



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

No. 07-22-00054-CV

IN THE MATTER OF R.D.D., APPELLANT

On Appeal from the County Court at Law No. 1
Randall County, Texas
Trial Court No. 7215J, Honorable James W. Anderson, Presiding

August 29, 2022

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Before QUINN, C.J., and PARKER and DOSS, JJ.

R.D.D., a juvenile, pleaded true to the State's allegation that he had engaged in delinquent conduct based on a charge of aggravated assault causing serious bodily injury. The trial court found that R.D.D. had engaged in delinquent conduct and committed him into the care, custody, and control of the Texas Juvenile Justice Department for an indeterminate period of time, not to exceed R.D.D.'s nineteenth birthday. R.D.D.'s court-appointed counsel has filed a motion to withdraw, supported by

an *Anders* brief in which he asserts that he has reviewed the record and believes the appeal is without merit.¹ We affirm the trial court's judgment.

In his brief, counsel for R.D.D. states that, after his thorough review of the record, he has concluded that an appeal of the disposition order is frivolous. See *Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744; *In re D.A.S.*, 973 S.W.2d 296, 299 (Tex. 1998) (extending *Anders* procedures to appeals from civil juvenile delinquency adjudications). Counsel certifies he served R.D.D. and his mother a copy of the motion to withdraw and *Anders* brief and advised them of their right to review the record and file a pro se response. This Court has also notified both R.D.D. and his mother of the opportunity to respond to counsel's motion and brief. See *In re A.L.H.*, 974 S.W.2d 359, 360–61 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1998, no pet.) (per curiam). No response has been filed. The State has not filed a brief.

Once an appellant's court-appointed attorney files an *Anders* brief, this Court is obligated to undertake an independent examination of the record to determine if any arguable grounds for appeal exist. See *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 511 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991). When analyzing whether any grounds for appeal exist, we consider the record, the *Anders* brief, and any responses filed. *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403, 408–09 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008) (orig. proceeding).

We have carefully examined the record and counsel's brief to determine whether there are any non-frivolous issues that were preserved in the trial court which might support an appeal but, like counsel, we have found no such issues. See *Penson v. Ohio*,

¹ See *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 744, 87 S. Ct. 1396, 18 L. Ed. 2d 493 (1967).

488 U.S. 75, 80, 109 S. Ct. 346, 102 L. Ed. 2d 300 (1988); *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 409.

Accordingly, we affirm the trial court's order.²

Judy C. Parker
Justice

² We take no action on counsel's motion to withdraw. 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. See *In re P.M.*, 520 S.W.3d 24, 27–28 (Tex. 2016) (per curiam); *In re A.H.*, 530 S.W.3d 715, 716–17 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2017, no pet.) (explaining why *Anders* and *In re P.M.* apply to an appeal from an order committing a juvenile to the Texas Juvenile Justice Department).