



**In The
Court of Appeals
Sixth Appellate District of Texas at Texarkana**

No. 06-16-00033-CV

THE STATE OF TEXAS FOR THE
BEST INTEREST AND PROTECTION OF H.S.

On Appeal from the County Court at Law No. 2
Hunt County, Texas
Trial Court No. M-11179

Before Morriss, C.J., Moseley and Burgess, JJ.
Memorandum Opinion by Justice Moseley

MEMORANDUM OPINION

H.S. appeals a trial court's order authorizing the administration of psychoactive drugs. A trial court may enter an order authorizing the administration of psychoactive medication to a patient who is under an order for extended mental health services if it finds, by clear and convincing evidence "that the patient lacks the capacity to make a decision regarding the administration of the proposed medication and treatment with the proposed medication is in the best interest of the patient." *See* TEX. HEALTH & SAFETY CODE ANN. § 574.106(a-1)(1) (West 2010).

On appeal, H.S. does not argue that the evidence is legally insufficient to show (1) that she lacks the capacity to make a decision regarding the administration of the proposed medication and treatment or (2) that the proposed medication is in her best interest. Instead, H.S. argues only that the trial court's extended commitment order is not supported by legally and factually sufficient evidence and that, therefore, the order authorizing the administration of psychoactive medication is likewise invalid. However, in our cause number 06-16-00019-CV, this Court affirmed the trial court's extended commitment order, concluding that such order was supported by legally and factually sufficient evidence. Accordingly, we overrule H.S.'s legal sufficiency point and affirm the trial court's order authorizing the administration of psychoactive medication.

We affirm the trial court's judgment.

Bailey C. Moseley
Justice

Date Submitted: May 20, 2016
Date Decided: May 27, 2016