

UNPUBLISHED

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

RAMAN KALYANARAMAN,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

BAYER CORPORATION, a foreign
corporation,

Defendant-Appellee.

No. 00-1936

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of West Virginia, at Wheeling.
Frederick P. Stamp, Jr., Chief District Judge.
(CA-99-41-5)

Submitted: January 31, 2001

Decided: March 13, 2001

Before WILKINS, MOTZ, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

COUNSEL

Patrick S. Cassidy, Wray V. Voegelin, CASSIDY, MYERS,
COGAN, VOEGELIN & TENNANT, L.C., Wheeling, West Virginia,
for Appellant. John J. Myers, William E. Adams, ECKERT, SEA-
MANS, CHERIN & MELLOTT, L.L.C., Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania,
for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

OPINION

PER CURIAM:

Raman Kalyanaraman, an East Indian, filed suit against his employer, Bayer Corporation ("Employer"), alleging that Employer violated his rights under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act by (1) discriminating against him based on his race/national origin in its decisions to promote, and (2) retaliating against him for filing a discrimination claim. The court entered summary judgment against Kalyanaraman and dismissed the action. Kalyanaraman now appeals that order. We affirm.

On appeal, Kalyanaraman maintains that the district court erred in finding that Kalyanaraman did not establish that Employer's non-discriminatory reasons for not promoting him were a pretext for discrimination based on his race/national origin. As to his retaliation claim, he further challenges the district court's finding that he did not establish a causal connection between his filing of a discrimination complaint and adverse employment action.

We review a grant of summary judgment de novo. *Higgins v. E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co.*, 863 F.2d 1162, 1167 (4th Cir. 1988). Summary judgment is appropriate only if there are no material facts in dispute and the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. *Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317, 322 (1986). We must view the evidence in the light most favorable to the non-moving party. *Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 255 (1986).

In light of this standard, we have carefully reviewed the formal briefs and materials submitted by the parties, and find that the district court's opinion was well-reasoned. Finding no reversible error, we affirm the district court order on the reasoning of the district court. (J.A. at 856-70). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED