



IN THE  
TENTH COURT OF APPEALS

---

No. 10-20-00211-CV

IN THE INTEREST OF K.L.F., A CHILD

---

From the 74th District Court  
McLennan County, Texas  
Trial Court No. 2019-2023-3

---

---

MEMORANDUM OPINION

---

---

Appellant, R.F., challenges the trial court's order terminating his parental rights to his child, K.L.F. Appellant's appointed appellate counsel has filed an *Anders* brief, asserting that she has diligently reviewed the record and that, in her opinion, the appeal is frivolous. *See generally Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 87 S. Ct. 1396, 18 L. Ed. 493 (1967); *see In re E.L.Y.*, 69 S.W.3d 838, 841 (Tex. App.—Waco 2002, order) (applying *Anders* to termination appeals).

I. *ANDERS* BRIEF

Pursuant to *Anders*, appellant's court-appointed appellate counsel has filed a brief and a motion to withdraw with this Court, stating that her review of the record yielded

no error upon which an appeal can be predicated. Counsel's brief meets the requirements of *Anders* as it presents a professional evaluation demonstrating why there are no arguable grounds to advance on appeal. See *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d 403, 407 n.9 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008) ("In Texas, an *Anders* brief need not specifically advance 'arguable' points of error if counsel finds none, but it must provide record references to the facts and procedural history and set out pertinent legal authorities.") (citing *Hawkins v. State*, 112 S.W.3d 340, 343-44 (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi 2003, no pet.)); *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 510 n.3 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991) (en banc).

In compliance with *High v. State*, 573 S.W.2d 807, 813 (Tex. Crim. App. [Panel Op.] 1978), appellant's counsel has carefully discussed why, under controlling authority, there are no reversible errors in the trial court's judgment. Counsel has informed this Court that she has: (1) examined the record and found no arguable grounds to advance on appeal; (2) served a copy of the brief and counsel's motion to withdraw on appellant; and (3) provided appellant with a copy of the record and informed him of his right to file a pro se response. See *Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744, 87 S. Ct. at 1400; *Stafford*, 813 S.W.2d at 510 n.3; see also *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 409 n.23. More than an adequate period of time has passed, and appellant has not filed a pro se response. See *In re Schulman*, 252 S.W.3d at 409.

## II. INDEPENDENT REVIEW

Upon receiving an *Anders* brief, we must conduct a full examination of all the proceedings to determine whether the case is wholly frivolous. *Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 80, 109 S. Ct. 346, 349-50, 102 L. Ed. 2d 300 (1988). We have reviewed the entire record and counsel's brief and have found nothing that would arguably support an appeal. *See Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 827-28 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005) ("Due to the nature of *Anders* briefs, by indicating in the opinion that it considered the issues raised in the briefs and reviewed the record for reversible error but found none, the court of appeals met the requirement of Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 47.1."); *Stafford*, 813 S.W.2d at 509.

## III. CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, we affirm the judgment of the trial court. In addition, we remind appellant's appointed appellate counsel that if appellant, after consulting with counsel, desires to file a petition for review, counsel is still under a duty to timely file with the Texas Supreme Court "a petition for review that satisfies the standards for an *Anders* brief." *In re P.M.*, 520 S.W.3d 24, 27-28 (Tex. 2016); *see In re G.P.*, 503 S.W.3d 531, 535 (Tex. App.—Waco 2016, pet. denied); *see also* TEX. FAM. CODE ANN. § 107.016(2) (West Supp. 2018).

JOHN E. NEILL  
Justice

Before Chief Justice Gray,  
Justice Davis, and  
Justice Neill

Affirmed

Opinion delivered and filed November 4, 2020

[CV06]

