



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

---

No. 02-22-00174-CV

---

IN THE INTEREST OF C.E., A CHILD

---

On Appeal from the 233rd District Court  
Tarrant County, Texas  
Trial Court No. 233-703782-21

---

Before Birdwell, Womack, and Wallach, JJ.  
Memorandum Opinion by Justice Birdwell

## MEMORANDUM OPINION

Appellant Mother appeals the termination of her parental rights to her child C.E.<sup>1</sup> See Tex. Fam. Code Ann. § 161.001(b)(1)(N), (O), (b)(2).

Mother's appointed appellate counsel has filed a brief asserting that her 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-rights termination cases). The brief meets the *Anders* requirements by presenting a professional evaluation of the record and demonstrating why there are no arguable grounds to be advanced on appeal. Mother was provided with the opportunity to obtain a copy of the appellate record and to file a pro se response. Neither she nor the Department of Family and Protective Services has filed a response.

When an *Anders* brief is filed, we must independently examine the appellate record to determine if any arguable grounds for appeal exist. *In re C.J.*, No. 02-18-00219-CV, 2018 WL 4496240, at \*1 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth Sept. 20, 2018, no pet.) (mem. op.); see also *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 511 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991); *Mays v. State*, 904 S.W.2d 920, 922–23 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 1995, no pet.). We also consider the *Anders* brief itself and any pro se response. *In re K.M.*, No. 02-18-00073-CV, 2018 WL 3288591, at \*10 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth July 5, 2018, pet. denied)

---

<sup>1</sup>In a termination-of-parental-rights case, we use aliases or initials for the names of the children and their parents. See Tex. Fam. Code Ann. § 109.002(d); Tex. R. App. P. 9.8(b)(2).

(mem. op.); see *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403, 408–09 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008) (orig. proceeding).

We have carefully reviewed counsel’s brief and the appellate record. Finding no reversible error, we agree with counsel that this appeal is without merit. See *Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 827 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005); *In re D.D.*, 279 S.W.3d 849, 850 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2009, pet. denied). Therefore, we affirm the trial court’s judgment terminating Mother’s parental rights to C.E.<sup>2</sup>

/s/ Wade Birdwell

Wade Birdwell  
Justice

Delivered: August 25, 2022

---

<sup>2</sup>Although counsel filed a motion to withdraw, she remains appointed in this appeal through proceedings in the supreme court unless she is otherwise relieved of her duties for good cause in accordance with Family Code Section 107.016. See Tex. Fam. Code Ann. § 107.016; *In re P.M.*, 520 S.W.3d 24, 27 (Tex. 2016).