

COURT OF APPEALS, SIXTH APPELLATE DISTRICT OF TEXAS AT
TEXARKANA

Chad Russell George v. the State of Texas

No. 06-25-00130-CR · No. 06-25-00130-CR · Decided March 13, 2026

SUMMARY

The Sixth Court of Appeals of Texas at Texarkana affirmed the revocation of Chad Russell George’s community supervision and his resulting two-year imprisonment sentence for endangering a child. Applying *Anders v. California*, the court independently reviewed the record and George’s pro se response and found no reversible error. The court also granted appointed counsel’s motion to withdraw.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals, Sixth Appellate District of Texas at Texarkana
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Justice Jeff Rambin; Chief Justice Stevens; Justice van Cleef; Justice Rambin
JURISDICTION	Court of Appeals, Sixth Appellate District of Texas at Texarkana
DECIDED	March 13, 2026
DOCKET	06-25-00130-CR
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Anders appeal from an order revoking community supervision, adjudicating guilt, and sentencing George to two years' imprisonment for endangering a child.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Independent review of the entire appellate record in an Anders appeal to determine whether reversible error exists.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Chad Russell George v. The State of Texas

TOPICS

- appellate procedure
- criminal procedure
- probation
- standard of review

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether appointed appellate counsel complied with *Anders v. California* by filing a brief demonstrating that the appeal presented no genuinely arguable grounds for reversal.
2. Whether independent review of the appellate record and George's pro se response revealed reversible error in the revocation of community supervision, adjudication of guilt, or sentence.

HOLDINGS

1. Counsel's professional evaluation of the record, explaining why no arguable grounds existed, satisfied the requirements of *Anders v. California*.
2. After independently reviewing the entire appellate record and George's pro se response, the court found no reversible error and affirmed the trial court's judgment.
3. Because the case presented no reversible error, the court granted counsel's motion to withdraw, and no substitute counsel was appointed.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"We have reviewed the entire appellate record and George's pro se response and have independently determined that no reversible error exists." (at 3)

"We affirm the trial court's judgment." (at 3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

George was placed on community supervision after receiving a suspended two-year sentence for endangering a child. The State alleged that he failed to pay required fees and fines and failed to report in January, February, and March 2025. George pleaded true to the payment-related allegation and partially true to the reporting allegation. Following a revocation hearing, the trial court found that he failed to report in February and March, revoked community supervision, adjudicated his guilt, and sentenced him to two years' imprisonment.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

George pleaded guilty under a plea agreement and received suspended sentences with community supervision in three separate causes. The State moved to revoke community supervision and seek adjudication, alleging unpaid fees and fines and failures to report. After a hearing, the trial court found the allegations true in part, revoked community supervision, adjudicated George guilty, and imposed a two-year sentence. Appointed counsel filed an *Anders* brief and moved to withdraw; George filed a pro se response. The court of appeals 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

PER CURIAM.

In the Court of Appeals Sixth Appellate District of Texas at Texarkana No. 06-25-00130-CR CHAD RUSSELL GEORGE, Appellant V. THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee On Appeal from the 6th District Court Red River County, Texas Trial Court No. CR03481 Before Stevens, C.J., van Cleef and Rambin, JJ. Memorandum Opinion by Justice Rambin MEMORANDUM OPINION Chad Russell George was placed on community supervision pursuant to a plea agreement in three separate cause numbers—one charge of injury to a child, for which he was sentenced to ten years’ imprisonment, and two separate charges of endangering a child, for which he was sentenced to two years’ imprisonment on each charge.¹ The trial court suspended George’s sentences and placed him on community supervision for a period of ten years for the first charge and a period of five years for the two separate charges.

The State subsequently moved to revoke George’s community supervision and sought adjudication, alleging, as to his charge of endangering a child, that George failed to pay required fees and fines, and failed to report for the months of January, February, and March of 2025. George pled true to the first allegation and partially true to the second.

After a hearing on the State’s motion to revoke, the trial court found allegation two to be true as to George’s failure to report in February and March, revoked George’s community supervision, adjudicated his guilt, and sentenced him to two years imprisonment for endangering a child. George appeals. George’s attorney has filed a brief stating that he 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 1 This appellate cause number addresses a charge of endangering a child, trial court cause number CR03481.

In companion cause number 06-25-00128-CR, George appeals his conviction for injury to a child in trial court cause number CR03479. In companion cause number 06-25-00129-CR, George appeals his conviction for endangering a child in trial court cause number CR03480. 2 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 December 2, 2025, counsel mailed to George copies of the brief, the motion to withdraw, and a printed copy of the record. George was informed of his rights to review the record and file a pro se response. On December 3, 2025, this Court informed George that his pro se brief, if any were to be filed, was due on or before January 2, 2026.

On January 13, 2026, we notified George that this cause was set for submission on the briefs on February 3, 2026. On January 20, 2026, George filed a motion requesting additional time to file his pro se response, which was granted, giving him until February 19, 2026, to file a pro se response. George’s response was received on February 17, 2026, and the case was re-set for submission on the briefs on March 10, 2026.

We have reviewed the entire appellate record and George’s pro se response and have independently determined that no reversible error exists. See *Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826–27 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005). 3 We affirm the trial court’s judgment.² Jeff Rambin Justice Date Submitted: March 10, 2026 Date Decided: March 13, 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, 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. 4