



NUMBER 13-24-00149-CR

COURT OF APPEALS

THIRTEENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS

CORPUS CHRISTI – EDINBURG

**JACHA ESCATIOLA A/K/A
JACHA BENAVIDES ESCATIOLA,**

Appellant,

v.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,

Appellee.

**ON APPEAL FROM THE 319TH DISTRICT COURT
OF NUECES COUNTY, TEXAS**

MEMORANDUM OPINION

**Before Justices Benavides, Longoria, and Silva
Memorandum Opinion by Justice Benavides**

Appellant Jacha Escatiola a/k/a Jacha Benavides Escatiola was placed on deferred adjudication community supervision for the offense of aggravated assault with a deadly weapon, a second-degree felony. See TEX. PENAL CODE ANN. § 22.02(a)(2), (b).

The State filed an initial motion to revoke Escatiola's community supervision that resulted in Escatiola serving a six-month sentence at an Intermediate Sanction Facility and the continuation of his supervision with additional terms. The State subsequently filed a second motion to revoke, alleging that Escatiola had again violated the terms of his supervision, including failing to report for six consecutive months and failing to submit to drug testing on two occasions. Escatiola pleaded "true" to each of the new allegations. At the conclusion of the hearing, the trial court found the allegations "true," terminated Escatiola's community supervision, adjudicated him guilty of the underlying offense, and sentenced him to four years' imprisonment. See *id.* § 12.33(a).

Although Escatiola filed a notice of appeal, his 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 the trial court's judgment.

I. *ANDERS* BRIEF

Pursuant to *Anders v. California*, Escatiola's court-appointed appellate counsel filed a brief and a motion to withdraw with this Court, stating that his 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.

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), Escatiola’s counsel carefully discussed why, under controlling authority, there is no reversible error in the trial court’s judgment. Escatiola’s counsel also informed this Court in writing that he: (1) notified Escatiola that counsel has filed an *Anders* brief and a motion to withdraw; (2) provided Escatiola with copies of both pleadings; (3) informed Escatiola 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 Escatiola with a form motion for pro se access to the appellate record that only requires Escatiola’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, Escatiola filed neither a timely motion seeking pro se access to the appellate record nor a motion for extension of time to do so. Escatiola did not file a pro se response.

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 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*, Escatiola’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 Escatiola and to advise him of his right to file a petition for discretionary review.¹ 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.

GINA M. BENAVIDES
Justice

Do not publish.
TEX. R. APP. P. 47.2(b).

Delivered and filed on the
15th day of August, 2024.

¹ No substitute counsel will be appointed. Should Escatiola 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.