UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-1151

MAGGIE JANE WOODS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CAROLYN W. COLVIN, Acting Commissioner of Social Security,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Wilmington. James C. Dever III, Chief District Judge. (7:14-cv-00220-D)

Submitted: November 18, 2016 Decided: November 29, 2016

Before NIEMEYER, AGEE, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

William Lee Davis, III, Lumberton, North Carolina, for Appellant. Andy Liu, General Counsel, Daniel Callahan, Deputy General Counsel, Jeffrey Blair, Associate General Counsel, John Stuart Bruce, United States Attorney, Mark J. Goldenberg, Special Assistant United States Attorney, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Maggie Jane Woods appeals the district court's order adopting the magistrate judge's recommendation and upholding the Commissioner's denial of Woods' application for 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. Bird v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec. Admin., 699 F.3d 337, 340 (4th Cir. 2012). "Substantial evidence means such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion." Hancock v. Astrue, 667 F.3d 470, 472 (4th Cir. 2012) (internal quotation marks omitted). In conducting this analysis, we may not "reweigh conflicting evidence, make credibility determinations, or substitute our judgment for that of the [administrative law judge]." Radford v. Colvin, 734 F.3d 288, 296 (4th Cir. 2013) (internal quotation marks omitted).

Within this framework, we have thoroughly reviewed the record and the parties' submissions and discern no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment. Woods v. Colvin, No. 7:14-cv-00220-D (E.D.N.C. Jan. 20, 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