



**COURT OF APPEALS  
SECOND DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
FORT WORTH**

**NO. 02-17-00219-CV**

IN THE INTEREST OF K.L., J.L.,  
AND K.L., CHILDREN

-----

FROM THE 360TH DISTRICT COURT OF TARRANT COUNTY  
TRIAL COURT NO. 360-571807-15

-----

**MEMORANDUM OPINION<sup>1</sup>**

-----

Appellant P.L. (Father) attempts to appeal from an “Order on Motion for Withdrawal of Counsel” signed on May 18, 2017. On June 28, 2017, we sent a letter to Father expressing our concern that we may not have jurisdiction over this appeal because the order does not appear to be a final judgment or appealable interlocutory order. *See Lehmann v. Har-Con Corp.*, 39 S.W.3d 191, 195 (Tex. 2001) (explaining that “the general rule, with a few mostly statutory

---

<sup>1</sup>See Tex. R. App. P. 47.4.

exceptions, is that an appeal may be taken only from a final judgment”); *Davis v. Tex. Dep’t of Family & Protective Servs.*, No. 03-10-00624-CV, 2010 WL 4367076, at \*1 (Tex. App.—Austin Nov. 5, 2010, no pet.) (mem. op.) (“A trial court’s order granting a motion to withdraw is not an appealable interlocutory order.”). We stated that unless Father or any party desiring to continue the appeal filed a response showing grounds for continuing the appeal by July 10, 2017, the appeal could be dismissed for want of jurisdiction. See Tex. R. App. P. 42.3(a), 44.3. Father filed a response, but it does not show grounds for continuing the appeal. Therefore, we dismiss the appeal for want of jurisdiction. See Tex. R. App. P. 42.3(a), 43.2(f).

PER CURIAM

PANEL: WALKER, MEIER, and GABRIEL, JJ.

DELIVERED: July 27, 2017