



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

No. 07-14-00102-CV

IN THE INTEREST OF A.G.R., A CHILD

On Appeal from the County Court at Law No. 1
Randall County, Texas
Trial Court No. 10069L1, Honorable Jack M. Graham, Presiding

August 28, 2014

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Before **CAMPBELL** and **HANCOCK** and **PIRTLE, JJ.**

Appellant, R.R.,¹ appeals an order terminating his parental relationship with A.G.R., his infant daughter. R.R.'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). R.R.'s counsel avers that she has zealously reviewed the record in this matter and can find no arguable points of appeal. Counsel has filed a motion to withdraw and provided R.R. with a copy of the brief. Further, counsel has advised R.R. that he has the right to file a *pro se* response to the *Anders* brief. The

¹ To protect the parent's and child's privacy, we refer to them by initials. See TEX. FAM. CODE ANN. § 109.002(d) (West 2012); TEX. R. APP. P. 9.8(b).

Court has likewise advised R.R. of this right. Additionally, R.R.'s counsel has certified that she has provided appellant with a copy of the record to use in preparation of a *pro se response*. See *Kelly v. State*, No. PD-0702-13, 2014 Tex. Crim. App. LEXIS 911 (Tex. Crim. App. June 25, 2014). R.R. has not favored the Court with a response.

This Court has long held that an appointed attorney in a termination case might discharge her professional duty to her 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 R.R. has the right to file a *pro se* petition for review with 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