**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 24-2260**

---

GREENBRIER MINERALS, LLC, as insured through SummitPoint Insurance Company,

Petitioner,

v.

DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF WORKERS' COMPENSATION PROGRAMS, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR; CARL E. LILLY,

Respondents.

---

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Benefits Review Board. (23-0306 BLA)

---

Submitted: April 22, 2026 Decided: August 17, 2026

---

Before WILKINSON, RUSHING, and BERNER, Circuit Judges.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

**ON BRIEF:** William S. Mattingly, JACKSON KELLY PLLC, Lexington, Kentucky, for Petitioner. Brad A. Austin, WOLFE WILLIAMS & AUSTIN, Norton, Virginia, for Respondent Carl E. Lilly.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Greenbrier, LLC, petitions for review of the Benefits Review Board's (BRB) decision and order affirming the Administrative Law Judge's (ALJ) award of black lung benefits pursuant to 30 U.S.C. §§ 901-944. Our review of the BRB's decision is limited to considering "whether substantial evidence supports the factual findings of the ALJ and whether the legal conclusions of the [BRB] and ALJ are rational and consistent with applicable law." *Westmoreland Coal Co. v. Stallard*, 876 F.3d 663, 668 (4th Cir. 2017) (internal quotation marks omitted). "Substantial evidence is more than a mere scintilla. It means such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion." *Sea "B" Mining Co. v. Addison*, 831 F.3d 244, 252 (4th Cir. 2016) (internal quotation marks omitted). "To determine whether this standard has been met, we consider whether all of the relevant evidence has been analyzed and whether the ALJ has sufficiently explained h[er] rationale in crediting certain evidence." *Hobet Mining, LLC v. Epling*, 783 F.3d 498, 504 (4th Cir. 2015) (internal quotation marks omitted).

Upon review of the record, we conclude that the BRB's decision is based on substantial evidence and is without reversible error. Accordingly, we deny the petition for review for the reasons stated by the BRB. No. 23-0306 BLA. 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.

*PETITION DENIED*