



Fourth Court of Appeals
San Antonio, Texas

MEMORANDUM OPINION

No. 04-13-00687-CV

IN THE INTEREST OF T.S.L., a Child

From the 288th Judicial District Court, Bexar County, Texas
Trial Court No. 2012-PA-01216
Honorable Charles E. Montemayor, Judge Presiding

PER CURIAM

Sitting: Catherine Stone, Chief Justice
Santee Bryan Marion, Justice
Patricia O. Alvarez, Justice

Delivered and Filed: January 29, 2014

AFFIRMED

This is an appeal from the trial court's termination of Appellant K.S.'s parental rights to T.S.L. The trial court terminated Appellant's parental rights based on grounds set forth in Texas Family Code section 161.001. *See* TEX. FAM. CODE ANN. § 161.001(1)(N), (O) (West Supp. 2013). The court also determined that terminating Appellant's parental rights was in T.S.L.'s best interest. *See id.* § 161.001(2).

Appellant's court-appointed attorney filed a brief containing a professional evaluation of the record and demonstrating there are no arguable grounds to be advanced. Based on his evaluation, counsel concludes the appeal is without merit. *See Fletcher v. Dep't of Family & Protective Servs.*, 277 S.W.3d 58, 64 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2009, no pet.) (affirming a judgment because the judgment could be upheld on an unchallenged ground). The brief meets the

requirements of *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 744 (1967). See *In re D.D.*, 279 S.W.3d 849, 850 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2009, pet. denied) (applying *Anders* procedure in an appeal from termination of parental rights); *In re D.E.S.*, 135 S.W.3d 326, 329 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2004, no pet.); *In re RR*, No. 04–03–00096–CV, 2003 WL 21157944, at *4 (Tex. App.—San Antonio May 21, 2003, no pet.) (mem. op.); *In re K.S.M.*, 61 S.W.3d 632, 634 (Tex. App.—Tyler 2001, no pet.). Counsel provided Appellant with a copy of the *Anders* brief and informed her of her right to review the record and file a pro se brief. Appellant has not filed a pro se brief.

After reviewing the record, we agree that the appeal is frivolous and without merit. The judgment of the trial court is affirmed, and counsel’s motion to withdraw is granted. See *Nichols v. State*, 954 S.W.2d 83, 85–86 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1997, no pet.); *Bruns v. State*, 924 S.W.2d 176, 177 n.1 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1996, no pet.).

PER CURIAM