

**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

---

**OPINION**

Anthony David McWilliams v. the State of Texas

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