

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 21-2153

NA'STARJA SAUNDERS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY; KILOLO KIJAKAZI, Acting
Commissioner, Social Security Administration,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at
Lynchburg. Norman K. Moon, Senior District Judge. (6:20-cv-00008-NKM-RSB)

Submitted: February 22, 2022

Decided: March 9, 2022

Before WILKINSON and HARRIS, Circuit Judges, and SHEDD, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Na'Starja Saunders, Appellant Pro Se. Maija DiDomenico, Assistant Regional Counsel,
Office of General Counsel, SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, Philadelphia,
Pennsylvania, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Na’Starja Saunders appeals the district court’s order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and upholding the Administrative Law Judge’s (ALJ) decision to terminate Saunders’s supplemental security income benefits. “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) (citation and internal quotation marks omitted). “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) (brackets, citation, and internal quotation marks omitted).

We have reviewed the record and perceive no reversible error. The ALJ applied the correct legal standards, and the ALJ’s factual findings are supported by substantial evidence. Accordingly, we affirm the district court’s judgment upholding the termination of benefits. *Saunders v. Comm’r Soc. Sec.*, No. 6:20-cv-00008-NKM-RSB (W.D. Va. Sept. 30, 2021). 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