

Affirmed and Memorandum Opinion filed October 19, 2023.



In The

Fourteenth Court of Appeals

NO. 14-23-00367-CV

IN THE INTEREST OF C.R., A CHILD

**On Appeal from the 310th District Court
Harris County, Texas
Trial Court Cause No. 2017-07130**

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Mother's counsel contends that there is no 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). Mother’s counsel notified this court that counsel delivered to Mother a copy of the *Anders* brief and this court’s letter informing Mother 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 is no 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. 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 Justices Wise, Zimmerer, and Poissant.