’s Anders appeal from her conviction for aggravated assault with a deadly weapon and found no reversible error. The court modified the judgment and bill of costs to reduce the sheriff’s reimbursement fee from \$360.00 to \$170.00, affirmed the judgment as modified, and granted appointed counsel’s motion to withdraw.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals of Texas, Sixth Appellate District at Texarkana
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Charles van Cleef; Stevens, C.J.; van Cleef, J.; Rambin, J.
JURISDICTION	Court of Appeals of Texas, Sixth Appellate District at Texarkana
DECIDED	January 5, 2026
DOCKET	06-25-00048-CR
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Isaacs appealed her conviction and sentence following an open guilty plea to aggravated assault with a deadly weapon and a punishment trial at which the jury assessed thirty years' imprisonment. Appointed appellate counsel filed an Anders brief and moved to withdraw.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The appellate court independently reviewed the entire record and the appellant's pro se response for reversible error under the Anders procedure.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Ruby Dee Isaacs v. The State of Texas

TOPICS

- appellate procedure
- criminal procedure
- remedies
- sentencing

PRACTICE AREAS

- Texas criminal appellate procedure
- Anders appeals
- criminal sentencing and costs

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether appointed appellate counsel satisfied the requirements of *Anders v. California* by filing a brief demonstrating that no genuinely arguable appellate issues existed.
2. Whether independent review of the appellate record and Isaacs's pro se response revealed reversible error.
3. Whether the trial court's judgment and bill of costs should be modified to correct the sheriff's reimbursement fee from \$360.00 to \$170.00.
4. Whether appellate counsel's motion to withdraw should be granted under *Anders*.

HOLDINGS

1. Counsel's brief constituted a professional evaluation of the record demonstrating why no arguable grounds existed and therefore satisfied the requirements of *Anders v. California*.
2. The appellate court independently reviewed the entire record and Isaacs's pro se response and determined that no reversible error existed.
3. The trial court's judgment and bill of costs had to be modified to reduce the sheriff's reimbursement fee from \$360.00 to \$170.00 because the appellate record supported only \$170.00 in fees.
4. The court granted counsel's motion to withdraw because the case presented no reversible error and no substitute counsel would be appointed.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"We have reviewed the entire appellate record and Isaacs's pro se response and have independently determined that no reversible error exists." (at 2)

"Accordingly, we modify the trial court's judgment and bill of costs to show that the sheriff's reimbursement fee is \$170.00 instead of \$360.00." (at 2)

"As modified, we affirm the trial court's judgment." (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Ruby Dee Isaacs entered an open plea of guilty to aggravated assault with a deadly weapon. During the punishment trial, she pleaded true to the State's punishment enhancement allegation, and the jury assessed thirty years' imprisonment. The trial court imposed the sentence and assessed \$360.00 in sheriff's reimbursement fees, although the appellate record supported only \$170.00 in such fees.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Isaacs pleaded guilty to aggravated assault with a deadly weapon, pleaded true to a punishment enhancement allegation, and received a thirty-year sentence from the trial court. The trial court also ordered her to pay \$360.00 in sheriff's reimbursement fees. On appeal, counsel filed an *Anders* brief asserting that no genuinely arguable grounds existed, Isaacs filed a pro se response, and the Court of Appeals independently reviewed the

record. The court found no reversible error but modified the judgment and bill of costs to reduce the sheriff's reimbursement fee to \$170.00, affirmed as modified, and granted counsel's motion to withdraw.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738, 743–44 (1967)
- In re Schulman, 252 S.W.3d 403, 406 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008) (orig. proceeding)
- Stafford v. State, 813 S.W.2d 503, 509–10 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991)
- High v. State, 573 S.W.2d 807, 812–13 (Tex. Crim. App. [Panel Op.] 1978)
- 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. 06-25-00048-CR RUBY DEE ISAACS, Appellant V. THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee On Appeal from the 402nd District Court Wood County, Texas Trial Court No. 25,321-2023 Before Stevens, C.J., van Cleef and Rambin, JJ. Memorandum Opinion by Justice van Cleef MEMORANDUM OPINION Ruby Dee Isaacs entered an open plea of guilty to aggravated assault with a deadly weapon.

See TEX. PENAL CODE ANN. § 22.02(a)(2) (Supp.). During a punishment trial, Isaacs pled true to the State's punishment enhancement allegation, and the jury assessed a sentence of thirty years' imprisonment. The trial court imposed Isaacs's sentence and ordered her to pay \$360.00 in sheriff's reimbursement fees. Isaacs appeals. Isaacs's attorney has filed a brief stating that he reviewed the record and found no genuinely arguable issues that could be raised on appeal.

The brief sets out the procedural history of the case and summarizes the evidence elicited during the course of 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 v. California. Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738, 743–44 (1967); In re Schulman, 252 S.W.3d 403, 406 (Tex.

Crim. App. 2008) (orig. proceeding); Stafford v. State, 813 S.W.2d 503, 509–10 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991); High v. State, 573 S.W.2d 807, 812–13 (Tex. Crim. App. [Panel Op.] 1978). Counsel also filed a motion with this Court seeking to withdraw as counsel in this appeal.

On October 10, 2025, counsel mailed to Isaacs copies of the brief, the motion to withdraw, and a motion for pro se access to the appellate record lacking only Isaacs's signature. Isaacs was

informed of her rights to review the record and file a pro se response.

We have received Isaacs's pro se response.² We have reviewed the entire appellate record and Isaacs's pro se response and have independently determined that no reversible error exists. See *Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826–27 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005).

However, non-reversible error is found in the trial court's judgment and bill of costs. Both the judgment and bill of costs contain a \$360.00 sheriff's reimbursement fee, but the appellate record only supports sheriff's reimbursement fees of \$170.00.

Accordingly, we modify the trial court's judgment and bill of costs to show that the sheriff's reimbursement fee is \$170.00 instead of \$360.00. As modified, we affirm the trial court's judgment.¹ Charles van Cleef Justice Date Submitted: December 1, 2025 Date Decided: January 5, 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