

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PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential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)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/court-of-appeals-sixth-appellate-district-of-texas-at-texarkana-court-of-appeals-sixth-appellate-dis/2026/chad-russell-george-v-the-state-of-texas-tz2b59wg>