

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-2093**

---

SAMANTHA P. WATSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CAROLYN W. COLVIN, Acting Commissioner of Social Security,

Defendant - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Wilmington. Kimberly A. Swank, Magistrate Judge. (7:13-cv-00212-KS)

---

Submitted: August 31, 2015

Decided: September 9, 2015

---

Before KING and SHEDD, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

William Lee Davis, III, Lumberton, North Carolina, for Appellant. Thomas G. Walker, United States Attorney, R.A. Renfer, Jr., Assistant United States Attorney, David N. Mervis, Special Assistant United States Attorney, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Samantha P. Watson appeals the district court's order affirming the Commissioner's denial of disability insurance benefits. We have reviewed the parties' briefs and the record on appeal and find no reversible error.\* Accordingly, we affirm substantially for the reasons stated by the district court. Watson v. Colvin, No. 7:13-cv-00212-KS (E.D.N.C. Sept. 18, 2014); see Hines v. Barnhart, 453 F.3d 559, 566 (4th Cir. 2006) (permitting vocational expert testimony "based upon a consideration of all other evidence in the record" and "in response to proper hypothetical questions which fairly set out all of claimant's impairments" (internal quotation marks omitted)); Johnson v. Barnhart, 434 F.3d 650, 659 (4th Cir. 2005) (recognizing hypothetical must include only impairments supported by substantial evidence). 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

---

\* Watson has waived appellate review of her claims under Mascio v. Colvin, 780 F.3d 632 (4th Cir. 2015). See In re Under Seal, 749 F.3d 276, 285 (4th Cir. 2014) (recognizing issues raised for first time on appeal generally will not be considered); Holland v. Big River Minerals Corp., 181 F.3d 597, 605-06 (4th Cir. 1999) (describing limitations on exception based on intervening change in law).