



In The
Eleventh Court of Appeals

No. 11-17-00097-CV

IN THE INTEREST OF K.A.S.L., A CHILD

**On Appeal from the 29th District Court
Palo Pinto County, Texas
Trial Court Cause No. C47260**

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This is an appeal from an order in which the trial court terminated the parental rights of the mother and father of K.A.S.L. The mother filed a notice of appeal. We dismiss her appeal.

The mother's court-appointed counsel has filed a motion to withdraw and a supporting brief in which he professionally and conscientiously examines the record and applicable law and concludes that the appeal is frivolous and presents no arguable issues of merit. The brief meets the requirements of *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), by presenting a professional evaluation of the record demonstrating why there are no arguable grounds to be advanced. See *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403, 406–08 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008); *High v. State*, 573

S.W.2d 807, 812 (Tex. Crim. App. [Panel Op.] 1978). In light of a recent holding by the Texas Supreme Court, however, an *Anders* motion to withdraw “may be premature” if filed in the court of appeals under the circumstances presented in this case. *See In re P.M.*, 520 S.W.3d 24, 27 (Tex. 2016). The court in *P.M.* stated that “appointed counsel’s obligations can be satisfied by filing a petition for review that satisfies the standards for an *Anders* brief.” *Id.* at 27–28.

Appellant’s counsel provided Appellant with a copy of the brief, the motion to withdraw, and an explanatory letter. Counsel also informed Appellant of her right to review the record and file a pro se response to counsel’s brief. In compliance with *Kelly v. State*, 436 S.W.3d 313, 318–20 (Tex. Crim. App. 2014), counsel provided Appellant with a prepared motion to file in this court to obtain access to the appellate record. We conclude that Appellant’s counsel has satisfied his duties under *Anders*, *Schulman*, and *Kelly*. We note that Appellant did not file in this court the pro se motion for access to the appellate record. Nor did she file a pro se response to counsel’s *Anders* brief.

Following the procedures outlined in *Anders* and *Schulman*, we have independently reviewed the record, and we agree that the appeal is without merit and should be dismissed. *See Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 409. However, in light of *P.M.*, we deny the motion to withdraw that was filed by Appellant’s court-appointed counsel. *See P.M.*, 520 S.W.3d at 27.

Counsel’s motion to withdraw is denied, and the appeal is dismissed.

PER CURIAM

August 31, 2017

Panel consists of: Wright, C.J.,
Willson, J., and Bailey, J.