

ARKANSAS COURT OF APPEALS

DIVISION II
No. CA12-173

MARCOS AMERICO JUAREZ-
ROSALDO

APPELLANT

V.

ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF
HUMAN SERVICES and MINOR
CHILDREN

APPELLEES

Opinion Delivered June 27, 2012

APPEAL FROM THE POPE COUNTY
CIRCUIT COURT
[NO. JV-2011-11]

HONORABLE KEN D. COKER, JR.,
JUDGE

AFFIRMED; MOTION TO
WITHDRAW GRANTED

ROBERT J. GLADWIN, Judge

This no-merit appeal is from a termination-of-parental-rights order filed in Pope County Circuit Court on November 30, 2011. Appellant Marcos Americo Juarez-Rosaldo filed a notice of appeal on December 20, 2011, and his appellate counsel filed a motion to withdraw on March 26, 2012, and a brief in accordance with *Linker-Flores v. Arkansas Department of Human Services*, 359 Ark. 131, 194 S.W.3d 739 (2004), and Rule 6-9(i) (2011) of the Rules of the Arkansas Supreme Court, alleging that no meritorious issues exist to support the appeal in this case.

Appellant was provided a copy of his counsel's brief and submitted a list of pro se points for reversal under Arkansas Supreme Court Rule 6-9(i)(3). In the accompanying brief, counsel explained why there is no meritorious ground for reversal and discussed the sufficiency of the evidence to support the termination order based on evidence presented at

all of the prior proceedings that were incorporated in the record of the termination proceeding, as required by *Lewis v. Arkansas Department of Human Services*, 364 Ark. 243, 217 S.W.3d 788 (2005).

In appellant's list of pro se points for reversal he contends that he "made a mistake" and that he is sorry; he wants another chance to be in his children's lives; he did not know how to do the things a dad is supposed to do for his family; he is going through an eighteen-month program that includes parenting classes, substance-abuse education, and anger management; his English is improving; he is taking G.E.D. classes; the children's mother is "trying to do better"; he goes in front of the parole board six months before his "T.E." date of January 17, 2013; he loves his children; he wants to change for his family; and he needs his children; and his children need him. This court does not reach arguments in termination cases that were not raised to the trial court. *Moore v. Ark. Dep't of Human Servs.*, 95 Ark. App. 138, 234 S.W.3d 883 (2006). Moreover, appellant provides no citation to authority or persuasive argument to support his arguments; thus, pursuant to *Pinder v. State*, 2012 Ark. 45, this court need not address them.

After carefully examining the record, the brief, and appellant's pro se points, we hold that his attorney has complied with the requirements established by the Arkansas Supreme Court for no-merit termination cases and that the appeal is wholly without merit. Accordingly, by memorandum opinion, we affirm the termination of appellant's parental rights. *In re Memorandum Opinions*, 16 Ark. App. 301, 700 S.W.2d 63 (1985); Ark. Sup. Ct. R. 5-2(e) (2011). We also grant his attorney's motion to be relieved from representation.

SLIP OPINION

Cite as 2012 Ark. App. 413

Affirmed; motion to withdraw granted.

HART and MARTIN, JJ., agree.