



**In The
Court of Appeals
Seventh District of Texas at Amarillo**

No. 07-14-00403-CV, 07-14-00404-CV

**IN THE INTEREST OF M.E., A CHILD
IN THE INTEREST OF T.E. AND Z.E., CHILDREN**

On Appeal from the County Court at Law No. 2
Potter County, Texas
Trial Court No. 83920-2, 84256-2, Honorable Pamela Cook Sirmon, Presiding

March 6, 2015

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Before QUINN, C.J., and CAMPBELL and HANCOCK, JJ.

Appellant, D.E., appeals the order terminating her parental rights to M.E., T.E., and Z.E.¹ D.E.'s appointed counsel has filed a brief in conformity with *Anders v. California* rendering his professional opinion that any issue that could be raised on appeal is frivolous and without legal merit. See 386 U.S. 738, 87 S.Ct. 1396, 18 L.Ed.2d 493 (1967). D.E.'s counsel avers that he has zealously reviewed the record in this matter and can find no arguable points of appeal. Counsel has filed a motion to withdraw and provided D.E. with a copy of the brief. Further, counsel has advised D.E.

¹ To protect the parent's and children's privacy, we refer to them by initials. See TEX. FAM. CODE ANN. § 109.002(d) (West 2014); TEX. R. APP. P. 9.8(b).

that she has the right to file a *pro se* response to the *Anders* brief. The Court has likewise advised D.E. of this right. Additionally, D.E.'s counsel has certified that he has provided appellant with a copy of the record to use in preparation of a *pro se* response. See *Kelly v. State*, No. PD-0792-13, Tex. Crim. App. LEXIS 911 (Tex. Crim. App. June 25, 2014). D.E. has not favored the Court with a response.

This Court has long held that an appointed attorney in a termination case might discharge his professional duty to his client by filing a brief in conformity with the *Anders* process. See *In re A.W.T.*, 61 S.W.3d 87, 88-89 (Tex. App.—Amarillo 2001, no pet.). Likewise, other intermediate appellate courts have so held. See *Sanchez v. Tex. Dep't of Family & Protective Servs.*, No. 03-10-00249-CV, 2011 Tex. App. LEXIS 2162, at *1 (Tex. App.—Austin March 24, 2011, no pet.) (mem. op.); *In re L.K.H.*, No. 11-10-00080-CV, 2011 Tex. App. LEXIS 1706, at *2-4 (Tex. App.—Eastland March 10, 2011, no pet.) (mem. op.); *In re D.D.*, 279 S.W.3d 849, 849-50 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2009, pet. denied); *In re D.E.S.*, 135 S.W.3d 326, 326-27 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2004, no pet.).

We have conducted our own review of the record in this matter and have come to the conclusion that there are no arguable points of appeal. See *In re A.W.T.*, 61 S.W.3d at 89. We, therefore, grant counsel's motion to withdraw. We remind counsel that D.E. has the right to file a *pro se* petition for review to the Texas Supreme Court. Finally, having found no arguable points of appeal requiring reversal, we affirm the judgment of the trial court.

Mackey K. Hancock
Justice