

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 18-1351

ANTHONY SHY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Charleston. Donald C. Coggins, Jr., District Judge. (2:16-cv-02456-DCC)

Submitted: September 18, 2018

Decided: September 20, 2018

Before WILKINSON and THACKER, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Anthony Shy, Appellant Pro Se. Patrick Eugene Roach, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Anthony Shy appeals the district court's order adopting the magistrate judge's recommendation and upholding the Administrative Law Judge's (ALJ) denial of Shy's applications 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). "Substantial evidence is that which a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion. It consists of more than a mere scintilla of evidence but may be less than a preponderance." *Pearson v. Colvin*, 810 F.3d 204, 207 (4th Cir. 2015) (citation and internal quotation marks omitted). "In reviewing for substantial evidence, we do not undertake to reweigh conflicting evidence, make credibility determinations, or substitute our judgment for that of the ALJ. Where conflicting evidence allows reasonable minds to differ as to whether a claimant is disabled, the responsibility for that decision falls on the ALJ." *Hancock v. Astrue*, 667 F.3d 470, 472 (4th Cir. 2012) (brackets, citation, and internal quotation marks omitted).

We have reviewed the record and perceive no reversible error. The ALJ applied the correct legal standards in evaluating Shy's claims for benefits, and the ALJ's factual findings are supported by substantial evidence. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment upholding the denial of benefits. *See Shy v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec. Admin.*, No. 2:16-cv-02456-DCC (D.S.C. Mar. 23, 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