

NINTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS OF TEXAS AT BEAUMONT

In the Interest of N.L. v. the State of Texas

In re N.L. · No. 09-25-00387-CV · Decided February 26, 2026

OPINION

In the Interest of N.L. v. the State of Texas

PER CURIAM.

In The Court of Appeals Ninth District of Texas at Beaumont _____

NO. 09-25-00387-CV

_____ IN THE INTEREST OF N.L.
_____ On

Appeal from the 279th District Court Jefferson County, Texas Trial Cause No. 24DCFM0176

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Mother appeals an order terminating her parental rights to her minor child, “Nancy.” 1 The trial court found, by clear and convincing evidence, that statutory grounds exist for termination of Mother’s, A.L., parental rights and that termination of her parental rights would be in the child’s best interest. See Tex. Fam. Code Ann. § 161.001(b)(1)(D), (E), (O), (2). 2 1 To protect the identity of the child, we use pseudonyms to refer to the child and the parents. See Tex. R. App. P. 9.8(b) (2). 2 The trial court also terminated the unknown Father’s parental rights. 1 Mother’s appointed attorney submitted a brief in which she contends that there are no arguable grounds for appeal. See *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738

(1967); *In re L.D.T.*, 161 S.W.3d 728, 730–31 (Tex. App.—Beaumont 2005, no

pet.) (noting *Anders* procedures apply in parental-rights termination cases). The brief presents the attorney’s professional evaluation of the record and explains why no arguable grounds exist to overturn the trial court’s judgment. The attorney represented to the Court that she gave Mother a copy of the *Anders* brief she filed and notified Mother of her right to file a pro se brief. The Court likewise notified Mother of her right to file a pro se response, the deadline for doing so, and this Court notified Mother that a copy of the appellate record was available to her upon request. Mother did not file a response with the Court or request a copy of the record. We have independently evaluated the appellate record and the brief filed by Mother’s court-appointed attorney. See *Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 80 (1988) (citing *Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744); *Bledsoe v. State*, 178 S.W.3d 824, 826–27 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005); *In re K.R.C.*, 346 S.W.3d 618, 619 (Tex. App.—El Paso 2009, no pet.). Based on our review of the record, we have found nothing that would arguably support an appeal and agree that the appeal is frivolous and lacks merit. See *Bledsoe*, 178 S.W.3d at 827–28 (“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 arguable error but found none, the court of appeals met the 2 requirements of Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 47.1.”); *In re K.R.C.*, 346 S.W.3d at 619. Therefore, we find it unnecessary to order appointment of new counsel to re-brief the appeal. Cf. *Stafford v. State*, 813 S.W.2d 503, 511 (Tex. Crim. App. 1991). We affirm the trial court’s order terminating Mother’s parental rights. Should Mother decide to pursue an appeal to the Supreme Court of Texas, her counsel’s obligation can be met “by filing a petition for review that satisfies the standards for an Anders brief.” See *In re P.M.*, 520 S.W.3d 24, 27–28 (Tex. 2016) (citations omitted). AFFIRMED.

W. SCOTT GOLEMON

Chief Justice Submitted on February 24, 2026 Opinion Delivered February 26, 2026 Before Golemon, C.J., Johnson and Wright, JJ. 3