



In The
Eleventh Court of Appeals

No. 11-21-00204-CV

IN THE INTEREST OF D.Q., JR., A CHILD

**On Appeal from the 318th District Court
Midland County, Texas
Trial Court Cause No. FM67512**

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This is an appeal from a final order in which the trial court terminated the parental rights of the parents of D.Q., Jr. *See* TEX. FAM. CODE ANN. § 161.001 (West Supp. 2021). The mother filed a notice of appeal. We affirm.

Appellant's court-appointed counsel has filed a motion to withdraw and a supporting brief in which she professionally and conscientiously examines the record and applicable law and concludes that the appeal presents no issues of arguable merit and is therefore frivolous. The brief meets the requirements of *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), by presenting a professional evaluation of the record and demonstrating why there are no arguable grounds to be advanced. *See In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403, 406–08 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008); *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807, 812 (Tex. Crim. App. [Panel Op.] 1978). In light of a holding by

the Texas Supreme Court, however, an *Anders* motion to withdraw “may be premature” if filed in the court of appeals under the circumstances presented in this case. *See In re P.M.*, 520 S.W.3d 24, 27 (Tex. 2016). The court in *P.M.* stated that “appointed counsel’s obligations can be satisfied by filing a petition for review that satisfies the standards for an *Anders* brief.” *Id.* at 27–28.

Appellant’s counsel provided Appellant with a copy of the brief and the motion to withdraw. In compliance with *Kelly v. State*, 436 S.W.3d 313, 318–20 (Tex. Crim. App. 2014), counsel provided Appellant with a copy of the reporter’s record in this cause and a form motion for pro se access to the appellate record. Counsel also informed Appellant of her right to review the record and file a pro se response to counsel’s brief. We conclude that Appellant’s counsel has satisfied her duties under *Anders*, *Schulman*, and *Kelly*.

We note that Appellant has not filed a pro se response to counsel’s *Anders* brief and motion to withdraw. Following the procedures outlined in *Anders* and *Schulman*, we have independently reviewed the record in this cause, and we agree that the appeal is frivolous. However, in light of *P.M.*, we must deny the motion to withdraw that was filed by Appellant’s court-appointed counsel. *See P.M.*, 520 S.W.3d at 27.

Accordingly, we deny counsel’s motion to withdraw, and we affirm the trial court’s order of termination.

PER CURIAM

February 3, 2022

Panel consists of: Bailey, C.J.,
Trotter, J., and Williams, J.