

**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

OPINION

Lancer Wayne Stokes v. the State of Texas

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