

**COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND DISTRICT OF TEXAS AT FORT
WORTH**

In the Interest of D.W., D.B., and J.B., Children v. the State of Texas

No. 02-26-00172-CV · No. No. 02-26-00172-CV · Decided April 23, 2026

SUMMARY

The Court of Appeals for the Second District of Texas dismissed the appeal for want of jurisdiction because the mother's notice of appeal from a final order in a suit affecting the parent-child relationship was untimely. The court noted that the notice was filed well after the accelerated-appeal deadline and that the mother did not respond to the court's jurisdictional warning.

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

In the Court of Appeals Second Appellate District of Texas at Fort Worth
_____ No. 02-26-00172-CV _____ IN
THE INTEREST OF D.W., D.B., AND J.B., CHILDREN On Appeal from the 325th District
Court Tarrant County, Texas Trial Court No. 325-746781-24 Before Birdwell, Bassel, and
Womack, JJ. Per Curiam Memorandum Opinion MEMORANDUM OPINION Appellant Mother¹
attempts to appeal the trial court's "Final Order in Suit Affecting the Parent–Child Relationship."
Mother filed her notice of appeal pro se, but it appears that she is represented by court-appointed
counsel.² The trial court signed its order on June 24, 2025; therefore, Mother's notice of appeal
was due July 14, 2025.

See Tex. R. App. P. 26.1(b) (providing that "in an accelerated appeal, the notice of appeal must be
filed within 20 days after the judgment or order is signed"), 28.1(b) (stating that accelerated
appeal is perfected by filing notice of appeal within time allowed by Rule 26.1(b)).

However, Mother did not file her notice of appeal until March 17, 2026, making it untimely. See
Tex. R. App. P. 26.1(b), 28.1(b). Without a timely filed notice of appeal or extension request, we
do not have jurisdiction over the appeal, and we must dismiss it. See Tex. R. App. P. 25.1(b),
26.1(b), 26.3; *Verburgt v. Dorner*, 959 S.W.2d 615, 617 (Tex. 1997); *Howlett v. Tarrant County*,
301 S.W.3d 840, 843 (Tex.

App.—Fort Worth 2009, pet. denied) (op. on reh'g); see also *Wheeler v. Green*, 157 S.W.3d 439,
444 (Tex. 2005) ("[P]ro se litigants are In suits affecting the parent–child relationship (SAPCR),
we use aliases for the 1 names of the children and their parents. See Tex. Fam. Code Ann. §
109.002(d); Tex. R. App. P. 9.8(b)(2). 2 In the SAPCR order, the trial court orders that Mother's

appointed counsel “shall continue in that capacity until all appeals of a final order... are exhausted or waived.” Mother’s appointed counsel has not filed a motion to withdraw in the trial court or in this court.

2 not exempt from the rules of procedure.”). On March 19, 2026, we notified Mother and her appointed counsel of our concern that we lack jurisdiction over this appeal because her notice of appeal was untimely. We warned her that we could dismiss this appeal for want of jurisdiction unless she filed a response by March 30, 2026, showing grounds for continuing the appeal.

See Tex. R. App. P. 42.3(a), 44.3. We have not received a response. Because Mother’s notice of appeal was untimely, we dismiss this appeal for want of jurisdiction. See Tex. R. App. P. 42.3(a), 43.2(f). Per Curiam Delivered: April 23, 2026 3