

COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIRST DISTRICT OF TEXAS

Cadwallader Coles v. the State of Texas

No. 01-23-00949-CR (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] Dec. 11, 2025) (mem. op.) · No. 01-23-00949-CR ·
Decided December 11, 2025

SUMMARY

The Texas Court of Appeals for the First District affirmed Cadwallader Coles’s conviction for sexual assault and six-year prison sentence. The court held that the complainant’s prompt report and testimony, corroborated by DNA evidence, were legally sufficient to establish sexual contact. The opinion also addresses the admissibility of evidence concerning drugs, drug paraphernalia, and a crack pipe discovered during a jail search.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals for the First District of Texas
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Andrew Johnson; Justice Guerra; Justice Guiney; Justice Johnson
JURISDICTION	Court of Appeals for the First District of Texas
DECIDED	December 11, 2025
DOCKET	01-23-00949-CR
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Coles appealed his jury conviction for sexual assault and six-year prison sentence, challenging the sufficiency of the evidence and the admission of evidence concerning drugs, drug paraphernalia, and a crack pipe.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Legal sufficiency is reviewed by asking whether any rational trier of fact could have found all essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt, viewing all admitted evidence in the light most favorable to the verdict and deferring to the jury's credibility and weight determinations. Evidentiary rulings under Rules 403 and 404(b) are reviewed for abuse of discretion and upheld if within the zone of reasonable disagreement.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Cadwallader Coles v. The State of Texas

TOPICS

evidence

criminal procedure

appellate procedure

relevance

character evidence

PRACTICE AREAS

criminal law

criminal procedure

evidence

appellate practice

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether legally sufficient evidence supported Coles's sexual-assault conviction.
2. Whether the trial court abused its discretion by admitting evidence of drugs and drug paraphernalia displayed after the assault and found in the CT scan-room control area under Texas Rules of Evidence 404(b) and 403.
3. Whether the trial court abused its discretion by allowing the State to reopen its case and introduce evidence of a crack pipe found during Coles's strip search at the Harris County jail under Rule 404(b).

HOLDINGS

1. The evidence was legally sufficient for a rational jury to find beyond a reasonable doubt that Coles caused his sexual organ to contact Jeff's mouth without Jeff's consent.
2. The trial court did not abuse its discretion by admitting evidence that Coles displayed a white rock, burned glass object, and lighter immediately after the alleged assault.
3. The trial court did not abuse its discretion by admitting evidence of drugs and drug paraphernalia found in the CT scan-room control area.
4. The trial court did not abuse its discretion by admitting evidence that a crack pipe was found during Coles's strip search at the Harris County jail.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“When reviewing a jury’s verdict for evidentiary sufficiency, we must uphold the verdict if any rational trier of fact could have found all the essential elements of the offense proven beyond a reasonable doubt.” (at 10)

“Same-transaction contextual evidence is thus admissible when several offenses are so interconnected as to form a single, indivisible criminal transaction, such that in describing one it is “impracticable” to avoid describing the other.” (at 19-20)

“A jury also could reasonably infer appellant was trying to use drugs as a means of “bribing” Jeff not to report the assault or that he was trying to persuade Jeff to intoxicate himself to diminish his credibility should he report the incident.” (at 21)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Coles, a hospital radiology technician, performed a CT scan on Jeff, who testified that Coles locked the scan-room door, sexually assaulted him, blocked his exit, and displayed items that appeared to be drugs. Coles denied the assault and claimed that Jeff and Marie fabricated the accusation for financial gain, while explaining the DNA found on Jeff's penis as the result of defensive contact and transfer during masturbation. Police found

drugs and drug paraphernalia in the scan-room control area, and a crack pipe was later found during a search at the Harris County jail. DNA testing provided very strong support that Coles was the source of DNA found on a swab from Jeff's penis.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

A jury found Coles guilty of sexual assault in the 351st District Court of Harris County. The trial court sentenced him to six years in prison. The First Court of Appeals affirmed the judgment.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Rodriguez v. State, No. 01-18-00708-CR, 2019 WL 5699737, at *2 n.2 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] Nov. 5, 2019, no pet.)
- Benavidez v. State, 323 S.W.3d 179, 181 (Tex. Crim. App. 2010)
- Edward v. State, 635 S.W.3d 649, 655-56 (Tex. Crim. App. 2021)
- Cary v. State, 507 S.W.3d 761, 766 (Tex. Crim. App. 2016)
- Harrell v. State, 620 S.W.3d 910, 913-14 (Tex. Crim. App. 2021)
- Winfrey v. State, 393 S.W.3d 763, 767 (Tex. Crim. App. 2013)
- Merritt v. State, 368 S.W.3d 516, 525 (Tex. Crim. App. 2012)
- Canfield v. State, 429 S.W.3d 54, 65 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2014, pet. ref'd)
- Lancon v. State, 253 S.W.3d 699, 705 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008)
- Isassi v. State, 330 S.W.3d 633, 638 (Tex. Crim. App. 2010)
- Jenkins v. State, 493 S.W.3d 583, 599 (Tex. Crim. App. 2016)
- Bond v. State, No. 01-18-00741-CR, 2020 WL 4006446, at *6, *10 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] July 16, 2020, no pet.)
- Green v. State, 607 S.W.3d 147, 154 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2020, no pet.)
- Wilson v. State, 473 S.W.3d 889, 898 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2015, pet. ref'd)
- De La Paz v. State, 279 S.W.3d 336, 342-43 (Tex. Crim. App. 2009)
- Willover v. State, 70 S.W.3d 841, 845 (Tex. Crim. App. 2002)
- Inthalangsy v. State, 634 S.W.3d 749, 756 (Tex. Crim. App. 2021)
- Camacho v. State, 864 S.W.2d 524, 532 (Tex. Crim. App. 1993)
- Devoe v. State, 354 S.W.3d 457, 469 (Tex. Crim. App. 2011)
- Wyatt v. State, 23 S.W.3d 18, 25 (Tex. Crim. App. 2000)
- Wesbrook v. State, 29 S.W.3d 103, 115 (Tex. Crim. App. 2000)
- McDonald v. State, 179 S.W.3d 571, 577 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005)
- Beltran v. State, 517 S.W.3d 243, 249 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 2017, no pet.)

- Taylor v. State, 263 S.W.3d 304, 314 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2007, no pet.), aff'd, 268 S.W.3d 561 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008)
- Heiman v. State, 923 S.W.2d 622, 626 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1995, pet. ref'd)
- Gonzalez v. State, 544 S.W.3d 363, 370 (Tex. Crim. App. 2018)
- Colone v. State, 573 S.W.3d 249, 256 (Tex. Crim. App. 2019)
- Gigliobianco v. State, 210 S.W.3d 637, 641-42 (Tex. Crim. App. 2006)
- Hedrick v. State, 473 S.W.3d 824, 831 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2015, no pet.)
- Thrift v. State, 176 S.W.3d 221, 224 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005)
- Bass v. State, 270 S.W.3d 557, 563 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008)
- Garcia Flores v. State, No. 01-19-00382-CR, 2020 WL 3525451, at *3 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2020, pet. ref'd)
- Bjorgaard v. State, 220 S.W.3d 555 (Tex. App.—Amarillo 2007, pet. dismiss'd)
- Sandoval v. State, 409 S.W.3d 259, 298 (Tex. App.—Austin 2013, no pet.)
- Curtis v. State, 89 S.W.3d 163, 169 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2002, pet. ref'd)