



**NUMBER 13-24-00050-CV**

**COURT OF APPEALS**

**THIRTEENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS**

**CORPUS CHRISTI – EDINBURG**

---

**IN THE INTEREST OF D.P.M.A., A CHILD**

---

**ON APPEAL FROM THE 138TH DISTRICT COURT  
OF CAMERON COUNTY, TEXAS**

---

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

**Before Justices Benavides, Tijerina, and Silva  
Memorandum Opinion by Justice Benavides**

Appellant I.S.N.<sup>1</sup> filed a pro se notice of appeal from an order denying her motion for a new trial. On January 30, 2024, the Clerk of this Court advised appellant that it appeared that there was not a final, appealable order. See TEX. R. APP. P. 37.1, 42.3(a). The Clerk informed appellant that the appeal would be dismissed if this defect was not cured within ten days. See *id.* R. 37.1, 42.3(a). To date, appellant has not responded to the Clerk's notice or corrected the defect in the appeal.

---

<sup>1</sup> To protect the privacy of the parties involved, we refer to them by initials. See TEX. FAM. CODE ANN. § 109.002(d); TEX. R. APP. P. 9.8(b)(2).

The Court, having examined and fully considered the documents on file, is of the opinion that the appeal should be dismissed. Appellant’s notice of appeal assails a December 20, 2022 order<sup>2</sup> rendered against her which denies her motion for new trial “on denial of appeal from CPS Court.” However, an order denying a motion for new trial is not independently appealable. *In re B.L.R.*, 592 S.W.3d 453, 462 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2018, no pet.); *In re Adams*, 416 S.W.3d 556, 560 (Tex. App.—Tyler 2013, orig. proceeding); *State Office of Risk Mgmt. v. Berdan*, 335 S.W.3d 421, 428 (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi–Edinburg 2011, pet. denied). Accordingly, we dismiss this appeal. *See id.* R. 42.3(a).

GINA M. BENAVIDES  
Justice

Delivered and filed on the  
11th day of April, 2024.

---

<sup>2</sup> We note that appellant’s notice of appeal was filed on January 12, 2023 in district court but was not filed with our Court until January 24, 2024. Given our disposition of this appeal, we need not further examine this anomaly. We further note that the district clerk’s office has furnished this Court with a copy of the final judgment in this case, the “Order of Termination,” signed by the associate judge on March 24, 2022, and adopted by the judge of the trial court on April 3, 2022. The final judgment terminates I.S.N.’s parental rights to D.P.M.A., and reflects that appellant was represented by counsel in that proceeding. Our records do not reflect that appellant filed a notice of appeal from that final judgment.