

Following an unsuccessful direct appeal, Hronek moved the district court to “Vacate, Set Aside, or Correct Sentence,” pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255, based on “ineffective assistance of counsel during plea negotiations,” due process violations, newly-discovered evidence, and *United States v. Booker*. The district court denied the petition, explaining that Hronek was not prejudiced by his lawyer’s ignorance about the forfeiture laws because “the letters petitioner provides in which his attorney discusses the erroneous application of the forfeiture laws are all dated *after* he entered his plea,” and “[o]ther than petitioner’s self-serving affidavit, there is simply no evidence that petitioner’s counselor provided erroneous advice prior to the time he changed his plea.” The court also found that “the vacation taken by petitioner’s attorney did not result in ineffective assistance of counsel. Rather, it was petitioner’s own inability to provide assistance, which resulted in the government ceasing its cooperation efforts with petitioner.” The court found that Hronek had procedurally defaulted on his alleged due process violations by failing to raise them on direct appeal, and that his alleged “newly discovered evidence” was neither newly discovered nor exculpatory. Finally, the court explained that *Booker* does not apply retroactively. Hronek appealed.

After carefully reviewing the record, the law, and the parties’ briefs, we conclude that the district court’s opinion correctly sets out the applicable law and correctly applies that law to the facts contained in the record. The issuance of a full written opinion by this court would serve no useful purpose. Accordingly, for the reasons stated in the district court’s opinion, we **AFFIRM**.