

**Affirmed and Memorandum Opinion filed December 20, 2022.**



**In The**

**Fourteenth Court of Appeals**

---

**NO. 14-22-00675-CV**

---

**IN THE INTEREST OF D.L.C., A CHILD**

---

**On Appeal from the 315th District Court  
Harris County, Texas  
Trial Court Cause No. 2020-01658J**

---

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Mother's counsel contends that there isn't a non-frivolous ground to challenge the trial court's judgment terminating Mother's parental rights to the Child because there is legally and factually sufficient evidence to support at least one predicate ground for termination, including endangerment under subsection (E), and that termination is in the Child's best interest.

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 In re D.E.S.*, 135 S.W.3d 326, 329

(Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2004, no pet.) (*Anders* procedures apply to an appeal from termination of parental rights). This court and Mother’s counsel notified Mother that counsel filed an *Anders* brief, and this court informed her about how to obtain a copy of the record and her right to file a pro se response. *See id.* at 329–30. No pro se response has been filed.

We have reviewed the record and counsel’s brief and agree that there isn’t a non-frivolous ground to challenge the trial court’s judgment terminating Mother’s parental rights because the evidence is legally and factually sufficient to support the trial court’s best-interest finding and the finding that Mother engaged in conduct that endangered the physical or emotional well-being of the Child under Section 161.001(b)(1)(E) of the Family Code. Counsel thoroughly analyzed the sufficiency of the evidence supporting the trial court’s findings. We find no reversible error in the record. A detailed discussion of this issue would add nothing to the jurisprudence of the state. *See In re D.E.S.*, 135 S.W.3d at 330.

Accordingly, the trial court’s judgment is affirmed.

PER CURIAM

Panel consists of Chief Justice Christopher and Justices Wise and Hassan.