



**In The
Court of Appeals
Seventh District of Texas at Amarillo**

No. 07-13-00398-CV

**IN THE INTEREST OF Z.B.W., Z.W.,
D.L., D.L., AND M.L., A/K/A M.W., CHILDREN**

On Appeal from the 72nd District Court
Lubbock County, Texas
Trial Court No. 2010-558,710, Honorable Ruben Gonzales Reyes, Presiding

March 25, 2014

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Before QUINN, CJ., and HANCOCK and PIRTLE, JJ.

Appellant, Trisha,¹ appeals an order of the trial court terminating her parental rights to Z.B.W., Z.W., D.L., D.L., and M.L., a/k/a M.W., her five children. Trisha's appointed counsel has filed a brief in conformity with *Anders v. California* rendering her professional opinion that any issue that could be raised on appeal is frivolous and without legal merit. See 386 U.S.738, 87 S.Ct. 1396, 18 L.Ed.2d 493 (1967). Trisha's counsel avers that she has zealously reviewed the record in this matter and can find no

¹ Throughout this opinion, appellant will be referred to as "Trisha," and the children will be identified by their initials. See TEX. FAM. CODE ANN. § 109.002(d) (West Supp. 2013); TEX. R. APP. P. 9.8(b).

arguable points of appeal. Counsel has filed a motion to withdraw and provided Trisha with a copy of the brief. Further, counsel has advised Trisha that she has the right to file a *pro se* response to the *Anders* brief. The Court has likewise advised Trisha of this right. Trisha has not favored the Court with a response.

This Court has long held that an appointed attorney in a termination case might discharge his professional duty to his client by filing a brief in conformity with the *Anders* process. See *In re A.W.T.*, 61 S.W.3d 87, 88-89 (Tex. App.—Amarillo 2001, no pet.). Likewise, other intermediate appellate courts have so held. See *Sanchez v. Tex. Dep’t of Family and Protective Servs.*, No. 03-10-00249-CV, 2011 Tex. App. LEXIS 2162, at *1 (Tex. App.—Austin March 24, 2011, no pet.) (mem. op.); *In re L.K.H.*, No. 11-10-00080-CV, 2011 Tex. App. LEXIS 1706, at *2-4 (Tex. App.—Eastland March 10, 2011, no pet.) (mem. op.); *In re D.D.*, 279 S.W.3d 849, 849-50 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2009, pet. denied); *In re D.E.S.*, 135 S.W.3d 326, 326-27 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2004, no pet.).

We have conducted our own review of the record in this matter and have come to the conclusion that there are no arguable points of appeal. See *In re A.W.T.*, 61 S.W.3d at 89. We, therefore, grant counsel’s motion to withdraw. We remind counsel that Trisha has the right to file a *pro se* petition for review at the Texas Supreme Court. Finally, having found no arguable points of appeal requiring reversal, we affirm the judgment of the trial court.

Mackey K. Hancock
Justice