

The Michigan Court of Appeals found as a matter of fact that it was Ward's fault that his counsel was unable to meet with him about his case before trial and that counsel performed "admirably" under the circumstances. Relying on these and other findings, the court dismissed Ward's ineffective assistance claims. Ward then brought this habeas appeal. The federal district court held that the state decision was not objectively unreasonable in its analysis under either *Cronic* or *Strickland*. Ward timely appealed to this court.

After carefully reviewing the district court's opinion, the briefs, and the record in this case, we conclude that the district court did not err in dismissing Ward's claims. As the district court correctly set out the applicable law and correctly applied that law to the undisputed material facts contained in the record, issuance of a full written opinion by the court would serve no jurisprudential purpose.

Accordingly, for the reasons stated in the district court's well-reasoned opinion, we **AFFIRM** the judgment of the district court.