



**Fourth Court of Appeals**  
**San Antonio, Texas**

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

No. 04-17-00020-CV

**IN THE INTEREST OF D.A.G., R.G. Jr., J.X.G., and S.A.G., Children**

From the 112th Judicial District Court, Sutton County, Texas  
Trial Court No. 6066  
Honorable Pedro Gomez Jr., Judge Presiding

Opinion by: Luz Elena D. Chapa, Justice

Sitting: Sandee Bryan Marion, Chief Justice  
Rebeca C. Martinez, Justice  
Luz Elena D. Chapa, Justice

Delivered and Filed: July 5, 2017

**AFFIRMED; MOTION TO WITHDRAW DENIED**

R.G.<sup>1</sup> appeals the trial court's order terminating his parent-child relationship with D.A.G., R.G. Jr., J.X.G., and S.A.G. Appellant's court-appointed appellate attorney filed a brief and motion to withdraw containing a professional evaluation of the record, asserting there are no arguable grounds to be advanced, and concluding the appeal is frivolous. The brief meets the requirements of *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967). *See In re P.M.*, — S.W.3d — No. 15-0171, 2016 WL 1274748, at \*3, n. 10 (Tex. April 1, 2016) (stating that *Anders* procedures protect indigent parents' statutory right to counsel on appeal in parental rights termination cases and apply in those cases). Appellant was provided copies of the brief and motion to withdraw and

---

<sup>1</sup> To protect the identity of the minor child, we refer to the father and children by their initials. *See* TEX. FAM. CODE ANN. § 109.002(d) (West 2014); TEX. R. APP. P. 9.8.

was informed of his right to review the record and file his own brief. In addition, counsel advised appellant to immediately file a motion in this court if he wished to review the appellate record and enclosed a form motion for that purpose. Appellant did not request access to the record. The court again advised appellant of his right to file a pro se brief and set a deadline for filing. Appellant did not file a pro se brief.

We have thoroughly reviewed the record and the attorney's *Anders* brief, and we agree with counsel that the appeal is without merit. Accordingly, we affirm the trial court's termination order.

However, we deny counsel's motion to withdraw because the motion does not assert any ground for withdrawal apart from counsel's conclusion that the appeal is frivolous. See *In re A.M.*, 495 S.W.3d 573, 583 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2016, pet. denied). Counsel's duty to his client extends through the exhaustion or waiver of all appeals, including the filing of a petition for review in the Texas Supreme Court. See TEX. FAM. CODE ANN. § 107.016(2) (West 2014); *In re P.M.*, 2016 WL 1274748 at \*3. After this court has rendered its decision, appointed counsel's obligations to his client may be satisfied by filing a petition for review that satisfies the standards for an *Anders* brief. *In re P.M.*, 2016 WL 1274748, at \*3 & n. 14.

Luz Elena D. Chapa, Justice