

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 18-1310

HEIDI M. PARKER,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Lynchburg. Robert Stewart Ballou, Magistrate Judge. (6:16-cv-00058-RSB)

Submitted: June 21, 2018

Decided: June 25, 2018

Before DIAZ and HARRIS, Circuit Judges, and SHEDD, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Heidi M. Parker, Appellant Pro Se. Evelyn Rose Marie Protano, Office of the General Counsel - Region III, SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Heidi M. Parker appeals the magistrate judge's* order upholding the Administrative Law Judge's (ALJ) denial of Parker's application for disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income. "In social security proceedings, a court of appeals applies the same standard of review as does the district court. That is, a reviewing court must uphold the determination when an ALJ has applied correct legal standards and the ALJ's factual findings are supported by substantial evidence." *Brown v. Comm'r Soc. Sec. Admin.*, 873 F.3d 251, 267 (4th Cir. 2017) (citation and internal quotation marks omitted).

Upon review of the administrative record, including the transcript of Parker's most recent administrative hearing and all of the relevant medical evidence, we conclude that the ALJ applied the correct legal standards in evaluating Parker's claim for benefits and that substantial evidence supports the administrative rulings, all of which were affirmed by the magistrate judge. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the magistrate judge. *See Parker v. Commissioner*, No. 6:16-cv-00058-RSB (W.D. Va. Mar. 13, 2018). 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

* The parties consented to a final disposition by the magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) (2012).