

# United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit

---

February 23, 2026

## ERRATA

---

Appeal No. 2024-1352

**APPLE INC.,**  
*Appellant*

v.

**SMART MOBILE TECHNOLOGIES LLC,**  
*Appellee*

---

Decided: January 21, 2026  
Nonprecedential Opinion

---

Please make the following changes:

On page 10, lines 6–7, the phrase “public carrier network” should be changed to “public carrier networks.” On page 10, line 9, the citation to “J.A. 2922–3004” should be changed to “J.A. 2992–3004.” On page 10, line 12, the period should be moved outside of the parenthesis. As a result of these changes, the sentence should read: “*See* J.A. 2882–83, J.A. 2892–2901 (Petition, citing teachings of Rautiola and Sainton for claim limitation [1.5], reciting “switching between one or more networks,” and claim 2,

reciting “switch dynamically between local networks and public carrier networks.”); J.A. 2965–66 (Patent Owner Response, proposing claim construction for “dynamic” as used in both claim limitation [1.9]’s “dynamic conversion” and claim 2’s “switch dynamically”); J.A. 2992–3004 (Patent Owner Response, addressing Apple’s arguments regarding claim limitations [1.5] and [1.9] and claim 2, including Apple’s reliance on Sainton).”

On page 11, line 8, the phrase “the ’968 patent” should be changed to “the ’936 patent.” As a result, the sentence should read: “Finding all elements of issue preclusion satisfied, we hold claim 1 of the ’936 patent unpatentable.”

On page 11, line 10, the phrase “the ’968 patent” should be changed to “the ’936 patent.” As a result, the sentence should read: “The Board’s decision as to the patentability of the dependent claims of the ’936 patent rested entirely on its conclusion that claim 1 was not unpatentable.”

On page 13, lines 28–29, the phrase “the ’729 patent” should be changed to “the ’739 patent.” As a result, the sentence should read: “Because the Board found the claims of the ’739 patent unpatentable under a construction that specifies “without the need for user intervention,” our conclusion here does not disturb our finding on issue preclusion.”

On page 14, lines 1–2, the reference to “the ’968 patent” should be changed to “the ’936 patent.” As a result, the sentence should read: “For the reasons stated above, we reverse the Board’s judgment regarding claim 1 of the ’936 patent.”