

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 16-1300**

---

JOHNNY RODNEY BROWN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,

Defendant - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Anderson. Timothy M. Cain, District Judge. (8:14-cv-04566-TMC)

---

Submitted: October 31, 2016

Decided: November 10, 2016

---

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

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Dana W. Duncan, DUNCAN DISABILITY LAW, S.C., Nekoosa, Wisconsin, for Appellant. Nora Koch, Acting Regional Chief Counsel, Taryn Jasner, Supervisory Attorney, Patricia M. Smith, Assistant Regional Counsel, SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Beth Drake, Acting United States Attorney, Barbara Bowens, Chief, Civil Division, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Johnny Rodney Brown appeals the district court's order accepting the magistrate judge's recommendation and upholding the Commissioner's denial of Brown'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. Brown v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec. Admin., No. 8:14-cv-04566-TMC (D.S.C. Feb. 16, 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