

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-1756

TONIA WILSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CAROLYN W. COLVIN, ACTING COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY
ADMINISTRATION,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle
District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. Malcolm J. Howard,
Senior District Judge. (1:11-cv-00370-MJH-JLW)

Submitted: February 27, 2015

Decided: March 24, 2015

Before SHEDD, FLOYD, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

David J. Cortes, ROBERTI, WITTENBERG, LAUFFER, WICKER & CINSKI,
Durham, North Carolina, for Appellant. Ripley Rand, United
States Attorney, Greensboro, North Carolina; Lisa G. Smoller,
Special Assistant United States Attorney, Boston, Massachusetts,
for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Tonia Wilson appeals the district court's order upholding the Commissioner's denial of Wilson's application for disability benefits. Our review of the Commissioner's disability determination is limited to evaluating whether the findings are supported by substantial evidence and whether the correct law was applied. See Johnson v. Barnhart, 434 F.3d 650, 653 (4th Cir. 2005). "Substantial evidence is such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion." Id. (internal quotation marks omitted). We do not reweigh evidence or make credibility determinations in evaluating whether a decision is supported by substantial evidence; "[w]here conflicting evidence allows reasonable minds to differ as to whether a claimant is disabled," we defer to the Commissioner's decision. Id. (internal quotation marks omitted).

Against this framework, we have thoroughly reviewed the parties' briefs, the administrative record, and the joint appendix, and we discern no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order. Wilson v. Colvin, No. 1:11-cv-00370-MJH-JLW (M.D.N.C. May 28, 2014). 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