

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PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential unpublished memorandum opinion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)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/court-of-appeals-for-the-thirteenth-district-of-texas-court-of-appeals-for-the-thirteenth-district-o/2026/anthony-david-mcwilliams-v-the-state-of-texas-vdlmjyvk>