



**In The
Court of Appeals
Sixth Appellate District of Texas at Texarkana**

No. 06-18-00044-CR

SHAWN MICHAEL WILLARD, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

On Appeal from the 124th District Court
Gregg County, Texas
Trial Court No. 42341-B

Before Morriss, C.J., Moseley and Burgess, JJ.
Memorandum Opinion by Chief Justice Morriss

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Shawn Michael Willard pled guilty to and was convicted of aggravated sexual assault. Following a bench trial on punishment, the trial court sentenced Willard to life imprisonment. Willard appeals.

Willard's attorney on appeal has filed a brief which states that he has reviewed the record and has found no genuinely arguable issues that could be raised. The brief sets out the procedural history and summarizes the evidence elicited during the course of the proceeding. Counsel has provided a professional evaluation of the record demonstrating why there are no arguable grounds to be advanced on appeal, meeting the requirements of *Anders v. California*. *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 743–44 (1967); *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403, 406 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008) (orig. proceeding); *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 509–10 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991); *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807, 812–13 (Tex. Crim. App. [Panel Op.] 1978). Counsel also filed a motion with this Court seeking to withdraw as counsel in this appeal.

Counsel provided Willard with a copy of the brief, the appellate record, and the motion to withdraw. Willard has filed a pro se response in which he argues that the proper predicate was not laid for the admission of a surveillance video depicting Willard entering the victim's place of employment, knocking her to the ground, and dragging her into the office where the rape occurred. Willard also argues that his counsel "failed to launch an intelligent objection to [the] admission of [the] video," and "failed to investigate video/preservation methods of surveillance [sic]."

We conclude that Willard's pro se response presents no genuinely arguable appellate issues and that this appeal is wholly frivolous. We have independently reviewed the entire appellate

record and, like counsel, have determined that no arguable issue supports an appeal. *See Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826–27 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005). In the *Anders* context, once we determine that the appeal is without merit, we must affirm the trial court’s judgment. *Id.*

We affirm the judgment of the trial court.¹

Josh R. Morriss, III
Chief Justice

Date Submitted: August 30, 2018
Date Decided: August 31, 2018

Do Not Publish

¹Since we agree that this case presents no reversible error, we also, in accordance with *Anders*, grant counsel’s request to withdraw from further representation of appellant in this case. *See Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744. No substitute counsel will be appointed. Should appellant desire to seek further review of this case by the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals, appellant 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 (1) must be filed within thirty days from either the date of this opinion or the date on which the last timely motion for rehearing was overruled by this Court, *see* TEX. R. APP. P. 68.2, (2) must be filed with the clerk of the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals, *see* TEX. R. APP. P. 68.3, and (3) should comply with the requirements of Rule 68.4 of the Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure, *see* TEX. R. APP. P. 68.4.