UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

———————

No. 14-1518

———————

CASEY LYNN BURNER,

        Plaintiff - Appellant,

    v.

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,

        Defendant - Appellee,

    and

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,

        Party-in-Interest.

———————

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern
District of West Virginia, at Elkins.   John Preston Bailey,
Chief District Judge.   (2:13-cv-00028-JPB-JES)

———————

Submitted: December 8, 2014   Decided: February 5, 2015

———————

Before MOTZ and KEENAN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior
Circuit Judge.

———————

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

———————

Travis M. Miller, TRAVIS MILLER ATTORNEY AT LAW, PLLC,
Bridgeport, West Virginia, for Appellant.   William J. Ihlenfeld,
II, United States Attorney, Helen Campbell Altmeyer, Assistant
United States Attorney, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY,
Wheeling, West Virginia; Nora Koch, Acting Regional Chief

Counsel, Stephen Giacchino, Supervisory Attorney, David Leach, Special Assistant United States Attorney, Office of the General Counsel, SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, for Appellee.

———————————

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Casey Lynn Burner (Burner) appeals from the district court's order adopting the magistrate judge's report and recommendation recommending the district court grant summary judgment in favor of the Commissioner of Social Security with respect to Burner's challenge to the denial of her application for childhood supplemental security income benefits under Subchapter XVI of the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 1381-1385. After reviewing the briefs and the record on appeal, we conclude there is no reversible error in the district court's decision. Thus, we affirm on the reasoning of the magistrate judge, as adopted by the district court. Burner v. Commissioner, No. 2:13-cv-00028, 2014 WL 1479201 (N.D.W.Va. Apr. 15, 2014).

We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED

- 3 -