UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-1254

KELVIN DEVAUGHN WATSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CAROLYN W. COLVIN,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Stephanie A. Gallagher, Magistrate Judge. (1:13-cv-00205-SAG)

Submitted: November 25, 2014 Decided: February 13, 2015

Before DUNCAN and DIAZ, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Marcia E. Anderson, LAW OFFICE OF MARCIA E. ANDERSON, LLC, Mount Airy, Maryland, for Appellant. Rod J. Rosenstein, United States Attorney, Alex S. Gordon, Assistant United States Attorney, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

PER CURIAM:

Kelvin Devaughn Watson appeals the magistrate judge's order upholding the Commissioner's denial of disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income.* 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 substantially on the reasoning of the magistrate judge. Watson v. Colvin, No. 1:13–cv–00205–SAG (D. Md. Feb. 12, 2014).

---

* The parties consented to proceed before a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) (2012).

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