UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

_____

No. 16-2315

_____

ELIZABETH W. WILLIAMSON,

　　　　　　　Plaintiff - Appellant,

　　　　v.

NANCY A. BERRYHILL,

　　　　　　　Defendant - Appellee.

_____

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Statesville. Graham C. Mullen, Senior District Judge. (5:15-cv-00070-GCM)

_____

Submitted: May 31, 2017　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Decided: July 11, 2017

_____

Before NIEMEYER, TRAXLER, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

_____

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

_____

Samuel F. Furgiuele, Jr., Boone, North Carolina, for Appellant. Jill Westmoreland Rose, United States Attorney, Gill P. Beck, Katherine T. Armstrong, Assistant United States Attorneys, Christian M. Vainieri, Special Assistant United States Attorney, Charlotte, North Carolina, for Appellee.

_____

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Elizabeth W. Williamson appeals the district court's order affirming the Commissioner's denial of Williamson's application for disability benefits. Our review of the Commissioner's determination is limited to evaluating whether the findings are supported by substantial evidence and whether the correct law was applied. *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 for the reasons stated by the district court. *Williamson v. Berryhill*, No. 5:15-cv-00070-GCM (W.D.N.C. Sept. 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