

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

Lancer Wayne Stokes v. The State of Texas

No. 06-25-00084-CR · No. 06-25-00084-CR · Decided February 27, 2026

SUMMARY

The Texas Sixth Court of Appeals affirmed Lancer Wayne Stokes’s conviction and twenty-two-year sentence for aggravated sexual assault of a child. Applying *Anders v. California*, the court independently reviewed the record, found no arguable grounds for appeal, granted appointed counsel’s motion to withdraw, and determined that no substitute counsel would be appointed.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals for the Sixth Appellate District of Texas at Texarkana
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Justice Charles van Cleef; Chief Justice Stevens; Justice van Cleef; Justice Rambin
JURISDICTION	Court of Appeals for the Sixth Appellate District of Texas at Texarkana
DECIDED	February 27, 2026
DOCKET	06-25-00084-CR
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Direct appeal from a judgment of conviction for aggravated sexual assault of a child and a twenty-two-year prison sentence following a jury trial. Appointed appellate counsel filed an <i>Anders</i> brief and a motion to withdraw.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	In an <i>Anders</i> appeal, the appellate court independently reviews the entire record to determine whether any arguable issue supports the appeal. If the appeal is without merit and presents no reversible error, the court affirms the trial court's judgment.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished memorandum opinion; marked Do Not Publish.
PARTIES	Lancer Wayne Stokes v. The State of Texas

TOPICS

- appellate procedure
- criminal procedure
- right to counsel

PRACTICE AREAS

criminal appellate procedure

appointed appellate counsel

Anders appeals

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether appointed appellate counsel's Anders brief adequately demonstrated that the appeal presented no genuinely arguable issue.
2. Whether the appellate record contained any arguable issue or reversible error requiring reversal of the judgment.
3. Whether counsel should be permitted to withdraw after the court determined that the appeal was wholly frivolous.

HOLDINGS

1. Counsel's professional evaluation of the record, explaining why no arguable grounds for appeal existed, satisfied the requirements of *Anders v. California*.
2. After independently reviewing the entire record and determining that the appeal was wholly frivolous and presented no arguable issue or reversible error, the court was required to affirm the trial court's judgment.
3. Because the appeal presented no reversible error, the court granted appointed counsel's motion to withdraw, and no substitute counsel was appointed.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"We have determined that this appeal is wholly frivolous. We have independently reviewed the entire appellate record and, like counsel, have determined that no arguable issue supports an appeal." (at 2)

"In the Anders context, once we determine that the appeal is without merit, we must affirm the trial court's judgment." (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

A Harrison County jury found Lancer Wayne Stokes guilty of aggravated sexual assault of a child and assessed a sentence of twenty-two years' imprisonment. The appellate opinion states that counsel summarized the trial evidence in the Anders brief, but the court's resolution rested on its independent review of the appellate record and determination that no arguable issue supported reversal.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

A Harrison County jury found Stokes guilty of aggravated sexual assault of a child and assessed twenty-two years' imprisonment. On appeal, appointed counsel filed an Anders brief stating that no genuinely arguable issue existed and sought permission to withdraw. Stokes was provided the brief, motion, and appellate record and was invited to file a pro se response, but filed none. The court independently reviewed the record, found the appeal wholly frivolous, affirmed the trial court's judgment, and granted counsel's motion to withdraw.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

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. 06-25-00084-CR LANCER WAYNE STOKES, Appellant V. THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee On Appeal from the 71st District Court Harrison County, Texas Trial Court No. 23-0183X Before Stevens, C.J., van Cleef and Rambin, JJ. Memorandum Opinion by Justice van Cleef MEMORANDUM OPINION A Harrison County jury found Lancer Wayne Stokes guilty of aggravated sexual assault of a child and assessed a sentence of twenty-two years' imprisonment.

Stokes appeals. Stokes's attorney has filed a brief stating that she 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 31, 2025, counsel mailed to Stokes copies of the brief, the motion to withdraw, and the appellate record. Stokes was informed of his rights to review the record and file a pro se response. On November 3, we informed Stokes that his pro se response was due on or before December 3. By letter dated December 17, this Court informed Stokes that the case would be set for submission on January 7, 2026.

We received neither a pro se response from Stokes nor a motion requesting an extension of time in which to file such a response. We have determined that this appeal is wholly frivolous. We have

independently reviewed the entire appellate record and, like counsel, have determined that no arguable issue 2 supports an appeal. See *Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826–27 (Tex.

Crim. App. 2005). In the *Anders* context, once we determine that the appeal is without merit, we must affirm the trial court’s judgment. *Id.* We affirm the judgment of the trial court.¹ Charles van Cleef Justice Date Submitted: January 7, 2026 Date Decided: February 27, 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, the 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