



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

---

No. 06-22-00096-CR

---

THOMAS RAY MAHON, Appellant

V.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, Appellee

---

---

On Appeal from the 5th District Court  
Cass County, Texas  
Trial Court No. 2021F00074

---

Before Stevens, C.J., van Cleef and Rambin, JJ.  
Memorandum Opinion by Justice van Cleef

## MEMORANDUM OPINION

A Cass County jury convicted Thomas Ray Mahon of family violence assault by occlusion causing bodily injury, a third-degree felony. *See* TEX. PENAL CODE ANN. § 22.01(b)(2)(B) (Supp.). In accordance with the jury's assessment, the trial court sentenced Mahon to ten years' imprisonment and ordered him to pay a \$3,000.00 fine. Mahon appeals.<sup>1</sup>

Mahon's attorney filed a brief stating that he has reviewed the record and has found no genuinely arguable issues that could be raised on appeal. The brief sets out the procedural history of the case and summarizes the evidence elicited during the course of the trial court proceedings. Since counsel provided a professional evaluation of the record demonstrating why there are no arguable grounds to be advanced, that evaluation meets the requirements of *Anders v. California*. *See 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. On March 20, 2023, counsel mailed to Mahon copies of the brief, the appellate record, and the motion to withdraw. Mahon was informed of his rights to review the record and file a pro se response. Mahon timely filed his pro se response to counsel's *Anders* brief.

We have determined that this appeal is wholly frivolous. We have independently reviewed the entire appellate record and Mahon's pro se response and, like counsel, have

---

<sup>1</sup>In companion causes 06-22-00097-CR, 06-22-00098-CR, and 06-22-00099-CR, Mahon appeals convictions for aggravated sexual assault and two counts of aggravated assault.

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.<sup>2</sup>

Charles van Cleef  
Justice

Date Submitted: July 5, 2023  
Date Decided: July 6, 2023

Do Not Publish

---

<sup>2</sup>Since 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, 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 (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.