



**Fourth Court of Appeals**  
**San Antonio, Texas**

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

No. 04-13-00146-CV

**IN THE INTEREST OF T.R.Z., J.M.A., H.A.A., and I.A.**

From the 57th Judicial District Court, Bexar County, Texas  
Trial Court No. 2011-PA-03206  
Honorable Charles E. Montemayor, Judge Presiding

PER CURIAM

Sitting: Catherine Stone, Chief Justice  
Sandee Bryan Marion, Justice  
Patricia O. Alvarez, Justice

Delivered and Filed: August 28, 2013

AFFIRMED

This is an appeal from the trial court's termination of Appellant I.A. Sr.'s parental rights to T.R.Z., J.M.A., H.A.A., and I.A. The trial court terminated Appellant's parental rights based on grounds set forth in Texas Family Code section 161.001. *See* TEX. FAM. CODE ANN. § 161.001(1)(E), (N), (O), (Q) (West Supp. 2012). The court also determined that terminating Appellant's parental rights was in the best interest of each child: T.R.Z., J.M.A., H.A.A., and I.A. *See id.* § 161.001(2) (West 2008).

Appellant's court-appointed attorney filed a brief containing a professional evaluation of the record and demonstrating there are no arguable grounds to be advanced. Therefore, counsel concludes the appeal is without merit. *See Fletcher v. Dep't of Family & Protective Servs.*, 277 S.W.3d 58, 64 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2009, no pet.) (affirming a judgment because the

judgment could be upheld on an unchallenged ground). The brief meets the requirements of *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967). See *In re D.D.*, 279 S.W.3d 849, 850 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2009, pet. denied) (applying *Anders* procedure in an appeal from termination of parental rights); *In re D.E.S.*, 135 S.W.3d 326, 329 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2004, no pet.); *In re RR*, No. 04-03-00096-CV, 2003 WL 21157944, at \*4 (Tex. App.—San Antonio May 21, 2003, no pet.) (mem. op.); *In re K.S.M.*, 61 S.W.3d 632, 634 (Tex. App.—Tyler 2001, no pet.). Counsel provided Appellant with a copy of the *Anders* brief and informed him of his right to review the record and file a *pro se* brief. Appellant has not filed a *pro se* brief.

After reviewing the record, we agree that the appeal is frivolous and without merit. The judgment of the trial court is affirmed, and counsel's motion to withdraw is granted. See *Nichols v. State*, 954 S.W.2d 83, 85-86 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1997, no pet.); *Bruns v. State*, 924 S.W.2d 176, 177 n.1 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1996, no pet.).

PER CURIAM