

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-1628

ERIC MATTHEW GAUTREAU,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

NANCY A. BERRYHILL, Acting Commissioner, Social Security Administration,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Rebecca Beach Smith, Chief District Judge. (2:15-cv-00081-RBS-DEM)

Submitted: March 31, 2017

Decided: April 21, 2017

Before NIEMEYER, MOTZ, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

John O. Goss, GOSS AND FENTRESS, PLC, Norfolk, Virginia, for Appellant. Nora Koch, Regional Chief Counsel, Taryn Jasner, Supervisory Attorney, Gregg W. Marsano, Assistant Regional Counsel, SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Dana J. Boente, United States Attorney, Virginia L. Van Valkenburg, Assistant United States Attorney, Norfolk, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Eric Matthew Gautreau appeals the district court's order adopting the magistrate judge's recommendation and affirming the Commissioner's denial of Gautreau's application for disability benefits. Our review of the Commissioner's determination is limited to evaluating whether the findings are supported by substantial evidence and whether the correct law was applied. *Mascio v. Colvin*, 780 F.3d 632, 634 (4th Cir. 2015). "Substantial evidence is such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion." *Johnson v. Barnhart*, 434 F.3d 650, 653 (4th Cir. 2005) (internal quotation marks omitted). We do not reweigh evidence or make credibility determinations in evaluating whether a decision is supported by substantial evidence; "[w]here conflicting evidence allows reasonable minds to differ as to whether a claimant is disabled," we defer to the Commissioner's decision. *Id.* (internal quotation marks omitted).

Against this framework, we have thoroughly reviewed the parties' briefs, the administrative record, and the joint appendix, and we discern no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. *Gautreau v. Colvin*, No. 2:15-cv-00081-RBS-DEM (E.D. Va. filed Mar. 31, 2016; entered Apr. 1, 2016). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED