

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-1289

NIA SHERIDAN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CAROLYN W. COLVIN, Acting Commissioner of Social Security,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Charlotte. Martin K. Reidinger, District Judge. (3:14-cv-00639-MR-DLH)

Submitted: November 30, 2016 Decided: December 14, 2016

Before DUNCAN, AGEE, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Daniel S. Jones, LAW OFFICES OF HARRY J. BINDER & CHARLES E. BINDER, P.C., New York, New York, for Appellant. Jill Westmoreland Rose, United States Attorney, Paul Taylor, Assistant United States Attorney, Christian M. Vainieri, Special Assistant United States Attorney, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Nia Sheridan appeals the district court's order adopting the magistrate judge's recommendation and upholding the Commissioner's denial of Sheridan's 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. Sheridan v. Colvin, No. 3:14-cv-00639-MR-DLH (W.D.N.C. Jan. 28, 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