

**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

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