

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-1407

BILLY M. THOMPSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

COMMISSIONER OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Orangeburg. J. Michelle Childs, District Judge. (5:14-cv-03805-JMC)

Submitted: November 29, 2016

Decided: December 28, 2016

Before WILKINSON, TRAXLER, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Hannah Rogers Metcalfe, METCALFE & ATKINSON, LLC, Greenville, South Carolina; Timothy Clardy, THE DENNISON LAW FIRM, PC, Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellant. Nora Koch, Acting Regional Chief Counsel, Charles Kawas, Acting Supervisory Attorney, Sandra Romagnole, Assistant Regional Counsel, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Beth Drake, Acting United States Attorney, Barbara Bowens, Chief, Civil Division, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Billy Thompson appeals the district court's order adopting the magistrate judge's recommendation and upholding the Commissioner's denial of Thompson's application for disability insurance benefits. 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. Thompson v. Colvin, No. 5:14-cv-03805-JMC (D.S.C. Feb. 11, 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