

**COURT OF APPEALS, SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT OF TEXAS AT FORT
WORTH**

In the Interest of T.F., a Child v. the State of Texas

No. 02-25-00480-CV (Tex. App.—Fort Worth Jan. 30, 2026) · No. 02-25-00480-CV · Decided January 30, 2026

SUMMARY

The Texas Court of Appeals, Second Appellate District, affirmed an order terminating the father's parental rights to T.F. and awarding permanent managing conservatorship to the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services. Applying Anders procedures, the court independently reviewed the record and concluded that the appeal presented no arguable grounds for relief; it also denied appointed counsel's motion to withdraw.

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

In the Court of Appeals Second Appellate District of Texas at Fort Worth
_____ No. 02-25-00480-CV _____ IN
THE INTEREST OF T.F., A CHILD On Appeal from the 324th District Court Tarrant County,
Texas Trial Court No. 324-748154-24 Before Birdwell, Bassel, and Womack, JJ. Memorandum
Opinion by Justice Birdwell MEMORANDUM OPINION Appellant Father appeals the trial
court's order terminating his parental rights to his child, T.F.,¹ and awarding permanent managing
conservatorship of her to the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services (TDFPS).² See
Tex. Fam.

Code Ann. § 161.001(b)(1)(D), (E), (b)(2). Because there are no arguable grounds that might
support the appeal, we affirm. Father's appointed appellate counsel has filed a brief stating that
she conducted a professional evaluation of the record and concluded that there are no arguable
grounds to support an appeal and that the appeal is frivolous. See *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S.
738, 744, 87 S. Ct.

1396, 1400 (1967). Counsel's brief meets the requirements of *Anders* by presenting a professional
evaluation of the record and demonstrating why there are no reversible grounds on appeal. See *id.*,
87 S. Ct. at 1400; see also *In re P.M.*, 520 S.W.3d 24, 27 & n.10 (Tex. 2016) (order) (approving
use of *Anders* procedures in termination-of-parental-rights appeals); *In re K.M.*, 98 S.W.3d 774,
776–77 (Tex.

App.—Fort Worth 2003, order) (holding that *Anders* procedures apply in termination cases). ¹ In
termination-of-parental-rights cases, we use aliases for the 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 same termination order, the trial court also terminated Mother's parental rights to T.F.

However, Mother has not appealed the termination order and is not a party to this appeal. 2 Further, counsel (1) provided Father with a copy of the Anders brief; (2) informed Father of his rights to request and review the appellate record and to file a pro se brief in response; (3) explained to Father the process of obtaining the appellate record; and (4) provided Father with a motion for pro se access to the appellate record, which lacked only Father's signature and the date.

See *Kelly v. State*, 436 S.W.3d 313, 318–20 (Tex. Crim. App. 2014). We too notified Father of his rights to request and examine the appellate record and to file a pro se response to the Anders brief, but he has not done so.

We then notified TDFPS that Father had not filed a pro se response and that its response to the Anders brief, if any, was due by January 5, 2026. TDFPS has declined to file a response but agrees with counsel's assertion that there are no arguable grounds for relief. When reviewing a brief that asserts an appeal is frivolous and that fulfills the requirements of Anders, we must independently examine the record to determine if any arguable grounds for appeal exist.

See *In re C.J.*, 501 S.W.3d 254, 255 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2016, pets. denied) (citing *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 511 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991)). We also consider the Anders brief itself and any pro se response.

In re K.M., No. 02-18-00073-CV, 2018 WL 3288591, at *10 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth July 5, 2018, pet. denied) (mem. op.). Having carefully reviewed the record and the Anders brief, we conclude that there are no arguable grounds that might support Father's appeal; therefore, we agree 3 with counsel that the appeal is frivolous. See *Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 827 (Tex.

Crim. App. 2005); *In re D.D.*, 279 S.W.3d 849, 850 (Tex. App.—Dallas 2009, pet. denied). We affirm the trial court's order terminating Father's parental rights to T.F.3 /s/ Wade Birdwell Wade Birdwell Justice Delivered: January 30, 2026 3 Father's counsel also filed a motion to withdraw.

We deny that motion because counsel did not show good cause for withdrawal independent from her conclusion that the appeal is frivolous. See *P.M.*, 520 S.W.3d at 27; *C.J.*, 501 S.W.3d at 255. Accordingly, Father's counsel remains appointed in this case through any proceedings in the Texas Supreme Court unless otherwise relieved of her duties. See *P.M.*, 520 S.W.3d at 27; see also Tex. Fam.

Code Ann. § 107.016(2)(C). 4