

**Affirmed and Opinion Filed November 30, 2016**



**In The  
Court of Appeals  
Fifth District of Texas at Dallas**

---

**No. 05-16-00662-CV**

---

**IN THE INTEREST OF L.R.C.V., A CHILD**

---

**On Appeal from the 330th Judicial District Court  
Dallas County, Texas  
Trial Court Cause No. DF-15-08826**

---

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Before Chief Justice Wright, Justice Bridges, and Justice Lang  
Opinion by Justice Bridges

Alejandro Valles appeals the trial court's order terminating his parental rights to his child, L.R.C.V. This Court, by letter dated October 4, 2016, notified Valles that his pro se brief did not comply with the rules of appellate procedure and ordered him to file an amended brief that complied with rule of appellate procedure 38.1. The letter cautioned appellant that failure to file an amended brief could result in the submission of this appeal on the deficient brief. Appellant has failed to file an amended brief.

We construe liberally pro se pleadings and briefs; however, we hold pro se litigants to the same standards as licensed attorneys and require them to comply with applicable laws and rules of procedure. *In re N.E.B.*, 251 S.W.3d 211, 211–12 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2008, no pet.) (citing *Mansfield State Bank v. Cohn*, 573 S.W.2d 181, 184–85 (Tex. 1978)). To do otherwise would give a pro se litigant an unfair advantage over a litigant who is represented by counsel. *Id.* at

212. The law is well established that, to present an issue to this Court, a party's brief shall contain, among other things, a concise, nonargumentative statement of the facts of the case, supported by record references, and a clear and concise argument for the contention made with appropriate citations to authorities and the record. TEX. R. APP. P. 38.1; *In re N.E.B.*, 251 S.W.3d at 212. Bare assertions of error, without argument or authority, waive error. *In re N.E.B.*, 251 S.W.3d at 212; *see also Fredonia State Bank v. Gen. Am. Life Ins. Co.*, 881 S.W.2d 279, 284 (Tex. 1994) (appellate court has discretion to waive point of error due to inadequate briefing). When a party fails to adequately brief a complaint, he waives the issue on appeal. *In re N.E.B.*, 251 S.W.3d at 212.

The record shows the trial court conducted a hearing on April 22, 2016, at which Valles failed to appear. The trial court determined by clear and convincing evidence that appellant: (1) voluntarily left L.R.C.V. alone or in the possession of another without providing adequate support of the child and remained away for a period of at least six months; (2) knowingly placed or knowingly allowed L.R.C.V. to remain in conditions or surroundings that endangered L.R.C.V.'s physical or emotional well-being; and (3) used a controlled substance in a manner that endangered L.R.C.V.'s health or safety and failed to complete a court-ordered substance abuse treatment program. The trial court found that termination of the parent-child relationship between Valles and L.R.C.V. was in the best interest of L.R.C.V.

In a two-paragraph "Summary of the Arguments," Valles appears to argue he did not receive notice of the April 22, 2016 hearing and the trial court erred in denying Valles' request for appointed counsel. On the contrary, the record shows Valles was notified of the April 22, 2016 hearing when he participated at a hearing on January 8, 2016. Nevertheless, Valles failed to appear at the April 22, 2016 hearing and, though properly cited, at the July 29, 2016 hearing on his request for appointed counsel. Valles has failed to provide us with argument, analysis, or

authorities that make his appellant complaints viable. *Id.* By failing to adequately brief his complaints, Valles has waived our review of his complaints. *See id.* Accordingly, we need not further address Valles' complaints.

We affirm the trial court's judgment.

/David L. Bridges/  
DAVID L. BRIDGES  
JUSTICE

160662F.P05



**Court of Appeals  
Fifth District of Texas at Dallas**

**JUDGMENT**

IN THE INTEREST OF L.R.C.V., A  
CHILD

No. 05-16-00662-CV

On Appeal from the 330th Judicial District  
Court, Dallas County, Texas  
Trial Court Cause No. DF-15-08826.  
Opinion delivered by Justice Bridges. Chief  
Justice Wright and Justice Lang  
participating.

In accordance with this Court's opinion of this date, the judgment of the trial court is  
**AFFIRMED.**

It is **ORDERED** that appellees Stephanie Clanton and Adam Clanton recover their costs  
of this appeal from appellant Alejandro Valles.

Judgment entered November 30, 2016.