

COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE THIRTEENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS,
CORPUS CHRISTI–EDINBURG

Anthony David McWilliams v. the State of Texas

No. 13-25-00559-CR · No. 13-25-00559-CR · Decided January 29, 2026

SUMMARY

The Thirteenth Court of Appeals of Texas affirmed the revocation of Anthony David McWilliams’s deferred-adjudication community supervision, adjudication of guilt, and nine-year prison sentence for possession of methamphetamine. The court conducted an independent Anders review, found no arguable grounds for appeal, and granted appointed counsel’s motion to withdraw.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals for the Thirteenth District of Texas, Corpus Christi–Edinburg
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Clarissa Silva; Justice Cron; Justice Fonseca
JURISDICTION	Court of Appeals for the Thirteenth District of Texas
DECIDED	January 29, 2026
DOCKET	13-25-00559-CR
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Appeal from an order revoking deferred-adjudication community supervision, adjudicating appellant guilty, and sentencing him to nine years' imprisonment. Appointed appellate counsel filed an Anders brief and a motion to withdraw.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Upon receipt of an Anders brief, the appellate court conducts a full examination of the proceedings and record to determine whether the appeal is wholly frivolous and whether any arguable ground for reversible error exists.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential unpublished memorandum opinion
PARTIES	Anthony David McWilliams v. The State of Texas

TOPICS

- criminal procedure
- appellate procedure
- right to counsel
- standard of review

PRACTICE AREAS

criminal procedure

appellate procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether independent review of the record under Anders disclosed any arguable ground for reversible error.
2. Whether appointed appellate counsel should be permitted to withdraw after filing an Anders brief that complied with applicable requirements.

HOLDINGS

1. After reviewing the record and counsel's Anders brief, the court found nothing that would arguably support an appeal and therefore affirmed the trial court's judgment.
2. The Anders brief complied with applicable requirements, and the court granted counsel's motion to withdraw.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Upon receiving an Anders brief, we must conduct a full examination of all the proceedings to determine whether the case is wholly frivolous.” (at 2)

“We have reviewed the record and counsel’s brief, and we have found nothing that would arguably support an appeal.” (at 3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

McWilliams pleaded guilty to possessing four grams or more but less than two hundred grams of methamphetamine. He received six years of deferred-adjudication community supervision. After the State alleged violations of the supervision conditions, McWilliams pleaded true to every allegation, and the trial court revoked supervision, adjudicated him guilty, and imposed a nine-year prison sentence.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Appellant pleaded guilty to possession of four grams or more but less than two hundred grams of methamphetamine, a second-degree felony. The trial court placed him on six years of deferred-adjudication community supervision. After the State filed a first amended motion to adjudicate alleging violations of community-supervision conditions, appellant pleaded true to all allegations. The trial court revoked supervision, adjudicated him guilty, and sentenced him to nine years' imprisonment. On appeal, counsel filed an Anders brief asserting that no arguable grounds existed; the court independently reviewed the record, found no reversible error, granted counsel's withdrawal motion, and affirmed.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 744 (1967)
- *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403, 406 n.9, 408–09, 411 n.35 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008) (orig. proceeding)
- *Hawkins v. State*, 112 S.W.3d 340, 343–44 (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi–Edinburg 2003, no pet.)
- *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 510 n.3, 511 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991)
- *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807, 813 (Tex. Crim. App. [Panel Op.] 1978)
- *Kelly v. State*, 436 S.W.3d 313, 319–22 (Tex. Crim. App. 2014)
- *Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 80 (1988)
- *Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 827–28 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005)
- *Ex parte Owens*, 206 S.W.3d 670, 673 (Tex. Crim. App. 2006)

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

NUMBER 13-25-00559-CR COURT OF APPEALS THIRTEENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS
CORPUS CHRISTI – EDINBURG ANTHONY DAVID MCWILLIAMS, Appellant, v. THE
STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee. ON APPEAL FROM THE 12TH DISTRICT COURT OF
WALKER COUNTY, TEXAS MEMORANDUM OPINION Before Justices Silva, Cron, and
Fonseca Memorandum Opinion by Justice Silva Appellant Anthony David McWilliams pleaded
guilty to the offense of possession of a controlled substance, namely methamphetamine, in the
amount of four grams or more but less than two hundred grams, a second-degree felony.

1 See TEX. HEALTH & SAFETY CODE § 481.115(d). The trial court placed him on deferred
adjudication community supervision for six years. The State later filed a first amended motion to
adjudicate guilt on September 16, 2025, alleging that appellant violated the terms and conditions
of his community supervision. Appellant entered pleas of “true” to all of the allegations raised in
the State’s motion.

After conducting a hearing, the trial court revoked appellant’s community supervision, adjudicated
him guilty, and sentenced him to nine years’ imprisonment in the Institutional Division of the
Texas Department of Criminal Justice. Appellant’s court-appointed counsel has filed an *Anders*
brief stating that there are no arguable grounds for appeal. See *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738,
744 (1967).

We affirm. I. *ANDERS BRIEF* Pursuant to *Anders v. California*, appellant’s court-appointed
appellate counsel filed a brief and a motion to withdraw with this Court, stating that her review of
the record yielded no grounds of reversible error upon which an appeal could be predicated. See
id. Counsel’s brief meets the requirements of *Anders* as it presents a professional evaluation
demonstrating why there are no arguable grounds to advance on appeal.

See *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403, 406 n.9 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008) (orig. proceeding) (“In Texas, an Anders brief need not specifically advance ‘arguable’ points of error if counsel finds none, but it must provide record references to the facts and procedural history and set out pertinent legal authorities.” (citing *Hawkins v. State*, 112 S.W.3d 340, 343–44 (Tex.

1 This case is before this Court on transfer from the Tenth Court of Appeals pursuant to a docket equalization order issued by the Supreme Court of Texas. See TEX. GOV’T CODE § 73.001. 2 App.—Corpus Christi–Edinburg 2003, no pet.)); *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 510 n.3 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991).

In compliance with *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807, 813 (Tex. Crim. App. [Panel Op.] 1978) and *Kelly v. State*, 436 S.W.3d 313, 319–22 (Tex. Crim. App. 2014), appellant’s counsel carefully discussed why, under controlling authority, there is no reversible error in the trial court’s judgment. Appellant’s counsel also informed this Court in writing that she: (1) notified appellant that counsel has filed an Anders brief and a motion to withdraw; (2) provided appellant with copies of both pleadings; (3) informed appellant of his rights to file a pro se response, to review the record prior to filing that response, and to seek discretionary review if we conclude that the appeal is frivolous; and (4) provided appellant with a form motion for pro se access to the appellate record that only requires appellant’s signature and date with instructions to file the motion within ten days.

See *Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744; *Kelly*, 436 S.W.3d at 319–20; see also *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 408–09. In this case, appellant neither filed a timely motion seeking pro se access to the appellate record nor a motion for extension of time to do so. Appellant did not file a pro se response in the case. II. INDEPENDENT REVIEW Upon receiving an Anders brief, we must conduct a full examination of all the proceedings to determine whether the case is wholly frivolous.

Penson v. Ohio, 488 U.S. 75, 80 (1988). We have reviewed the record and counsel’s brief, and we have found nothing that would arguably support an appeal. See *Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 827–28 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005) (“Due to the nature of Anders briefs, by indicating in the opinion that it considered the issues raised in the briefs and reviewed the record for 3 reversible error but found none, the court of appeals met the requirements of Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 47.1.”); *Stafford*, 813 S.W.2d at 511.

III. MOTION TO WITHDRAW In accordance with *Anders*, appellant’s counsel has asked this Court for permission to withdraw as counsel. See *Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744; see also *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 408 n.17. We grant counsel’s motion to withdraw. Within five days from the date of this Court’s opinion, counsel is ordered to send a copy of this opinion and this Court’s judgment to appellant and to advise him of his right to file a petition for discretionary review.

2 See TEX. R. APP. P. 48.4; see also *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 411 n.35; *Ex parte Owens*, 206 S.W.3d 670, 673 (Tex. Crim. App. 2006). IV. CONCLUSION We affirm the trial court’s

judgment. CLARISSA SILVA Justice Do not publish. TEX. R. APP. P. 47.2(b). Delivered and filed on the 29th day of January, 2026. 2 No substitute counsel will be appointed. Should appellant wish to seek further review of this case by the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals, he 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 must be filed within thirty days from the date of either this opinion or the last timely motion for rehearing or timely motion for en banc reconsideration that was overruled by this Court. See TEX. R. APP. P. 68.2. Any petition for discretionary review must be filed with the Clerk of the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals.

See id. R. 68.3. Any petition for discretionary review should comply with the requirements of Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 68.4. See id. R. 68.4. 4