



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

---

No. 07-18-00279-CV

---

**IN THE INTEREST OF J.D.V., S.E.H.E., R.G.E., AND H.R.E., JR., CHILDREN**

---

On Appeal from the 100th District Court  
Donley County, Texas  
Trial Court No. DTX-17-07376, Honorable Stuart Messer, Presiding

---

September 18, 2018

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

**Before QUINN, C.J., and CAMPBELL and PARKER, JJ.**

L.E. had her parental rights to J.D.V., S.E.H.E., R.G.E., and H.R.E., Jr. terminated and appealed from that order. Her appointed counsel filed a motion to withdraw, together with an *Anders*<sup>1</sup> brief. In the latter, counsel certified that the record was diligently searched and that the appeal was without merit. Appellate counsel also attached a copy of a letter sent to L.E. informing her of her right to file a *pro se* response. L.E. was also provided a copy of the appellate record, according to counsel. By letter dated August 28, 2018, this court also notified L.E. of her right to file her own brief or

---

<sup>1</sup>*Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 87 S. Ct. 1396, 18 L. Ed. 2d 493 (1967).

response by September 17, 2018, if she wished to do so. To date no response has been received.

In compliance with the principles enunciated in *Anders*, appellate counsel discussed potential areas for appeal which included the sufficiency of the evidence to support the statutory grounds found for termination and whether termination was in the best interests of the children. L.E. had executed an affidavit of relinquishment of her parental rights. Counsel, on appeal, explained that no evidence existed to show that the affidavit was procured by fraud, duress or coercion, and there was sufficient evidence to support a finding that termination was in the best interests of the children. Per our obligation specified in *In re D.D.*, 279 S.W.3d 849, 850 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2009, pet. denied) (citing *Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 827 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005)), we too reviewed the appellate record in search of arguable issues for appeal. None were found. Thus, we concur with counsel's representation that the appeal is meritless due to the absence of reversible error. Accordingly, the judgment is affirmed.<sup>2</sup>

Brian Quinn  
Chief Justice

---

<sup>2</sup>We call counsel's attention to the continuing duty of representation through the exhaustion of proceedings, which may include the filing of a petition for review. Counsel has filed a motion to withdraw, on which we will take no action. *In re P.M.*, 520 S.W.3d 24, 27 (Tex. 2016) (per curiam).