

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 00-1361**

---

CONNIE S. LAWSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

KENNETH S. APFEL, COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL  
SECURITY,

Defendant - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western  
District of Virginia, at Big Stone Gap. James P. Jones, District  
Judge. (CA-98-168)

---

Submitted: October 31, 2000

Decided: November 15, 2000

---

Before WILKINS and MOTZ, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Cir-  
cuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Erick A. Bowman, S. Scott Baker, WOLFE & FARMER, Norton, Virginia,  
for Appellant. James A. Winn, Regional Chief Counsel, Region III,  
Patricia M. Smith, Deputy Chief Counsel, Eda Giusti, Assistant  
Regional Counsel, Office of the General Counsel, SOCIAL SECURITY  
ADMINISTRATION, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Robert P. Crouch, Jr.,  
United States Attorney, Julie C. Dudley, Assistant United States  
Attorney, Roanoke, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.  
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Connie S. Lawson appeals the district court's order granting summary judgment to the Commissioner of Social Security in her action seeking review of the Commissioner's decision denying her application for disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income. On appeal, Lawson argues that the Administrative Law Judge erred in determining that her IQ was 74, instead of below 70, as one test demonstrated, and erred in rejecting the work assessment of a consulting physician, Dr. Kaur.

We have reviewed the record, briefs, and pertinent case law in this matter. Our review persuades us that the district court correctly accepted the recommendation of the magistrate judge and found that the Commissioner's decision denying benefits is based on substantial evidence. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Lawson v. Apfel, No. CA-98-168 (W.D. Va. Feb. 9, 2000). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED