



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

No. 02-22-00162-CV

IN THE INTEREST OF A.R., A CHILD

On Appeal from the 325th District Court
Tarrant County, Texas
Trial Court No. 325-703446-21

Before Sudderth, C.J.; Kerr and Walker, JJ.
Memorandum Opinion by Justice Walker

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Appellants Mother and Father both appeal from the trial court's judgment terminating their parental rights to their child, A.R.¹ See Tex. Fam. Code Ann. §§ 161.001(b), 161.206. Because we find no arguable grounds for reversal, we affirm the trial court's final order of termination.

The attorneys for Mother and Father have each filed an *Anders* brief stating that they have conducted a professional evaluation of the record and have concluded that there are no arguable grounds to be advanced to support an appeal of the trial court's termination order and that the appeal is frivolous. See *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 744, 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 cases terminating parental rights). Father's attorney also filed a motion to withdraw as his attorney of record.

The briefs meet the *Anders* requirements by presenting professional evaluations of the record and by demonstrating why there are no arguable grounds to be advanced on appeal for either parent. Additionally, both Mother and Father have been (1) provided with a copy of the brief filed by their respective attorneys, (2) informed of their rights to file a pro se response and to seek discretionary review from the supreme court, and (3) advised of their rights to access the appellate record.

¹We use initials to refer to the child. See Tex. Fam. Code Ann. § 109.002(d); Tex. R. App. P. 9.8(b)(2).

See Kelly v. State, 436 S.W.3d 313, 319–20 (Tex. Crim. App. 2014). Mother and Father did not respond, and the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services has indicated that it does not intend to file a response to either *Anders* brief.

When an *Anders* brief is filed, we must independently examine the record to determine if any arguable grounds for appeal exist. *In re C.J.*, 501 S.W.3d 254, 255 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2016, pets. denied). Our examination should consider the record, the briefs, and any pro se response. *In re L.B.*, No. 02-19-00407-CV, 2020 WL 1809505, at *1 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth Apr. 9, 2020, no pet.) (mem. op.).

Having carefully and independently reviewed the entire record and the *Anders* briefs, we conclude that there are no arguable grounds supporting the appeals; thus, we agree with the attorneys for Mother and Father that their appeals are without merit. *See C.J.*, 501 S.W.3d at 255. Accordingly, we affirm the trial court’s final order of termination. *See* Tex. R. App. P. 43.2(a). However, we deny the motion to withdraw filed by Father’s attorney because it did not show good cause for withdrawal. *See In re P.M.*, 520 S.W.3d 24, 27–28 (Tex. 2016); *In re C.J.*, 501 S.W.3d at 255. Thus, counsels for both Mother and Father remain appointed in this case through any proceedings in the supreme court unless otherwise relieved of these duties. *See In re P.M.*, 520 S.W.3d at 27.

/s/ Brian Walker

Brian Walker
Justice

Delivered: October 20, 2022