

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

LOIS B. CHANDLER,  
*Plaintiff-Appellant,*

v.

CASUAL CORNER GROUP,  
INCORPORATED,  
*Defendant-Appellee,*

and

CLAUDIO DELVECCHIO, President and  
CEO in his official capacity and in  
his personal capacity; KAREN  
RASMUSSEN, In her official capacity  
and in her personal capacity,  
*Defendants.*

No. 00-2209

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria.  
T. S. Ellis, III, District Judge.  
(CA-99-1626-A)

Submitted: May 17, 2001

Decided: May 25, 2001

Before WIDENER, NIEMEYER, and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

**COUNSEL**

Lois B. Chandler, Appellant Pro Se. David C. Burton, Sean Michael Gibbons, Steven David Brown, WILLIAMS, MULLEN, CLARK & DOBBINS, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

---

**OPINION**

PER CURIAM:

Lois B. Chandler appeals the district court's order granting summary judgment to Casual Corner in her employment discrimination action. Claims submitted to this court on appeal from the district court's grant of summary judgment are subject to de novo review. *See Mitchell v. Data General Corp.*, 12 F.3d 1310, 1313 (4th Cir. 1993).

Chandler first claims that Casual Corner's failure to promote her to the position of store manager was an adverse employment action. The district court, however, properly found no adverse action because it was undisputed that Chandler never applied for the position. *See Shackelford v. Deloitte & Touche, LLP*, 190 F.3d 398, 400 (5th Cir. 1999).

Chandler's second cause of action alleged Casual Corner acted adversely in withholding quarterly bonuses. The employer asserted legitimate reasons in conformance with their written disciplinary policy for the actions it undertook, and Chandler offered no evidence that the actions taken were pretextual. *See Taylor v. Virginia Union University*, 193 F.3d 219, 230 (4th Cir. 1999).

Accordingly, we find no reversible error and affirm the judgment of the district court. 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*