

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 21-2027

GREGORY ANTHONY VANTRECE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

KILOLO KIJAKAZI, Acting Commissioner of Social Security,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Liam O'Grady, Senior District Judge. (1:20-cv-00124-LO-MSN)

Submitted: January 23, 2023

Decided: June 28, 2023

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, and WYNN and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Gregory Anthony VanTrece, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Gregory Anthony VanTrece appeals the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and upholding the Administrative Law Judge's (ALJ) denial of VanTrece's applications for disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income. "In social security proceedings, a court of appeals applies the same standard of review as does the district court. That is, a reviewing court must uphold the determination when an ALJ has applied correct legal standards and the ALJ's factual findings are supported by substantial evidence." *Brown v. Comm'r Soc. Sec. Admin.*, 873 F.3d 251, 267 (4th Cir. 2017) (citation and internal quotation marks omitted). "Substantial evidence is that which a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion. It consists of more than a mere scintilla of evidence but may be less than a preponderance." *Pearson v. Colvin*, 810 F.3d 204, 207 (4th Cir. 2015) (cleaned up). "In reviewing for substantial evidence, we do not undertake to reweigh conflicting evidence, make credibility determinations, or substitute our judgment for that of the ALJ. Where conflicting evidence allows reasonable minds to differ as to whether a claimant is disabled, the responsibility for that decision falls on the ALJ." *Hancock v. Astrue*, 667 F.3d 470, 472 (4th Cir. 2012) (cleaned up).

We have reviewed the record and perceive no reversible error. The ALJ applied the correct legal standards in evaluating VanTrece's claims for benefits, and the ALJ's factual findings are supported by substantial evidence. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment upholding the denial of benefits. *VanTrece v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec.*, 1:20-cv-00124-LO-MSN (E.D. Va. Aug. 23, 2021). We also deny VanTrece's motion to remove

online access to his case. 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