

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 04-1286**

---

CHESTER SANDERLIN,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

JO ANNE B. BARNHART, COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL  
SECURITY,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of North Carolina, at Elizabeth City. Terrence W. Boyle,  
Chief District Judge. (CA-02-62-2-1B0)

---

Submitted: November 3, 2004

Decided: January 18, 2005

---

Before NIEMEYER, MICHAEL, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Peter D. Keisler, Assistant Attorney General, Frank D. Whitney,  
United States Attorney, Raleigh, North Carolina, Thomas M. Bondy,  
Teal Luthy Miller, Attorneys, Appellate Staff, Civil Division,  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C., for  
Appellant. Mason Hogan, KATHLEEN SHANNON GLANCY, P.A., Wilmington,  
North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Jo Anne B. Barnhart, Commissioner of the Social Security Administration ("Commissioner"), appeals the district court's order remanding the case to the administrative law judge for further development of the record. We affirm.

Our review of the Commissioner's decision is limited to an inquiry into whether there is substantial evidence to support the findings of the Commissioner, and whether the correct legal standards were applied. 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) (2000); Hays v. Sullivan, 907 F.2d 1453, 1456 (4th Cir. 1990). When there are conflicting physician opinions, as in this case, we have required explicit indications as to the weight given to all the evidence. See Gordon v. Schweiker, 725 F.2d 231, 235 (4th Cir. 1984) (citing cases); see also Murphy v. Bowen, 810 F.2d 433, 437 (4th Cir. 1987).

We have reviewed the record and the district court's order and affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. See Sanderlin v. Barnhart, No. CA-02-62-2-1BO (E.D.N.C. Dec. 29, 2003). 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