

Affirmed and Memorandum Opinion filed May 11, 2017.



**In The
Fourteenth Court of Appeals**

NO. 14-16-00653-CV

**THE STATE OF TEXAS FOR THE BEST INTEREST AND PROTECTION
OF P.P.**

**On Appeal from Probate Court No. 3
Harris County, Texas
Trial Court Cause No. I230121**

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

This is an appeal from an order authorizing the administration of psychoactive medication to appellant. *See* Tex. Health & Safety Code Ann. § 574.106 (West 2010).

Appellant's appointed counsel filed a brief in which she concludes the appeal is wholly frivolous and without merit. 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 High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807, 811–13 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978); *State ex rel.*

L.E.H., 228 S.W.3d 219, 220 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 2007, no pet.) (applying *Anders* procedures to appeal from mental health order).

A copy of counsel’s brief was delivered to appellant. Appellant was advised of the right to examine the appellate record and file a pro se response. *See Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 512 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991). As of this date, more than 60 days have passed and no pro se response has been filed.

We have carefully reviewed the record and counsel’s brief and agree that there are no arguable grounds to be advanced on appeal, and the appeal is without merit. Further, we find no reversible error in the record. We are not to address the merits of each claim raised in an *Anders* brief or a pro se response when we have determined there are no arguable grounds for review. *See Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 827–28 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005).

Accordingly, the judgment of the trial court is affirmed.

PER CURIAM

Panel consists of Justices Boyce, Jamison, and Brown.