

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-1564

KENNETH M. DICKERSON, SR.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CAROLYN W. COLVIN, Acting Commissioner of Social Security,

Defendant - Appellee,

and

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,

Party-in-Interest.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle
District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. James A. Beaty, Jr.,
Senior District Judge. (1:11-cv-00001-JAB-JEP)

Submitted: January 28, 2016

Decided: March 2, 2016

Before SHEDD and HARRIS, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior
Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

J. Kevin Morton, Winston-Salem, North Carolina, for Appellant.
Ripley Rand, United States Attorney, Michael L. Henry, Special
Assistant United States Attorney, Boston, Massachusetts, for
Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Kenneth M. Dickerson, Sr., appeals the district court's order adopting the magistrate judge's recommendation and upholding the Commissioner's denial of Dickerson's applications for disability benefits and supplemental security income. Our review of the Commissioner's determination is limited to evaluating whether the correct law was applied and whether the findings are supported by substantial evidence. 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 the district court's judgment. Dickerson v. Colvin, No. 1:11-cv-00001-JAB-JEP (M.D.N.C. Mar. 24, 2015). 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