

**Affirmed and Memorandum Opinion filed January 14, 2016.**



**In The**

**Fourteenth Court of Appeals**

---

**NO. 14-15-00864-CV**

---

**IN THE INTEREST OF B.M.S., A CHILD**

---

**On Appeal from the 314th District Court  
Harris County, Texas  
Trial Court Cause No. 2014-04457J**

---

**M E M O R A N D U M    O P I N I O N**

Appellant, P.R.M., appeals a final decree signed September 9, 2015, terminating her parental rights to the child who is the subject of this suit. We affirm.

Appellant's appointed counsel filed a brief in which he concludes the appeal is wholly frivolous and without merit. The brief meets the requirements of *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), presenting a professional evaluation of the record demonstrating why there are no arguable grounds to be advanced. *See High*

*v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978). The *Anders* procedures are applicable to an appeal from the termination of parental rights when an appointed attorney concludes there are no non-frivolous issues to assert on appeal. *In re D.E.S.*, 135 S.W.3d 326, 329 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2004, no pet.).

A copy of the record and counsel’s brief were delivered to appellant and appellant was notified of the right to file a pro se response. *See Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 510 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991); *In re D.E.S.*, 135 S.W.3d at 329–30. More than twenty-five days have elapsed and as of this date, no pro se response has been filed.

We have carefully reviewed the record and counsel’s brief and agree the appeal is wholly frivolous and without merit. Further, we find no reversible error in the record. A discussion of the brief would add nothing to the jurisprudence of the state.

The judgment of the trial court is affirmed.

PER CURIAM

Panel consists of Chief Justice Frost and Justices Boyce and Wise.