



**COURT OF APPEALS
SECOND DISTRICT OF TEXAS
FORT WORTH**

NO. 02-18-00092-CV

IN THE INTEREST OF A.A., A
CHILD

FROM THE 233RD DISTRICT COURT OF TARRANT COUNTY
TRIAL COURT NO. 233-616179-17

MEMORANDUM OPINION¹

Appellant G.A. (Father) appeals the trial court's order terminating his parental rights to his child A.A. The trial court found by clear and convincing evidence that termination was appropriate under subsections (L), (N), (O), and (Q) of family code section 161.001(b)(1) and under section 161.002(b) and that termination was in A.A.'s best interest. See Tex. Fam. Code Ann. §§ 161.001(b)(1)(L), (N), (O), (Q), (2), 161.002(b) (West Supp. 2017).

¹See Tex. R. App. P. 47.4.

Father's court-appointed appellate attorney has filed a motion to withdraw as counsel and a brief in support of that motion, averring that after diligently reviewing the record, he believes that the appeal is frivolous. See *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 744–45, 87 S. Ct. 1396, 1400 (1967); see also *In re K.M.*, 98 S.W.3d 774, 776–77 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2003, no pet.) (holding that *Anders* procedures apply in parental termination cases). The brief meets the requirements of *Anders* by presenting a professional evaluation of the record and demonstrating why there are no arguable grounds to be advanced on appeal. We gave Father the opportunity to file a response, and he did so.

As the reviewing appellate court, we must independently examine the record to decide whether an attorney is correct in determining that the appeal is frivolous. See *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 511 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991); *In re K.R.C.*, 346 S.W.3d 618, 619 (Tex. App.—El Paso 2009, no pet.). Having carefully reviewed the record, the *Anders* brief, and Father's pro se response, we agree that the appeal is frivolous. We find nothing in the record that might arguably support Father's appeal. See *Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 827 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005).

Therefore, we affirm the trial court's order terminating the parent-child relationship between Father and A.A. However, we deny the motion to withdraw because it does not show "good cause" separate and apart from its accurate determination that there are no arguable grounds for appeal. See *In re P.M.*, 520

S.W.3d 24, 27 (Tex. 2016), *cert. denied*, 138 S. Ct. 1562 (2018); *In re C.J.*, 501 S.W.3d 254, 255 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2016, *pets. denied*).²

/s/ Bill Meier
BILL MEIER
JUSTICE

PANEL: MEIER, PITTMAN, and BIRDWELL, JJ.

DELIVERED: July 12, 2018

² “[A]ppointed counsel’s obligations can be satisfied by filing a petition for review that satisfies the standards for an *Anders* brief.” *P.M.*, 520 S.W.3d at 27–28.