

In The
Court of Appeals
Ninth District of Texas at Beaumont

NO. 09-15-00246-CV

IN THE INTEREST OF T.H.

On Appeal from the County Court at Law No. 3
Montgomery County, Texas
Trial Cause No. 14-04-03973 CV

MEMORANDUM OPINION

C.H. appeals from an order terminating her parental rights to her minor child, T.H.¹ The trial court found, by clear and convincing evidence, that statutory grounds exist for termination of C.H.'s parental rights and that termination of C.H.'s parental rights would be in the best interest of the child. *See* Tex. Fam. Code Ann. § 161.001(1)(E), (N), (O), (2) (West 2014).

C.H.'s court-appointed appellate counsel submitted a brief in which counsel contends there are no arguable grounds to be advanced on appeal. *See Anders v.*

¹ To protect the identity of the minor, we use the initials for the child and the child's mother. *See* Tex. R. App. P. 9.8(b)(2).

California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967); *In re L.D.T.*, 161 S.W.3d 728, 731 (Tex. App.—Beaumont 2005, no pet.). The brief provides counsel’s professional evaluation of the record. Counsel certified that C.H. was served with a copy of the *Anders* brief filed on her behalf. This Court notified C.H. of her right to file a *pro se* response, as well as the deadline for doing so. This Court did not receive a *pro se* response.

We have independently reviewed the appellate record and counsel’s brief, and we agree that any appeal would be frivolous. We find no arguable error requiring us to order appointment of new counsel to re-brief this appeal. *Compare Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 511 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991). We affirm the trial court’s order terminating C.H.’s parental rights, and we grant counsel’s motion to withdraw.²

AFFIRMED.

LEANNE JOHNSON
Justice

Submitted on November 10, 2015
Opinion Delivered November 12, 2015

Before McKeithen, C.J., Horton and Johnson, JJ.

² With respect to withdrawing from the case, counsel shall inform C.H. of the outcome of this appeal and inform her that she has the right to file a petition for review with the Texas Supreme Court. *See* Tex. R. App. P. 53; *In the Interest of K.D.*, 127 S.W.3d 66, 68 n.3 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2003, no pet.).