

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

Michael Steven Sickler v. the State of Texas

Sickler v. State, No. 06-25-00086-CR (Tex. App.—Texarkana Feb. 19, 2026) (mem. op., not designated for publication) · No. No. 06-25-00086-CR · Decided February 19, 2026

SUMMARY

The Sixth Court of Appeals of Texas at Texarkana affirmed Michael Steven Sickler’s twenty-year prison sentence following his open guilty plea to sexual assault of a child. In an Anders appeal, the court independently reviewed the record, found no reversible error, and granted appointed counsel’s motion to withdraw.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals for the Sixth Appellate District of Texas at Texarkana
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Scott E. Stevens, Chief Justice; Charles van Cleef, Justice; Randy Rambin, Justice
JURISDICTION	Court of Appeals for the Sixth Appellate District of Texas at Texarkana
DECIDED	February 19, 2026
DOCKET	No. 06-25-00086-CR
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Sickler appealed his conviction and twenty-year sentence following an open guilty plea to sexual assault of a child. Appellate counsel filed an Anders brief and moved to withdraw.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	In an Anders appeal, the appellate court independently reviews the entire record to determine whether reversible error exists.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential memorandum opinion; designated Do Not Publish.
PARTIES	Michael Steven Sickler v. The State of Texas

TOPICS

- appellate procedure
- criminal procedure
- right to counsel

PRACTICE AREAS

- criminal appellate procedure
- criminal procedure
- appointed counsel

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether independent review of the record in this Anders appeal revealed any reversible error.
2. Whether appellate counsel should be permitted to withdraw after filing an Anders brief.

HOLDINGS

1. After independently reviewing the entire appellate record, the court determined that no reversible error existed and affirmed the trial court's judgment.
2. The court granted appellate counsel's motion to withdraw because the case presented no reversible error and counsel had complied with Anders requirements.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“We have reviewed the entire appellate record and have independently determined that no reversible error exists.” (at 2)

“In the Anders context, once we determine that no reversible error exists, we must affirm the trial court’s judgment.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Sickler was indicted for sexual assault of a child under Texas Penal Code section 22.011(a)(2). He entered an open guilty plea, and the trial court imposed a twenty-year prison sentence. Appellate counsel reviewed the record, found no genuinely arguable grounds for appeal, and filed an Anders brief and motion to withdraw.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Sickler was indicted in the 124th District Court of Gregg County, Texas, for sexual assault of a child. He entered an open guilty plea, and the trial court sentenced him to twenty years' imprisonment. On appeal, appointed counsel filed an Anders brief asserting that no genuinely arguable issue existed and moved to withdraw. Sickler was given access to the record and opportunities to file a pro se response but filed none. The court independently reviewed the record and affirmed.

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

Michael Steven Sickler v. the State of Texas

PER CURIAM.

In the Court of Appeals Sixth Appellate District of Texas at Texarkana No. 06-25-00086-CR MICHAEL STEVEN SICKLER, Appellant V. THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee On Appeal from the 124th District Court Gregg County, Texas Trial Court No. 56127-B Before Stevens, C.J., van Cleef and Rambin, JJ. Memorandum Opinion by Chief Justice Stevens

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Michael Steven Sickler was indicted for sexual assault of a child. See TEX. PENAL CODE ANN. § 22.011(a)(2) (Supp.). Sickler entered an open plea of guilty, and the trial court sentenced him to twenty years' imprisonment. Sickler appeals. Sickler's attorney 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 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 September 29, 2025, counsel mailed Sickler copies of the brief, her motion to withdraw, and a motion for pro se access to the appellate record. Counsel informed Sickler of his rights to review the record and file a pro se response. On October 21, 2025, we sent notice that the case had been set for submission and that any pro se response needed to be filed by November 12, 2025. On November 10, 2025, Sickler filed a pro se motion seeking access to the record, which was granted. Sickler's pro se response was due December 29, 2025. On January 9, 2026, notice was sent that the case was again set for submission on the briefs for January 30, 2026. We have received no pro se response from Sickler. 2 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 Scott E. Stevens Chief Justice Date Submitted: January 30, 2026 Date Decided: February 19, 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

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/court-of-appeals-for-the-sixth-appellate-district-of-texas-at-texarkana-court-of-appeals-for-the-six/2026/michael-steven-sickler-v-the-state-of-texas-qcstkjefn>