

**COURT OF APPEALS SIXTH APPELLATE DISTRICT OF TEXAS AT
TEXARKANA**

Robert Wayne Dugan II v. the State of Texas

No. 06-26-00027-CR · No. No. 06-26-00027-CR · Decided June 11, 2026

SUMMARY

The Sixth Court of Appeals of Texas at Texarkana affirmed the trial court's judgment after Robert Wayne Dugan II pleaded guilty to first-degree felony manufacture or delivery of methamphetamine and received a twenty-four-year prison sentence. Applying *Anders v. California*, the court found no arguable issues supporting the appeal, granted appointed counsel's motion to withdraw, and concluded the appeal was wholly frivolous.

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

In the Court of Appeals Sixth Appellate District of Texas at Texarkana No. 06-26-00027-CR ROBERT WAYNE DUGAN II, Appellant V. THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee On Appeal from the 355th District Court Hood County, Texas Trial Court No. CR16978 Before Stevens, C.J., van Cleef and Rambin, JJ. Memorandum Opinion by Chief Justice Stevens MEMORANDUM OPINION Robert Wayne Dugan, II, pled guilty to the first-degree felony of manufacture or delivery of a controlled substance, methamphetamine, four grams or more but less than 200 grams.

See TEX. HEALTH & SAFETY CODE ANN. § 481.112 (Supp.). Dugan was advised at the time of his plea that the punishment range for the first-degree felony offense was from five to ninety-nine years or life in prison and a fine of up to \$10,000.00. There was a punishment hearing before the bench, and the trial court sentenced Dugan to twenty-four years' incarceration.

Dugan appeals.¹ Dugan'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 March 19, 2026, counsel confirmed that copies of the brief, the motion to 1 Originally appealed to the Second Court of Appeals, this case was transferred to this Court by the Texas Supreme Court pursuant to its docket equalization efforts. See TEX. GOV'T CODE ANN. § 73.001 (Supp.).

We follow the precedent of the Second Court of Appeals in deciding the issues presented. See TEX. R. APP. P. 41.3. 2 withdraw, the record, and a letter outlining his pro se rights were delivered to Dugan. Dugan was informed of his rights to review the record and file a pro se response. By letter dated April 22, this Court informed Dugan that the case would be set for submission on May 13.

We received neither a pro se response from Dugan 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 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.² Scott E. Stevens Chief Justice Date Submitted: May 13, 2026 Date Decided: June 11, 2026 Do Not Publish 2 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