Motion to Withdraw Granted, Affirmed as Modified, and Majority and Dissenting Opinions filed August 31, 2023.



In The

Fourteenth Court of Appeals

NO. 14-22-00398-CR

JUCHWAY RHODES JUNIOR, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

On Appeal from the 230th District Court Harris County, Texas Trial Court Cause No. 1692996

DISSENTING OPINION

By failing to follow the procedure in *Bledsoe v. State*,¹ the majority sure raises a lot of interesting questions:

¹ Bledsoe, 178 S.W.3d 824 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005).

- Do the Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure authorize Texas intermediate appellate courts to change the practice mandated by *Anders v. California* by reclassifying a nonfrivolous error in the judgment as a "nonjudgment error" or "nonjudgment mistake" and thus something the intermediate appellate court can and should modify and as modified affirm?²
- Is a restitution order that is a part of the "Judgment of Conviction by Jury" legally not a part of that judgment such that appointed counsel has no duty to the client to argue on appeal that the restitution order is nonfrivolous error?³
- Is arguing on appeal that the trial court erred in ordering \$442,422.30 in restitution an unethical frivolous argument under *Anders* that would subject appointed counsel to potential judicial sanctions and potential disciplinary action by the bar, even though this court must "fix" that unethical frivolous argument by using Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 43.2(b) to classify it as "nonjudgment error"?
- Although the majority does not make the argument, does the law dignify "fixing" a \$442,422.30 "nonjudgment error" or "nonjudgment mistake" restitution order but not "fixing" one for \$5.00, thus haggling over the amount?

If it seems silly that we're here, then I don't disagree. But here we are.4

² Anders, 386 U.S. 738 (1967); Tex. R. App. P. 43.2(b).

³ The first page of the "Judgment of Conviction" is attached to this dissenting opinion so there is no question where the mistake is. And appointed counsel actually did argue it was error: "Because the district court did not order restitution at the time it pronounced sentence, the inclusion of a restitution requirement in the written judgment was error."

⁴ Perhaps a more conventional phrasing of the legal mess unleashed by the majority might be:

Few, if any, opinions of the Supreme Court of the United States are so familiar to justices and staff attorneys at the courts of appeals as *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967). And its holding is well known:

The constitutional requirement of substantial equality and fair process can only be attained where counsel acts in the role of an active advocate on behalf of his client, as opposed to that of amicus curiae. The no-merit letter and the procedure it triggers do not reach that dignity. Counsel should, and can with honor and without conflict, be of more assistance to his client and to the court. His role as advocate requires that he support his client's appeal to the best of his ability. Of course, if counsel finds his case to be wholly frivolous, after a conscientious examination of it, he should so advise the court and request permission to withdraw. That request must, however, be accompanied by a brief referring to anything in the record that might arguably support the appeal. A copy of counsel's brief should be furnished the indigent and time allowed him to raise any points that he chooses; the court—not counsel—then proceeds, after a full examination of all the proceedings, to decide whether the case is wholly frivolous. If it so finds it may grant counsel's request to withdraw and dismiss the appeal insofar as federal requirements are concerned, or proceed to a decision on the merits, if state law so requires. On the other hand, if it finds any of the legal points arguable on their merits (and therefore not frivolous) it must, prior to decision, afford the indigent the assistance of counsel to argue the appeal.

Id. at 744 (omitting footnote 3).

Does the law allow appointed counsel for a convicted indigent defendant to file a brief that identifies "error" in the four-corners of the criminal judgment, call that an *Anders* brief, request permission to withdraw as counsel, and forward a copy of the brief to the indigent defendant to allow the defendant to raise any points on appeal? Can the appellate court conclude that the "nonjudgment error" warrants correction, correct that "nonjudgment error," yet allow counsel to withdraw and deprive defendant of the right to counsel guaranteed by the federal and state constitutions throughout the entire proceeding in the court of appeals because the judgment contains no nonfrivolous error?

Here, the majority identifies what I believe is nonfrivolous error in the judgment⁵, corrects that error, and allows appointed counsel to withdraw. In doing so, the majority cites *Bledsoe v. State*, yet does not follow it:

When faced with an *Anders* brief and if a later *pro se* brief is filed, the court of appeals has two choices. It may determine that the appeal is wholly frivolous and issue an opinion explaining that it has reviewed the record and finds no reversible error. *Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744. Or, it may determine that arguable grounds for appeal exist and remand the cause to the trial court so that new counsel may be appointed to brief the issues. [*Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 511 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991).] Only after the issues have been briefed by new counsel may the court of appeals address the merits of the issues raised. *Id.* at 509–10 (quoting *Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744).

Bledsoe v. State, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826–27 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005).

It seems clear to me that we must follow the precedent of the Supreme Court of the United States and the Court of Criminal Appeals of Texas.⁶ Even though the majority "fixes" things for appellant, it does so while depriving appellant of the right to counsel for the duration of this appeal.⁷ No matter how well intentioned

⁵ The majority studiously avoids labelling the mistaken restitution order that the majority proceeds to "fix," suggesting that if we eliminate the word for whatever it is, then we won't have to think about how it fits into *Anders* practice.

⁶ The majority cites a bunch of cases that do what the majority does, yet not even one engages the issue whether that action is permissible when appointed counsel files an *Anders* brief. Mere recitation of what a court did is not precedent. *See In re Kholaif*, 624 S.W.3d 228, 230–31 (order), *mand. dism'd*, 615 S.W.3d 369 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2020) (orig. proceeding) (discussing precedent).

⁷ If we make an error while modifying, and as so modified, affirming the "nonjudgment error," then appellant will have no counsel who could point out that error in a motion for rehearing because we allowed that counsel to withdraw. I suppose if appellant can't raise this "nonjudgment error" or "nonjudgment mistake" but we can and should "fix" it, then maybe it

this court is, that's not the adversarial system guaranteed in the federal and state constitutions.⁸

I dissent from this court's judgment. I would abate the appeal and remand the case to the trial court for the limited purpose of appointing new appellate counsel for the indigent defendant to argue the appeal as required by the federal and state constitutions and precedent from the court of criminal appeals.⁹

/s/ Charles A. Spain Justice

Panel consists of Justices Jewell, Spain, and Wilson (Jewell, J., majority). Publish — Tex. R. App. P. 47.2(b).

might make sense to some that appellant can't tell us we didn't do it right. To be clear, I don't think that.

⁸ If appointed counsel had filed an appellant's brief identifying the error in the restitution order as an issue or point on appeal and had not asked to withdraw as counsel, then I wouldn't have a problem. But I just can't accept the majority's argument that this restitution-order nonfrivolous error cannot be raised by appellant in an issue or point, yet we can nonetheless "fix" it. I'm somewhat surprised the majority doesn't criticize appointed counsel for mentioning the "error" at all. *Supra* note 3.

⁹ If the court of criminal appeals were to modify *Bledsoe* and hold that the proper procedure in this unusual situation is to deny appointed counsel's motion to withdraw and order appointed counsel to file an appellant's brief raising the error in the restitution order as an issue or point in that brief, then that's fine by me.



THE STATE OF TEXAS IN THE 230TH DISTRICT (999) COURT C	()	CAU	SE No. 169299601010	-	
N. COURT (999) RHODES, JUCHWAY JR SHARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS STATE ID NO. TX03699206 JUDGMENT OF CONVICTION BY JURY Jedge Presiding: CHRIS MORTON Due Sentence Imposed: 47/2022 Anomey for State: STATE ID NO. TX03699206 JUDGMENT OF CONVICTION BY JURY VALERIE TURNER AND SHELLA HANSEL Anomey for Defendant: CUCCI, JOHN JR. Officere the which Defenden Correlated: THEPT AGGREGATE >=-\$300K MULTI CW OPERING INSTITUTED: SENTEN OF OFFICERED STATE STAT	INCIDENT No. /TRN: 9267584766D001 Pgs-4				
JUDGMENT OF CONVICTION BY JURY Julge Presiding: CHRIS MORTON Due Sentence Imposed: 471/2022 Anoney for Same: VALERIE TURNER AND SHEILA HANSEL Altorsey for Defendant: CUCCI, JOHN JR. Offense for which Defendant Convicted: THEPT AGGREGATE >= \$300K MULTI CW Statist for Offense: INDICTMENT Date of Offense: Person of Offense: INDICTMENT Date of Offense: IST DEGREE FELONY Verefact of Face: IST DEGREE FELONY Verefact of Face: IST DEGREE FELONY Verefact of Face: Presupph PLEADED TRUE Presiding on 2* Enhancement Presupph PRESIDENCE OF CONTROLLER Presidence Controller (The County of Table Controller) Presidence and Place of Confidence of Confid	v. RHODES, JUC	CHWAY JR	5 COURT	(999- DIJC	
June Presidence CHRIS MORTON Due Sentence Imposed: 4/1/2022	SINIE ID IVOL TA		OF CONVICTION BY JUDY		
Alterney for States: VALERIE TURNER AND SHEILA HANSEL Alterney for Defendant: CUCCI, JOHN JR. Offence for which Defendent Convicted: THERT AGGREGATE >=\$300K MULTI CW Cherting Instrument; INDICTMENT Date of Offence: Please of Offence: Status for Offence: Please of Offence: The Defendant of THROUGH 07/27/2017 Perres of Offence: ST DEGREE FELONY Verific of Proc. GUILTY NA Prinding on 1* Enhancement Prinding on 2* Enhancement FOUND TRUE Prinding on 2* Enhancement Found 1* Enhancement FOUND TRUE FOUND TRUE Prinding on 2* Enhancement FOUND TRUE Prinding on 2* Enhancement FOUND TRUE Prinding on 2* Enhancement FOUND TR			(
Altoracy for Defendant: CUCCI, JOHN JR. Officials for which Defendant Convisced: THEFT AGGREGATE >=\$300K MULTI CW Chrysing Instrument: INDICTMENT Date of Officials: INDICTMENT Described from: INDICTMENT Principals: INDICTMENT INDICTMENT INDICTMENT INDICTMENT INDICTMENT INDICTMENT INDICTMENT INDICT	Jodge Presiding:		Date Sentance Imposed: 4/7/2022		
THEFT AGGREGATE >=\$300K MULTI CW Cherging Instrument: INDICTMENT Degree of Offense: 12/14/2016 THROUGH 07/27/2017 THROUGH 07/		SHEILA HANSEL	Attorney for Defendant: CUCCI, JOHN JR.		
Surine for Officials: Surine for Officials: Pieu to Officials: P			-		
INDICTMENT Date of Officials Date of Officials INT DEGREE FELONY Selected FEC Service of Officials SET DEGREE FELONY Selected FEC Product of FEC Finding on 1° Enhancement Paragraph: PLEADED TRUE Production of 1° Enhancement Paragraph: PLEADED TRUE Production of 2° Enhancement Paragraph: POUND TRUE Production of 2° Enhancement Paragraph: FOUND TRUE Production of 2° Enhancement Production of 2° Enhance					
12/14/2016 THROUGH 07/27/2017			Statute for Ottome:		
SENTENCE OF CONFERENCE IS SENTENCE SHALL RUN: N/A	12/14/2016 TH	ROUGH 07/27/2017		·_	
Performance		PI ONV		-	
Enhancement		ELONI	Pladings on Death Wasser		
Paragraph* PLEADED TRUE Pringraph: FOUND TRUE 2* Enhancement Paragraph* PLEADED TRUE Pringraph: FOUND TRUE Punishment Assessed by: Date Sentence Congretices (for the set up by a mathematic and assessed by: A 1/2022 Punishment and Place of Confinement 40 YEARS TDCJ, CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS DIVISION THIS SENTENCE SHALL RUN: N/A. SENTENCE OF CONVIDEMENT SUSPENDED, DEFENDANT, PLACED ON COMMUNITY SUPERVISION FOR N/A Before and the foregoing the first and the sent of the offense was N/A. Defendant is required to register as sex effender in accordance with Chapter 62, Tex. Code Crim. Proc. (For sex effender registration purposes only) The age of the victim at the time of the offense was N/A. Restlution: Restlution: Restlution: Sex special finding or order of restitution which is incorporated herein by this reference.) Cort Costs: Reimbursement Fee: \$ 290.00 \$ 2.65 Was the victim impact statement returned to the attorney representing the State? N/A (row strain was recover corrawars over.) Is Defendant presemptively entitled to difficult participation credit in accordance with Article 42A.559, Tex. Code Crim. Proc.? N/A Total fail Time Credit 2 If Defendant is to serve accorded in county fail or is given credit served the fine and costs, only days tredited below.	GUILTY			•	
2" Enhancement Paragraph: PLEADED TRUE Paragraph: FOUND TRUE Punishment Assessed by: COURT 47/2022 Punishment and Place of Confidences: 40 YEARS TDCJ, CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS DIVISION THIS SENTENCE SHALL RUN: N/A. SENTENCE OF CONFINEMENT SUSPENDED, DEPENDANT PLACED ON COMMUNITY SUPERVISION FOR N/A (The derivation that the institute of the offence of the property of the institute purposes only) The age of the victim at the time of the offence in VICTIM SN/A S 442,422.30 (See special finding or order of restitution which is incorporated herein by this reference.) Corri Costs: Resimbarement Foes: \$ 290.00 \$ 265 Was the victim impact statement returned to the automaty representing the State? N/A (row state un remove corranges over, is Defendent presumptively entitled to different participation credit in accordance with Article 42A.559, Tex. Code Crim. Proc.? N/A Total Juli Time Credit: 2 If Defendent is to serve scattere in covery tell or is given or of the fine and costs, other dres credital below.		DI PADED TRITT			
Paragraph: PLEADED TRUE Paragraph: FOUND TRUE Punishment Assessed by: Date Sentence Commences that an extensive and accordance to comment would a condense and comment and a comment an		PLEADED TRUE			
COURT 4/1/2022 Punishment and Place of Confinement 40 YEARS TDCJ, CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS DIVISION THIS SENTENCE SHALL RUN: N/A. SENTENCE OF CONFIDEMENT SUSPENDED, DEFENDANT PLACED ON COMMUNITY SUPERVISION FOR N/A (the transport state of the state of the confinement of the paper 62, Tex. Code Crim. Proc. (For size offender in accordance with Chapter 62, Tex. Code Crim. Proc. (For size offender in accordance with Chapter 62, Tex. Code Crim. Proc. (For size offender in accordance with Chapter 62, Tex. Code Crim. Proc. (For size offender in accordance with Chapter 62, Tex. Code Crim. Proc.) Restlution: Restlution: S N/A S 442,422,30 (See special finding or order of restitution which is incorporated herein by this reference.) S 290.00 S 265 Was the victim impact statement returned to the attorney representing the State? N/A (row strate and resconder corrections on a restriction of the statement returned to the attorney representing the State? N/A Total Juli Time Credit 2 If Defendent is to serve scattered in country bill or is given great severed the fine and costs, other dress credited below.		PLEADED TRUE			
THIS SENTENCE SHALL RUN: N/A. SENTENCE OF CONFORMENT SUSPENDED, DEFENDANT PLACED ON COMMUNITY SUPERVISION FOR N/A (The formess who led its preferred to register as set offender in accordance with Chapter 62, Tex. Code Crim. Proc. (For six effender registeration purposes only) The age of the victim at the time of the offense was N/A. Restitution: Restitution: Restitution Psychia by VICTIM S N/A	Punishment Assessed by: Date Sentence Consumering (nor doe and app) as confinence we of an accusary specialized				
SENTENCE OF CONFIDEMENT SUSPENDED, DEFENDANT PLACED ON COMMUNITY SUPERVISION FOR N/A Defendant is required to register as sex offender in accordance with Chapter 62, Tex. Code Crim. Proc. Proc. Regulation purposes only The age of the victim at the time of the offense was N/A					
Defendent is required to register as sex effected in accordance with Chapter 62. Tex. Code Crim. Proc. (For sex effected registeration purposes only) The ago of the victim at the time of the offense was N/A. Fleet: Restitution: S N/A S 442,422.30 (See special finding or order of restitution which is incorporated herein by this reference.) S 265 Was the victim impact statement returned to the attorney representing the State? N/A (rest state on a resource or statement returned to the attorney representing the State? N/A Total Init Time Credit: If Defendent is to serve scatored in country bit or is given or other credit and costs, other days residually below.	THIS SENTENCE SHALL RUN: N/A.				
Place: S N/A S 442,422.30 See special finding or order of restitution which is incorporated herein by this reference.) Cont Costs: Reimbursement Foot: S 290.00 S 265 Was the victim impact statement returned to the attorney representing the State? N/A (row strate and resource correspondence on the attorney representing the State? N/A Total Juli Time Credit 2 If Defendent is to serve scattered in country but or is given great severed the fine and costs, only does credital below.	Defendant is requ	The ferrorat option test the se- fred to register as sex offender in accordar	noe with Chapter 62, Tex. Code Crim. Proc.	Α.	
Cont Costs: Reimbursement Foes: \$ 290.00 \$ 2.65 Was the victim impact statement returned to the attorney representing the State? N/A (rea trans and reacon corravates one ry is Defendant presemptively entitled to different participation credit in accordance with Article 42A.559, Tex. Code Crim. Proc.? N/A Total Juil Time Credit: 2 If Defendant is to serve scatoned in countried to its elven gredit severel the fine and costs, only days credited below.	Place	Regitation:	Restitution Psymble to: VICTIM		
Cont Costs: Reimbursement Foes: 5 290.00 5 265 Was the victim impact statement returned to the attorney representing the State? N/A (row strate and returned or returned on the attorney representing the State? N/A Code Crim. Proc.? N/A Total Init! Time Credit: 2 If Defendent is to serve scatomen in country bill or is given great severed the fine and costs, only dress credited below.		s 442,422.30	(See special finding or order of restitution while herein by (bis reference.)	th is incorporated	
Was the victim impact statement returned to the attorney representing the State? N/A (row state an excess one.r) Is Defendent presemptively entitled to diligent participation credit in accordance with Article 42A.559, Tex. Code Crim. Proc.? N/A Total Juli Time Credit: 2 If Defendent is to serve scatome in country bill or is given great severed the fine and costs, only days credited below.	Court Costs:	Reimburgement Fors:			
(rea state an experience or average on a place of the presemptively entitled to diligent participation credit in accordance with Article 42A.559, Tex. Code Crim. Proc.? N/A Total July Time Credit: 2 If Defendent is to serve soutones in county bill or is siven gradit served the fine and costs, order days credited below.	5 290.00	\$ 265	I _m	4	
Credic 2 . If Defendent is to serve scattered in county lattice is given great severed the fine and costs, only days evaluated below.	Crim. Proc.? N/A			.559, Tex. Code	
	Total Jail Time Credic 2 DAYS			v	

This cause was called for trial by jury and the parties appeared. The State appeared by her District Automory as named above.

Counsel/Waiver of Counsel (select one)

RECORDER'S MEMORANDUM This instrument is of poor quality at the time of imaging