



**In the
Court of Appeals
Second Appellate District of Texas
at Fort Worth**

No. 02-18-00272-CV

IN THE MATTER OF M.L.

On Appeal from the 323rd District Court
Tarrant County, Texas
Trial Court No. 323-105801-17

Before Sudderth, C.J.; Birdwell and Womack, JJ.
Memorandum Opinion by Justice Womack

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This is an appeal from a juvenile court's judgment adjudicating M.L. delinquent and ordering probation. *See* Tex. Fam. Code Ann. §§ 54.03, 54.04, 56.01; Tex. Penal Code Ann. §§ 21.11(a)(2), 22.021(a)(2)(B). M.L.'s court-appointed appellate counsel has filed a motion to withdraw and a brief in support of that motion, in which he states that he has reviewed the record and believes the appeal is frivolous. Counsel has also filed a motion to withdraw as appellate counsel in accordance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 744, 87 S. Ct. 1396, 1400, 18 L. Ed. 2d 493 (1967). Counsel's brief meets the *Anders* requirements by presenting a professional evaluation of the record demonstrating why there are no arguable grounds for relief. *See Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744, 87 S. Ct. at 1400; *In re D.A.S.*, 973 S.W.2d 296, 299 (Tex. 1998) (orig. proceeding) (holding that *Anders* procedures apply to juvenile appeals).

Appellate counsel notified M.L. of the right to file a pro se response to counsel's *Anders* brief. This court also notified both M.L. and his father of the right to file a response to counsel's *Anders* brief. We have not received any response. The State declined to file a brief.

When an appellant's court-appointed counsel files a motion to withdraw on the ground that an appeal is frivolous and fulfills the requirements of *Anders*, we must independently examine the record to see if there is any arguable ground that may be raised on the appellant's behalf. *See Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 511 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991); *In re A.H.*, 530 S.W.3d 715, 717 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2017, no pet.).

When determining whether a ground for appeal exists, we consider the record, the briefs, and any pro se response. *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403, 408–09 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008) (orig. proceeding); *A.H.*, 530 S.W.3d at 717.

We have carefully reviewed the record and counsel’s brief, we agree with counsel that the appeal is wholly frivolous and without merit, and we find nothing in the record that might arguably support the appeal. *See Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826–27 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005); *A.H.*, 530 S.W.3d at 717. We therefore affirm the trial court’s judgment.

However, for the reasons expressed in *In re P.M.*, 520 S.W.3d 24, 26–28, 26 n.5 (Tex. 2016), and *A.H.*, 530 S.W.3d at 717, we deny counsel’s motion to withdraw.

/s/ Dana Womack

Dana Womack
Justice

Delivered: August 8, 2019