



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

---

No. 07-15-00194-CV

---

IN THE INTEREST OF G.D., A CHILD

---

On Appeal from the 364th District Court  
Lubbock County, Texas  
Trial Court No. 2014-511,239, Honorable Kara L. Darnell, Presiding

---

August 27, 2015

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Before CAMPBELL and HANCOCK and PIRTLE, JJ.

Appellants, J.D., the father, and C.F., the mother, appeal the decision of the trial court to terminate their respective parental rights to G.D. J.D. and C.F.'s appointed counsel has filed a brief in conformity with *Anders v. California* rendering her 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). J.D. and C.F.'s counsel avers that she 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 both parents with a copy of the brief. Further, counsel has advised J.D. and C.F. that each has the right to file a *pro se* response to the *Anders* brief. The Court has

likewise advised both parents of this right. Additionally, J.D. and C.F.'s counsel has certified that she has provided appellant with a copy of the record to use in preparation of a *pro se* response. See *Kelly v. State*, 436 S.W.3d 313, 321–22 (Tex. Crim. App. 2014). C.F. has not favored the Court with a response. J.D. has filed a response to counsel's *Anders* brief.

This Court has long held that an appointed attorney in a termination case might discharge her professional duty to her 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 and Protective Servs.*, No. 03-10-00249-CV, 2011 Tex. App. LEXIS 2162, at \*1 (Tex. App.—Austin Mar. 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 Mar. 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 have reviewed the response filed by J.D., and that review has revealed no arguable points of appeal. J.D.'s response is more akin to a plea for forgiveness and mercy. These are requests that we are unable to grant.

We, therefore, grant counsel's motion to withdraw. We remind counsel that J.D. and C.F. have the right to file a *pro se* petition for review with 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