UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-1473

JUDITH HALPERN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

SSA,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Theodore D. Chuang, District Judge. (8:14-cv-02538-TDC)

Submitted: February 9, 2017 Decided: February 17, 2017

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, and WILKINSON and NIEMEYER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Judith Halpern, Appellant Pro Se. Benjamin Blair Prevas, SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Judith Halpern appeals the district court's order adopting the magistrate judge's recommendation and upholding the Commissioner's denial of Halpern's applications for disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income. At the outset, we limit our review to the issues raised in Halpern's informal brief. Jackson v. Lightsey, 775 F.3d 170, 177 (4th Cir. 2014). Further, 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. Halpern v. SSA, No. 8:14-cv-02538-TDC (D. Md. Mar. 21, 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