

ARKANSAS COURT OF APPEALS

DIVISION III
No. CV-13-1127

JENNIFER HOLT and
JOEL HOLT

APPELLANTS

V.

ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF
HUMAN SERVICES and MINOR
CHILD

APPELLEES

Opinion Delivered June 4, 2014

APPEAL FROM THE SEBASTIAN
COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT,
FORT SMITH DISTRICT
[NO. JV-2010-55]

HONORABLE MARK HEWETT,
JUDGE

AFFIRMED; MOTION TO
WITHDRAW GRANTED

RHONDA K. WOOD, Judge

The circuit court terminated Jennifer and Joel Holt’s parental rights to their child, B.H. The Holts’ counsel filed a no-merit brief and motion to withdraw. No pro se points have been filed. We affirm the court’s termination order and grant counsel’s motion to withdraw.

The Department of Human Services filed a petition to terminate the Holts’ parental rights based on two statutory grounds: “other factors” and aggravated circumstances.¹ The petition also alleged that termination was in B.H.’s best interest. After

¹Ark. Code Ann. § 9-27-341(b)(3)(B)(vii), (ix) (Supp. 2013).

a termination hearing, the court terminated the Holts' parental rights after finding multiple statutory grounds and agreeing with DHS that termination was in B.H.'s best interest.

If appellate counsel thinks that an appeal from a termination-of-parental-rights order is meritless, he or she may file a no-merit brief. *Linker-Flores v. Ark. Dep't of Human Servs.*, 359 Ark. 131, 194 S.W.3d 739 (2004); Ark. Sup. Ct. R. 6-9(i) (2013). The brief must list all adverse rulings and explain why none provide a meritorious ground for reversal. Ark. Sup. Ct. R. 6-9(i)(1)(A). Here, there were eight adverse rulings: the termination order and seven evidence-based objections. Counsel has adequately explained why none provide a meritorious ground to appeal. Counsel fully complied with our rules. We grant the motion to withdraw and affirm the termination order by memorandum opinion. See *In re Memorandum Opinions*, 16 Ark. App. 301, 700 S.W.2d 63 (1985).

Affirmed; motion to withdraw granted.

PITTMAN and HIXSON, JJ., agree.

Dusti Standridge, for appellants.

No response.