

Marathon Patent Group, Inc.
Form 10-K
March 25, 2019

UNITED STATES

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Washington, D.C. 20549

FORM 10-K

(Mark One)

QUARTERLY REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15 (D) OF THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

For the fiscal year ended December 31, 2018

or

TRANSITION REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15 (D) OF THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

For the transition period from _____ to _____

MARATHON PATENT GROUP, INC.

(Exact Name of Registrant as Specified in Charter)

Exchange Act.]

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a shell company (as defined in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act) Yes
 No

Indicate the number of shares outstanding of each of the issuer's classes of common stock, as of the latest practicable date. 25,519,940 shares of common stock are issued and outstanding as of March 25, 2019.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
<u>PART I.</u>	
Item 1. <u>Business</u>	4
Item 1A. <u>Risk Factors</u>	4
Item 1B. <u>Unresolved Staff Comments</u>	24
Item 2. <u>Properties</u>	24
Item 3. <u>Legal Proceedings</u>	24
Item 4. <u>Mine Safety Disclosures</u>	25
<u>PART II.</u>	
Item 5. <u>Market for Registrant’s Common Equity, Related Stockholder Matters and Issuer Purchases of Equity Securities</u>	26
Item 6. <u>Selected Financial Data</u>	30
Item 7. <u>Management’s Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations</u>	30
Item 7A. <u>Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures About Market Risk</u>	36
Item 8. <u>Financial Statements and Supplementary Data</u>	F-1
Item 9. <u>Changes in and Disagreements with Accountants on Accounting and Financial Disclosure</u>	37
Item 9A. <u>Controls and Procedures</u>	37
Item 9B. <u>Other Information</u>	37
<u>PART III.</u>	
Item 10. <u>Directors, Executive Officers and Corporate Governance</u>	38
Item 11. <u>Executive Compensation</u>	42
Item 12. <u>Security Ownership of Certain Beneficial Owners and Management and Related Stockholder Matters</u>	45
Item 13. <u>Certain Relationships and Related Transactions, Director Independence</u>	45
Item 14. <u>Principal Accounting Fees and Services</u>	45
<u>PART IV.</u>	
Item 15. <u>Exhibits, Financial Statement Schedules</u>	46
Item 16. <u>Form 10-K Summary</u>	48

MARATHON PATENT GROUP, INC.

FORWARD LOOKING STATEMENTS

This Annual Report on Form 10-K and other written and oral statements made from time to time by us may contain so-called “forward-looking statements,” all of which are subject to risks and uncertainties. Forward-looking statements can be identified by the use of words such as “expects,” “plans,” “will,” “forecasts,” “projects,” “intends,” “estimates,” and other words of similar meaning. One can identify them by the fact that they do not relate strictly to historical or current facts. These statements are likely to address our growth strategy, financial results and product and development programs. One must carefully consider any such statement and should understand that many factors could cause actual results to differ from our forward-looking statements. These factors may include inaccurate assumptions and a broad variety of other risks and uncertainties, including some that are known and some that are not. No forward-looking statement can be guaranteed, and actual future results may vary materially.

These statements are only predictions and involve known and unknown risks, uncertainties and other factors, including the risks in the section entitled “Risk Factors” and the risks set out below, any of which may cause our or our industry’s actual results, levels of activity, performance or achievements to be materially different from any future results, levels of activity, performance or achievements expressed or implied by these forward-looking statements. These risks include, by way of example and not in limitation:

The uncertainty of profitability;

Risks related to failure to obtain adequate financing on a timely basis and on acceptable terms; and

Other risks and uncertainties related to our business plan and business strategy.

This list is not an exhaustive list of the factors that may affect any of our forward-looking statements. These and other factors should be considered carefully, and readers should not place undue reliance on our forward-looking statements. Forward looking statements are made based on management’s beliefs, estimates and opinions on the date the statements are made, and we undertake no obligation to update forward-looking statements if these beliefs, estimates and opinions or other circumstances should change. Although we believe that the expectations reflected in the forward-looking statements are reasonable, we cannot guarantee future results, levels of activity, performance or achievements. Except as required by applicable law, including the securities laws of the United States we do not intend to update any of the forward-looking statements to conform these statements to actual results.

Edgar Filing: Marathon Patent Group, Inc. - Form 10-K

Information regarding market and industry statistics contained in this Annual Report on Form 10-K is included based on information available to us that we believe is accurate. It is generally based on industry and other publications that are not produced for purposes of securities offerings or economic analysis. We have not reviewed or included data from all sources. Forecasts and other forward-looking information obtained from these sources are subject to the same qualifications and the additional uncertainties accompanying any estimates of future market size, revenue and market acceptance of products and services. As a result, investors should not place undue reliance on these forward-looking statements.

As used in this annual report, the terms “we”, “us”, “our”, the “Company”, “Marathon Patent Group, Inc.” and “MARA” mean Marathon Patent Group, Inc. and its subsidiaries, unless otherwise indicated.

PART I

ITEM 1. BUSINESS

We were incorporated in the State of Nevada on February 23, 2010 under the name Verve Ventures, Inc. On December 7, 2011, we changed our name to American Strategic Minerals Corporation and were engaged in exploration and potential development of uranium and vanadium minerals business. In June 2012, we discontinued our minerals business and began to invest in real estate properties in Southern California. In October 2012, we discontinued our real estate business when our former CEO joined the firm and we commenced our IP licensing operations, at which time the Company's name was changed to Marathon Patent Group, Inc. On November 1, 2017, we entered into a merger agreement with Global Bit Ventures, Inc. ("GBV"), which is focused on mining digital assets. We purchased cryptocurrency mining machines and established a data center in Canada to mine digital assets. We intend to expand its activities in the mining of new digital assets, while at the same time harvesting the value of our remaining IP assets.

On June 28, 2018, our Board has determined that it is in the best interests of the Company and our shareholders to allow the Amended Merger Agreement with GBV to expire on its current termination date of June 28, 2018 without further negotiation or extension. The Board approved to issue 3,000,000 shares of our common stock to GBV as a termination fee for us canceling the proposed merger between the two companies.

All share and per share values for all periods presented in the accompanying consolidated financial statements have been retroactively adjusted to reflect the 1:4 Reverse Split which occurred on October 30, 2017.

Digital Asset Mining

We intend to power and secure blockchains by verifying blockchain transactions using custom hardware and software. We are currently using our hardware to mine bitcoin ("BTC") and expect to mine BTC and ether ("ETH"), and potentially other cryptocurrencies. Bitcoin and ether rely on different technologies based on the blockchain. Wherein bitcoin is a digital currency and ether is generally associated with smart contracts and digital tokens, we will be compensated in either BTC or ETH based on the mining transactions we perform for each, which is how we will earn revenue.

Blockchains are decentralized digital ledgers that record and enable secure peer-to-peer transactions without third party intermediaries. Blockchains enable the existence of digital assets by allowing participants to confirm

transactions without the need for a central certifying authority. When a participant requests a transaction, a peer-to-peer network consisting of computers, known as nodes, validate the transaction and the user's status using known algorithms. After the transaction is verified, it is combined with other transactions to create a new block of data for the ledger. The new block is added to the existing blockchain in a way that is permanent and unalterable, and the transaction is complete.

Digital assets (also known as cryptocurrency) are a medium of exchange that uses encryption techniques to control the creation of monetary units and to verify the transfer of funds. Many consumers use digital assets because it offers cheaper and faster peer-to-peer payment options without the need to provide personal details. Every single transaction and the ownership of every single digital asset in circulation is recorded in the blockchain. Miners use powerful computers that tally the transactions to run the blockchain. These miners update each time a transaction is made and ensure the authenticity of information. The miners receive a transaction fee for their service in the form of a portion of the new digital "coins" that are issued.

Competition

Subject to raising additional capital, our digital asset initiatives will compete with other industry participants that focus on investing in and securing the Blockchains of bitcoin and other digital assets. Market and financial conditions, and other conditions beyond the Company's control, may make it more attractive to invest in other entities, or to invest in bitcoin or digital assets directly. Companies have raised substantial capital this year seeking to enter the digital assets business. Our lack of capital is a competitive disadvantage.

Patent Enforcement Litigation

As of December 31, 2018, we were not involved in any active patent enforcement litigation.

Employees

As of December 31, 2018, we had 3 full-time employees. We believe our employee relations to be good.

ITEM 1A. RISK FACTORS

The combined organization will be faced with a market environment that cannot be predicted and that involves significant risks, many of which will be beyond its control. In addition to the other information contained in this Annual Report on Form 10-K, you should carefully consider the material risks described below before investing in our securities. If any of the following risks actually occur, our business, results of operations and financial condition would likely suffer. In these circumstances, the market price of our common stock could decline, and you may lose all or part of your investment.

Risks Related to Marathon

We may be classified as an inadvertent investment company.

We are not engaged in the business of investing, reinvesting, or trading in securities, and we do not hold ourselves out as being engaged in those activities. Under the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended (the “1940 Act”), however, a company may be deemed an investment company under Section 3(a)(1)(C) of the 1940 Act if the value of its investment securities is more than 40% of its total assets (exclusive of government securities and cash items) on a consolidated basis.

We have commenced digital asset mining, the outputs of which are cryptocurrencies, which may be deemed a security. In the event that the digital assets held by us exceed 40% of our total assets, exclusive of cash, we inadvertently become an investment company. An inadvertent investment company can avoid being classified as an investment company if it can rely on one of the exclusions under the 1940 Act. One such exclusion, Rule 3a-2 under the 1940 Act, allows an inadvertent investment company a grace period of one year from the earlier of (a) the date on which an issuer owns securities and/or cash having a value exceeding 50% of the issuer’s total assets on either a consolidated or unconsolidated basis and (b) the date on which an issuer owns or proposes to acquire investment securities having a value exceeding 40% of the value of such issuer’s total assets (exclusive of government securities and cash items) on an unconsolidated basis. We are putting in place policies that we expect will work to keep the investment securities held by us at less than 40% of our total assets, which may include acquiring assets with our cash, liquidating our investment securities or seeking a no-action letter from the SEC if we are unable to acquire sufficient assets or liquidate sufficient investment securities in a timely manner.

As Rule 3a-2 is available to a company no more than once every three years, and assuming no other exclusion were available to us, we would have to keep within the 40% limit for at least three years after we cease being an inadvertent investment company. This may limit our ability to make certain investments or enter into joint ventures that could otherwise have a positive impact on our earnings. In any event, we do not intend to become an investment company engaged in the business of investing and trading securities.

Classification as an investment company under the 1940 Act requires registration with the SEC. If an investment company fails to register, it would have to stop doing almost all business, and its contracts would become voidable. Registration is time consuming and restrictive and would require a restructuring of our operations, and we would be very constrained in the kind of business we could do as a registered investment company. Further, we would become subject to substantial regulation concerning management, operations, transactions with affiliated persons and portfolio composition, and would need to file reports under the 1940 Act regime. The cost of such compliance would result in the Company incurring substantial additional expenses, and the failure to register if required would have a materially adverse impact to conduct our operations.

There is no way to determine in advance the amount the Company may be required to pay the holders of certain warrants issued by the Company, which are classified as liabilities.

Certain warrants issued by the Company, which are classified as liabilities on the Company's balance sheet, have a put feature allowing the holder to put the warrants to the Company in return for cash payment in the event that there is a change of control. The amount of the cash payment to each holder is based on the value of the warrant, as determined by the Black-Scholes model and Monte Carlo method, on the day the warrant is put to the Company. As the inputs to the Monte Carlo method include the volatility of the Company's stock and the underlying price of the Company's stock on the day the warrant(s) are put to the Company, there is no way to determine in advance the amount the Company may be required to pay the holders, but it may be material.

Failure to effectively manage our growth could place strains on our managerial, operational and financial resources and could adversely affect our business and operating results.

Our growth has placed, and is expected to continue to place, a strain on our limited managerial, operational and financial resources and systems. Further, as our subsidiary companies' businesses grow, we will be required to continue to manage multiple relationships. Any further growth by us or our subsidiary companies, or an increase in the number of our strategic relationships, may place additional strain on our managerial, operational and financial resources and systems. Although we may not grow as we expect, if we fail to manage our growth effectively or to develop and expand our managerial, operational and financial resources and systems, our business and financial results would be materially harmed.

Marathon has an evolving business model.

As digital assets and blockchain technologies become more widely available, we expect the services and products associated with them to evolve. Very recently, the Securities and Exchange Commission (the "Commission" or the "SEC") issued a Report that promoters that use initial coin offerings or token sales to raise capital may be engaged in the offer and sale of securities in violation of the Securities Act and the Exchange Act of 1934 (the "Exchange Act"). This may cause us to potentially change our future business in order to comply fully with the federal securities laws as well as applicable state securities laws. As a result, to stay current with the industry, our business model may need to evolve as well. From time to time we may modify aspects of our business model. We cannot offer any assurance that these or any other modifications will be successful or will not result in harm to the business. We may not be able to manage growth effectively, which could damage our reputation, limit our growth and negatively affect our operating results.

Digital Assets such as bitcoin and ether may be regulated as securities or investment securities.

Bitcoin is the oldest and most well-known form of digital asset. Bitcoin, ether, and other forms of digital assets/cryptocurrencies have been the source of much regulatory consternation, resulting in differing definitional outcomes without a single unifying statement. When the interests of investor protection are paramount, for example in the offer or sale of Initial Coin Offering (“ICO”) tokens, the SEC has no difficulty determining that the token offerings are securities under the “Howey” test as stated by the United States Supreme Court, a conclusion with which Marathon agrees. As such, ICO offerings would require registration under the Securities Act or an available exemption therefrom for offers or sales in the United States to be lawful. Section 5(a) of the Securities Act provides that, unless a registration statement is in effect as to a security, it is unlawful for any person, directly or indirectly, to engage in the offer or sale of securities in interstate commerce. Section 5(c) of the Securities Act provides a similar prohibition against offers to sell, or offers to buy, unless a registration statement has been filed. Although we do not believe our mining activities require registration for us to conduct such activities and accumulate digital assets the SEC, CFTC, NASDAQ or other governmental or quasi-governmental agency or organization may conclude that our activities involve the offer or sale of “securities”, or ownership of “investment securities”, and we may face regulation under the Securities Act or the 1940 Act. Such regulation or the inability to meet the requirements to continue operations, would have a material adverse effect on our business and operations.

Bitcoin and other digital assets are viewed differently by different regulatory and standards setting organizations. For example, the Financial Action Task Force (“FATF”) and the Internal Revenue Service (“IRS”) consider a cryptocurrency as currency or an asset or property.

Bitcoin is described as a virtual currency by the Financial Action Task Force, as follows:

a digital representation of value that can be digitally traded and functions as: (1) a medium of exchange; and/or (2) a unit of account; and/or (3) a store of value, but does not have legal tender status (i.e., when tendered to a creditor, is a valid and legal offer of payment) in any jurisdiction. It is not issued or guaranteed by any jurisdiction, and it fulfils the above functions only by agreement within the community of users of the virtual currency. Virtual currency is distinguished from fiat currency (a.k.a. “real currency,” “real money,” or “national currency”), which is the coin and paper money of a country that is designated as its legal tender; circulates; and is customarily used and accepted as a medium of exchange in the issuing country. It is distinct from e-money, which is a digital representation of fiat currency used to electronically transfer value denominated in fiat currency.¹

Further, the IRS views bitcoin as property and applies general tax principles that apply to property transactions to transactions involving virtual currency, as follows:²

IR-2014-36, March. 25, 2014

WASHINGTON — The Internal Revenue Service today issued a notice providing answers to frequently asked questions (FAQs) on virtual currency, such as bitcoin. These FAQs provide basic information on the U.S. federal tax implications of transactions in, or transactions that use, virtual currency.

In some environments, virtual currency operates like “real” currency — i.e., the coin and paper money of the United States or of any other country that is designated as legal tender, circulates, and is customarily used and accepted as a medium of exchange in the country of issuance — but it does not have legal tender status in any jurisdiction.

The notice provides that virtual currency is treated as property for U.S. federal tax purposes. General tax principles that apply to property transactions apply to transactions using virtual currency. Among other things, this means that:

Wages paid to employees using virtual currency are taxable to the employee, must be reported by an employer on a Form W-2, and are subject to federal income tax withholding and payroll taxes.

Payments using virtual currency made to independent contractors and other service providers are taxable and self-employment tax rules generally apply. Normally, payers must issue Form 1099.

The character of gain or loss from the sale or exchange of virtual currency depends on whether the virtual currency is a capital asset in the hands of the taxpayer.

A payment made using virtual currency is subject to information reporting to the same extent as any other payment made in property.

¹ FATF Report, Virtual Currencies, Key Definitions and Potential AML/CFT Risks, FINANCIAL ACTION TASK FORCE (June 2014), <http://www.fatf-gafi.org/media/fatf/documents/reports/Virtual-currency-key-definitions-and-potentialaml-cft-risks.pdf>. The Financial Action Task Force (“FATF”) is an independent inter-governmental body that develops and promotes policies to protect the global financial system against money laundering, terrorist financing and the financing of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. The FATF Recommendations are recognized as the global anti-money laundering (“AML”) and counter-terrorist financing (“CFT”) standard.

² IR-2014-36 (Marth 25, 2014). <https://www.irs.gov/newsroom/irs-virtual-currency-guidance>

In June 2016, the AICPA commented on IRS Notice 2014-21 urging the IRS to provide additional guidance about existing tax principles whether virtual currency is property, currency or commodity.³

Furthermore, in the several applications to establish an Exchange Traded Fund (“ETF”) of cryptocurrency, and in the questions raised by the Staff under the 1940 Act, no clear principles emerge from the regulators as to how they view these issues and how to regulate cryptocurrency under the applicable securities acts. It has been widely reported that the SEC has recently issued letters and requested various ETF applications be withdrawn because of concerns over liquidity and valuation and unanswered questions about absence of reporting and compliance procedures capable of being implemented under the current state of the markets for exchange traded funds.⁴

Accordingly, there is no one unifying principle governing the regulatory status of cryptocurrency nor whether cryptocurrency is a security in each context in which it is viewed. Cryptocurrency may be a security and its offer or sale may require compliance with Section 5 of the Securities Act, in certain instances. However, since the Company does not intend to be engaged in the offer or sale of securities in the form of ICO offerings its internal mining activities that are not related to ICO offerings do not require registration under the Securities Act. We may face similar issues with various state securities regulators who may interpret our actions as requiring registration under state securities laws, banking laws, or money transmitter and similar laws, which are also an unsettled area or regulation that exposes us to risks.

Since there has been limited precedence set for financial accounting or taxation of digital assets other than digital securities, it is unclear how we will be required to account for digital asset transactions and the taxation of our businesses.

There is currently no authoritative literature under accounting principles generally accepted in the United States which specifically addresses the accounting for digital assets, including digital currencies. Therefore, by analogy, we intend to record digital assets similar to financial instruments under ASC 825, Financial Instruments, because the economic nature of these digital assets is most closely related to a financial instrument such as an investment in a foreign currency.

We believe that Marathon will recognize revenue when it is realized or realizable and earned. Our material revenue stream is expected to be related to the mining of digital currencies. Marathon will derive revenue by providing transaction verification services within the digital currency networks of crypto-currencies, such as bitcoin and ethereum commonly termed “crypto-currency mining.” In consideration for these services, Marathon expects to receive digital currency (also known as “Coins”). Coins are generally recorded as revenue, using the average spot price on the date of receipt. The coins are recorded on the balance sheet at their fair value. Gains or losses on sale of Coins are recorded in the statement of operations. Expenses associated with running the crypto-currency mining business, such as equipment depreciation, rent and electricity cost are recorded as cost of revenues.

In 2014, the IRS issued guidance in Notice 2014-21 that classified cryptocurrency as property, not currency, for federal income tax purposes. But according to the requirements of FATCA, which requires foreign financial institutions to provide the IRS with information about accounts held by U.S. taxpayers or foreign entities controlled by U.S. taxpayers, cryptocurrency exchanges, in the ordinary course of doing business, are considered financial institutions.

On November 30, 2016, a federal judge in the Northern District of California granted an IRS application to serve a “John Doe” summons on Coinbase Inc., which operates a cryptocurrency wallet and exchange business. The summons asked Coinbase to identify all U.S. customers who transferred convertible cryptocurrency from 2013 to 2015. The IRS is trying to get cryptocurrency owners to report the value of their wallets to the federal government and the IRS is treating cryptocurrency as both property and currency.

The American Institute of Certified Public Accountants recommended in a June 2016 letter to the IRS that cryptocurrency accounts be reported in the summary information section of Form 8938, Statement of Specified Foreign Financial Assets, which breaks with the IRS’s 2014 guidance that cryptocurrency be treated as property.

Property is divided into certain sections within the Internal Revenue Code (“IRC”) that determine everything from how the property is treated at sale, to how the property is depreciated, to the nature and character of the gain on sale of the asset. For instance, IRC §1231 property (real or depreciable business property held for more than one year) is treated as capital in nature when sold for a profit, but it is treated as ordinary when the property is sold for a loss. IRC §1245 property, on the other hand, is treated as ordinary in nature. IRC §1245 property encompasses most types of property. IRC §1250 property covers everything else. IRC §1250 states that a gain from selling real property that has been depreciated should be taxed as ordinary income, to the extent that the accumulated depreciation exceeds the depreciation calculated using the straight-line method, which is the most basic depreciation method used on an income statement. IRC §1250 bases the amount of tax due on the type of property, such as residential or nonresidential property, and on how many months the property was owned.

IRS guidance is silent on which section of the tax code cryptocurrency falls into. For instance, IRC §1031 allows for the like-kind exchange of certain property. IRC §1031 exchanges typically are done with real estate or business assets. However, with the classification of cryptocurrency as property by the IRS, many tax professionals will argue that cryptocurrency can be exchanged using IRC §1031.

³ <https://www.aicpa.org/advocacy/cpaadvocate/2016/virtual-currency-guidance-needed.html>

⁴ <https://seekingalpha.com/article/4137093-sec-saying-no-bitcoin-etfs-one-may-still-get-approved>

We believe that all of our digital asset mining activities will be accounted for on the same basis regardless of the form of digital asset. A change in regulatory or financial accounting standards or interpretation by the IRS or accounting standards or the SEC could result in changes in our accounting treatment, taxation and the necessity to restate our financial statements. Such a restatement could negatively impact our business, prospects, financial condition and results of operation.

The further development and acceptance of digital asset networks and other digital assets, which represent a new and rapidly changing industry, are subject to a variety of factors that are difficult to evaluate. The slowing or stopping of the development or acceptance of digital asset systems may adversely affect an investment in us.

Digital assets such as bitcoins and ether, that may be used, among other things, to buy and sell goods and services are a new and rapidly evolving industry of which the digital asset networks are prominent, but not unique, parts. The growth of the digital asset industry in general, and the digital asset networks of bitcoin and ether in particular, are subject to a high degree of uncertainty. The factors affecting the further development of the digital asset industry, as well as the digital asset networks, include:

continued worldwide growth in the adoption and use of bitcoins and other digital assets;

government and quasi-government regulation of bitcoins and other digital assets and their use, or restrictions on or regulation of access to and operation of the digital asset network or similar digital assets systems;

the maintenance and development of the open-source software protocol of the bitcoin network and ether network;

changes in consumer demographics and public tastes and preferences;

the availability and popularity of other forms or methods of buying and selling goods and services, including new means of using fiat currencies;

general economic conditions and the regulatory environment relating to digital assets; and

the impact of regulators focusing on digital assets and digital securities and the costs associated with such regulatory oversight.

A decline in the popularity or acceptance of the digital asset networks of bitcoin or ether, or similar digital asset systems, could adversely affect an investment in us.

If we acquire digital securities, even unintentionally, we may violate the Investment Company Act of 1940 and incur potential third-party liabilities

The Company intends to comply with the 1940 Act in all respects. To that end, if holdings of cryptocurrencies are determined to constitute investment securities of a kind that subject the Company to registration and reporting under the 1940 Act, the Company will limit its holdings to less than 40% of its assets. Section 3(a)(1)(C) of the 1940 Act defines “investment company” to mean any issuer that is engaged or proposes to engage in the business of investing, reinvesting, owning, holding, or trading in securities, and owns or proposes to acquire investment securities having a value exceeding 40% of the value of such issuer’s total assets (exclusive of Government securities and cash items) on an unconsolidated basis. Section 3(a)(2) of the 1940 Act defines “investment securities” to include all securities except (A) Government securities, (B) securities issued by employees’ securities companies, and (C) securities issued by majority-owned subsidiaries which (i) are not investment companies and (ii) are not relying on the exception from the definition of investment company in section 3(c)(1) or 3(c)(7) of the 1940 Act. As noted above, the SEC has not stated whether bitcoin and cryptocurrency is an investment security, as defined in the 1940 Act.

Currently, there is relatively small use of digital assets in the retail and commercial marketplace in comparison to relatively large use by speculators, thus contributing to price volatility that could adversely affect an investment in us.

As relatively new products and technologies, digital assets and the blockchain networks on which they exist have only recently become widely accepted as a means of payment for goods and services by many major retail and commercial outlets and use of digital assets by consumers to pay such retail and commercial outlets remains limited. Conversely, a significant portion of demand for digital assets is generated by speculators and investors seeking to profit from the short- or long-term holding of such digital assets. A lack of expansion of digital assets into retail and commercial markets, or a contraction of such use, may result in increased volatility or a reduction in the price of all or any digital asset, either of which could adversely impact an investment in us.

Significant contributors to all or any digital asset network could propose amendments to the respective network’s protocols and software that, if accepted and authorized by such network, could adversely affect an investment in us.

For example, with respect to bitcoin's network, a small group of individuals contribute to the Bitcoin Core project on GitHub.com. This group of contributors is currently headed by Wladimir J. van der Laan, the current lead maintainer. These individuals can propose refinements or improvements to the bitcoin network's source code through one or more software upgrades that alter the protocols and software that govern the bitcoin network and the properties of bitcoin, including the irreversibility of transactions and limitations on the mining of new bitcoin. Proposals for upgrades and discussions relating thereto take place on online forums. For example, there is an ongoing debate regarding altering the blockchain by increasing the size of blocks to accommodate a larger volume of transactions. Although some proponents support an increase, other market participants oppose an increase to the block size as it may deter miners from confirming transactions and concentrate power into a smaller group of miners. To the extent that a significant majority of the users and miners on the bitcoin network install such software upgrade(s), the bitcoin network would be subject to new protocols and software that may adversely affect an investment in the Shares. In the event a developer or group of developers proposes a modification to the bitcoin network that is not accepted by a majority of miners and users, but that is nonetheless accepted by a substantial plurality of miners and users, two or more competing and incompatible blockchain implementations could result. This is known as a "hard fork." In such a case, the "hard fork" in the blockchain could materially and adversely affect the perceived value of digital assets as reflected on one or both incompatible blockchains, which may adversely affect an investment in us.

Forks in a digital asset network may occur in the future which may affect the value of digital assets held by us.

For example, on August 1, 2017 bitcoin's blockchain was forked and Bitcoin Cash was created. The fork resulted in a new blockchain being created with a shared history, and a new path forward. Bitcoin Cash has a block size of 8mb and other technical changes. On October 24, 2017, bitcoin's blockchain was forked and Bitcoin Gold was created. The fork resulted in a new blockchain being created with a shared history, and new path forward, Bitcoin Gold has a different proof of work algorithm and other technical changes. The value of the newly created Bitcoin Cash and Bitcoin Gold may or may not have value in the long run and may affect the price of bitcoin if interest is shifted away from bitcoin to the newly created digital assets. The value of bitcoin after the creation of a fork is subject to many factors including the value of the fork product, market reaction to the creation of the fork product, and the occurrence of forks in the future. As such, the value of bitcoin could be materially reduced if existing and future forks have a negative effect on bitcoin's value. If a fork occurs on a digital asset network which we are mining or hold digital assets in it may have a negative effect on the value of the digital asset and may adversely affect an investment in us.

The open-source structure of the bitcoin network protocol means that the contributors to the protocol are generally not directly compensated for their contributions in maintaining and developing the protocol. A failure to properly monitor and upgrade the protocol could damage the bitcoin network and an investment in us.

The bitcoin network for example operates based on an open-source protocol maintained by contributors, largely on the Bitcoin Core project on GitHub. As an open source project, bitcoin is not represented by an official organization or authority. As the bitcoin network protocol is not sold and its use does not generate revenues for contributors, contributors are generally not compensated for maintaining and updating the bitcoin network protocol. Although the

MIT Media Lab's Digital Currency Initiative funds the current maintainer Wladimir J. van der Laan, among others, this type of financial incentive is not typical. The lack of guaranteed financial incentive for contributors to maintain or develop the bitcoin network and the lack of guaranteed resources to adequately address emerging issues with the bitcoin network may reduce incentives to address the issues adequately or in a timely manner. Changes to a digital asset network which we are mining on may adversely affect an investment in us.

If a malicious actor or botnet obtains control in excess of 50% of the processing power active on any digital asset network, including the bitcoin network or ether network, it is possible that such actor or botnet could manipulate the blockchain in a manner that adversely affects an investment in us.

If a malicious actor or botnet (a volunteer or hacked collection of computers controlled by networked software coordinating the actions of the computers) obtains a majority of the processing power dedicated to mining on any digital asset network, including the bitcoin network or ether network, it may be able to alter the blockchain by constructing alternate blocks if it is able to solve for such blocks faster than the remainder of the miners on the blockchain can add valid blocks. In such alternate blocks, the malicious actor or botnet could control, exclude or modify the ordering of transactions, though it could not generate new digital assets or transactions using such control. Using alternate blocks, the malicious actor could "double-spend" its own digital assets (i.e., spend the same digital assets in more than one transaction) and prevent the confirmation of other users' transactions for so long as it maintains control. To the extent that such malicious actor or botnet does not yield its majority control of the processing power or the digital asset community does not reject the fraudulent blocks as malicious, reversing any changes made to the blockchain may not be possible. Such changes could adversely affect an investment in us.

For example, in late May and early June 2014, a mining pool known as GHash.io approached and, during a 24- to 48-hour period in early June may have exceeded, the threshold of 50% of the processing power on the bitcoin network. To the extent that GHash.io did exceed 50% of the processing power on the network, reports indicate that such threshold was surpassed for only a short period, and there are no reports of any malicious activity or control of the blockchain performed by GHash.io. Furthermore, the processing power in the mining pool appears to have been redirected to other pools on a voluntary basis by participants in the GHash.io pool, as had been done in prior instances when a mining pool exceeded 40% of the processing power on the bitcoin network.

The approach towards and possible crossing of the 50% threshold indicate a greater risk that a single mining pool could exert authority over the validation of digital asset transactions. To the extent that the digital assets ecosystems do not act to ensure greater decentralization of digital asset mining processing power, the feasibility of a malicious actor obtaining in excess of 50% of the processing power on any digital asset network (e.g., through control of a large mining pool or through hacking such a mining pool) will increase, which may adversely impact an investment in us.

If the award of digital assets for solving blocks and transaction fees for recording transactions are not sufficiently high to incentivize miners, miners may cease expending hashrate to solve blocks and confirmations of transactions on the blockchain could be slowed temporarily. A reduction in the hashrate expended by miners on any digital asset network could increase the likelihood of a malicious actor obtaining control in excess of fifty percent (50%) of the aggregate hashrate active on such network or the blockchain, potentially permitting such actor to manipulate the blockchain in a manner that adversely affects an investment in us.

Bitcoin miners record transactions when they solve for and add blocks of information to the blockchain. When a miner solves for a block, it creates that block, which includes data relating to (i) the solution to the block, (ii) a reference to the prior block in the blockchain to which the new block is being added and (iii) all transactions that have occurred but have not yet been added to the blockchain. The miner becomes aware of outstanding, unrecorded transactions through the data packet transmission and propagation discussed above. Typically, bitcoin transactions will be recorded in the next chronological block if the spending party has an internet connection and at least one minute has passed between the transaction's data packet transmission and the solution of the next block. If a transaction is not recorded in the next chronological block, it is usually recorded in the next block thereafter.

As the award of new digital assets for solving blocks declines, and if transaction fees are not sufficiently high, miners may not have an adequate incentive to continue mining and may cease their mining operations. For example, the current fixed reward on the bitcoin network for solving a new block is twelve and a half (12.5) bitcoins per block; the reward decreased from twenty-five (25) bitcoin in July 2016. It is estimated that it will halve again in about four (4) years. This reduction may result in a reduction in the aggregate hashrate of the bitcoin network as the incentive for miners will decrease. Moreover, miners ceasing operations would reduce the aggregate hashrate on the bitcoin network, which would adversely affect the confirmation process for transactions (i.e., temporarily decreasing the speed at which blocks are added to the blockchain until the next scheduled adjustment in difficulty for block solutions) and make the bitcoin network more vulnerable to a malicious actor obtaining control in excess of fifty percent (50%) of the aggregate hashrate on the bitcoin network. Periodically, the bitcoin network has adjusted the difficulty for block solutions so that solution speeds remain in the vicinity of the expected ten (10) minute confirmation time targeted by the bitcoin network protocol.

Marathon believes that from time to time there will be further considerations and adjustments to the bitcoin network, and others, including the ether network, regarding the difficulty for block solutions. More significant reductions in aggregate hashrate on digital asset networks could result in material, though temporary, delays in block solution confirmation time. Any reduction in confidence in the confirmation process or aggregate hashrate of any digital asset network may negatively impact the value of digital assets, which will adversely impact an investment in us.

To the extent that the profit margins of digital asset mining operations are not high, operators of digital asset mining operations are more likely to immediately sell their digital assets earned by mining in the digital asset exchange market, resulting in a reduction in the price of digital assets that could adversely impact an investment in us.

Over the past two years, digital asset mining operations have evolved from individual users mining with computer processors, graphics processing units and first-generation servers. Currently, new processing power brought onto the digital asset networks is predominantly added by incorporated and unincorporated “professionalized” mining operations. Professionalized mining operations may use proprietary hardware or sophisticated machines. They require the investment of significant capital for the acquisition of this hardware, the leasing of operating space (often in data centers or warehousing facilities), incurring of electricity costs and the employment of technicians to operate the mining farms. As a result, professionalized mining operations are of a greater scale than prior miners and have more defined, regular expenses and liabilities. These regular expenses and liabilities require professionalized mining operations to more immediately sell digital assets earned from mining operations on the digital asset exchange market, whereas it is believed that individual miners in past years were more likely to hold newly mined digital assets for more extended periods. The immediate selling of newly mined digital assets greatly increases the supply of digital assets on the digital asset exchange market, creating downward pressure on the price of each digital asset.

The extent to which the value of digital assets mined by a professionalized mining operation exceeds the allocable capital and operating costs determines the profit margin of such operation. A professionalized mining operation may be more likely to sell a higher percentage of its newly mined digital assets rapidly if it is operating at a low profit margin—and it may partially or completely cease operations if its profit margin is negative. In a low profit margin environment, a higher percentage could be sold into the digital asset exchange market more rapidly, thereby potentially reducing digital asset prices. Lower digital asset prices could result in further tightening of profit margins, particularly for professionalized mining operations with higher costs and more limited capital reserves, creating a network effect that may further reduce the price of digital assets until mining operations with higher operating costs become unprofitable and remove mining power from the respective digital asset network. The network effect of reduced profit margins resulting in greater sales of newly mined digital assets could result in a reduction in the price of digital assets that could adversely impact an investment in us.

To the extent that any miners cease to record transactions in solved blocks, transactions that do not include the payment of a transaction fee will not be recorded on the blockchain until a block is solved by a miner who does not require the payment of transaction fees. Any widespread delays in the recording of transactions could result in a loss of confidence in that digital asset network, which could adversely impact an investment in us.

To the extent that any miners cease to record transaction in solved blocks, such transactions will not be recorded on the blockchain. Currently, there are no known incentives for miners to elect to exclude the recording of transactions in solved blocks; however, to the extent that any such incentives arise (e.g., a collective movement among miners or one or more mining pools forcing bitcoin users to pay transaction fees as a substitute for or in addition to the award of new bitcoins upon the solving of a block), actions of miners solving a significant number of blocks could delay the recording and confirmation of transactions on the blockchain. Any systemic delays in the recording and confirmation of transactions on the blockchain could result in greater exposure to double-spending transactions and a loss of confidence in certain or all digital asset networks, which could adversely impact an investment in us.

The acceptance of digital asset network software patches or upgrades by a significant, but not overwhelming, percentage of the users and miners in any digital asset network could result in a “fork” in the respective blockchain, resulting in the operation of two separate networks until such time as the forked blockchains are merged. The temporary or permanent existence of forked blockchains could adversely impact an investment in us.

Digital asset networks are open source projects and, although there is an influential group of leaders in, for example, the bitcoin network community known as the “Core Developers,” there is no official developer or group of developers that formally controls the bitcoin network. Any individual can download the bitcoin network software and make any desired modifications, which are proposed to users and miners on the bitcoin network through software downloads and upgrades, typically posted to the bitcoin development forum on GitHub.com. A substantial majority of miners and bitcoin users must consent to those software modifications by downloading the altered software or upgrade that implements the changes; otherwise, the changes do not become a part of the bitcoin network. Since the bitcoin network’s inception, changes to the bitcoin network have been accepted by the vast majority of users and miners, ensuring that the bitcoin network remains a coherent economic system; however, a developer or group of developers could potentially propose a modification to the bitcoin network that is not accepted by a vast majority of miners and users, but that is nonetheless accepted by a substantial population of participants in the bitcoin network. In such a case, and if the modification is material and/or not backwards compatible with the prior version of bitcoin network software, a fork in the blockchain could develop and two separate bitcoin networks could result, one running the pre-modification software program and the other running the modified version (i.e., a second “bitcoin” network). Such a fork in the blockchain typically would be addressed by community-led efforts to merge the forked blockchains, and several prior forks have been so merged. This kind of split in the bitcoin network could materially and adversely impact an investment in us and, in the worst-case scenario, harm the sustainability of the bitcoin network’s economy.

Intellectual property rights claims may adversely affect the operation of some or all digital asset networks.

Third parties may assert intellectual property claims relating to the holding and transfer of digital assets and their source code. Regardless of the merit of any intellectual property or other legal action, any threatened action that reduces confidence in some or all digital asset networks’ long-term viability or the ability of end-users to hold and transfer digital assets may adversely affect an investment in us. Additionally, a meritorious intellectual property claim could prevent us and other end-users from accessing some or all digital asset networks or holding or transferring their digital assets. As a result, an intellectual property claim against us or other large digital asset network participants could adversely affect an investment in us.

The digital asset exchanges on which digital assets trade are relatively new and, in most cases, largely unregulated and may therefore be more exposed to fraud and failure than established, regulated exchanges for other products. To the extent that the digital asset exchanges representing a substantial portion of the volume in digital asset trading are involved in fraud or experience security failures or other operational issues, such digital asset exchanges’ failures may result in a reduction in the price of some or all digital assets and can adversely affect an investment in us.

The digital asset exchanges on which the digital assets trade are new and, in most cases, largely unregulated. Furthermore, many digital asset exchanges (including several of the most prominent USD denominated digital asset exchanges) do not provide the public with significant information regarding their ownership structure, management teams, corporate practices or regulatory compliance. As a result, the marketplace may lose confidence in, or may experience problems relating to, digital asset exchanges, including prominent exchanges handling a significant portion of the volume of digital asset trading.

For example, over the past 4 years, a number of bitcoin exchanges have been closed due to fraud, failure or security breaches. In many of these instances, the customers of such bitcoin exchanges were not compensated or made whole for the partial or complete losses of their account balances in such bitcoin exchanges. While smaller bitcoin exchanges are less likely to have the infrastructure and capitalization that make larger bitcoin exchanges more stable, larger bitcoin exchanges are more likely to be appealing targets for hackers and “malware” (i.e., software used or programmed by attackers to disrupt computer operation, gather sensitive information or gain access to private computer systems). Further, the collapse of the largest bitcoin exchange in 2014 suggests that the failure of one component of the overall bitcoin ecosystem can have consequences for both users of a bitcoin exchange and the bitcoin industry as a whole.

More recently, the Wall Street Journal has reported that China will shut down bitcoin exchanges and other virtual currency trading platforms. The article reported that China has accounted for the bulk of global bitcoin trading.

A lack of stability in the digital asset exchange market and the closure or temporary shutdown of digital asset exchanges due to fraud, business failure, hackers or malware, or government-mandated regulation may reduce confidence in the digital asset networks and result in greater volatility in digital asset values. These potential consequences of a digital asset exchange’s failure could adversely affect an investment in us.

Political or economic crises may motivate large-scale sales of digital assets, which could result in a reduction in some or all digital assets' values and adversely affect an investment in us.

As an alternative to fiat currencies that are backed by central governments, digital assets such as bitcoins, which are relatively new, are subject to supply and demand forces based upon the desirability of an alternative, decentralized means of buying and selling goods and services, and it is unclear how such supply and demand will be impacted by geopolitical events. Nevertheless, political or economic crises may motivate large-scale acquisitions or sales of digital assets either globally or locally. Large-scale sales of digital assets would result in a reduction in their value and could adversely affect an investment in us.

Demand for ether and bitcoin is driven, in part, by their status as the two most prominent and secure digital assets. It is possible that digital assets other than ether and bitcoin could have features that make them more desirable to a material portion of the digital asset user base, resulting in a reduction in demand for ether and bitcoin, which could have a negative impact on the price of ether and bitcoin and adversely affect an investment in us.

Bitcoins and ether, as assets, hold “first-to-market” advantages over other digital assets. This first-to-market advantage is driven in large part by having the largest user bases and, more importantly, the largest combined mining power in use to secure their respective blockchains and transaction verification systems. Having a large mining network results in greater user confidence regarding the security and long-term stability of a digital asset’s network and its blockchain; as a result, the advantage of more users and miners makes a digital asset more secure, which makes it more attractive to new users and miners, resulting in a network effect that strengthens the first-to-market advantage.

As of March 25, 2019, there were over 2,000 alternate digital assets tracked by CoinMarketCap, having a total market capitalization (including the market capitalization of ether and bitcoin) of approximately \$140.1 billion, using market prices and total available supply of each digital asset. This included digital assets using a “proof of work” mining structure similar to bitcoin, and those using a “proof of stake” transaction verification system that is different than bitcoin’s mining system (e.g., Peercoin, Bitshares and NXT). As of March 25, 2019, bitcoin’s \$71.1 billion market capitalization was almost five (5) times the size of the \$14.6 billion market cap of ether, the second largest proof-of-work digital asset. Despite the marked first-mover advantage of the bitcoin network over other digital asset networks, it is possible that another digital asset could become materially popular due to either a perceived or exposed shortcoming of the bitcoin network protocol that is not immediately addressed by the bitcoin contributor community or a perceived advantage of an altcoin that includes features not incorporated into bitcoin. If a digital asset obtains significant market share (either in market capitalization, mining power or use as a payment technology), this could reduce bitcoin’s market share as well as other digital assets we may become involved in and have a negative impact on the demand for, and price of, such digital assets and could adversely affect an investment in us.

Our ability to adopt technology in response to changing security needs or trends poses a challenge to the safekeeping of our digital assets.

The history of digital asset exchanges has shown that exchanges and large holders of digital assets must adapt to technological change in order to secure and safeguard their digital assets. We rely on Bitgo Inc.'s multi-signature enterprise storage solution to safeguard our digital assets from theft, loss, destruction or other issues relating to hackers and technological attack. Our digital assets will also be moved to various exchanges in order to exchange them for fiat currency during which time we'll be relying on the security of such exchanges to safeguard our digital assets. We believe that it may become a more appealing target of security threats as the size of our bitcoin holdings grow. To the extent that either Bitgo Inc. or we are unable to identify and mitigate or stop new security threats, our digital assets may be subject to theft, loss, destruction or other attack, which could adversely affect an investment in us.

Security threats to us could result in, a loss of our digital assets, or damage to the reputation and our brand, each of which could adversely affect an investment in us.

Security breaches, computer malware and computer hacking attacks have been a prevalent concern in the digital asset exchange markets, for example since the launch of the bitcoin network. Any security breach caused by hacking, which involves efforts to gain unauthorized access to information or systems, or to cause intentional malfunctions or loss or corruption of data, software, hardware or other computer equipment, and the inadvertent transmission of computer viruses, could harm our business operations or result in loss of our digital assets. Any breach of our infrastructure could result in damage to our reputation which could adversely affect an investment in us. Furthermore, we believe that, as our assets grow, it may become a more appealing target for security threats such as hackers and malware.

We primarily rely on Bitgo Inc.'s multi-signature enterprise storage solution to safeguard its digital assets from theft, loss, destruction or other issues relating to hackers and technological attack. Nevertheless, Bitgo Inc.'s security system may not be impenetrable and may not be free from defect or immune to acts of God, and any loss due to a security breach, software defect or act of God will be borne by the Company. The Company's digital assets will also be stored with exchanges such as Bitgo, Kraken, Bitfinex, Itbit and Coinbase and others prior to selling them.

The security system and operational infrastructure may be breached due to the actions of outside parties, error or malfeasance of an employee of ours, or otherwise, and, as a result, an unauthorized party may obtain access to our, private keys, data or bitcoins. Additionally, outside parties may attempt to fraudulently induce employees of ours to disclose sensitive information in order to gain access to our infrastructure. As the techniques used to obtain unauthorized access, disable or degrade service, or sabotage systems change frequently, or may be designed to remain dormant until a predetermined event and often are not recognized until launched against a target, we may be unable to anticipate these techniques or implement adequate preventative measures. If an actual or perceived breach of our security system occurs, the market perception of the effectiveness of our security system could be harmed, which could adversely affect an investment in us.

At present, Marathon has not experienced hacking and we use a Bitcoin Address and other cryptocurrency wallets, and may consider using services, such as Xapo, Inc., or Bitgo Inc., which services claim to offer a free, ultra-secure vault for storing bitcoin, but we have not made any decision to do so. As disclosed herein, the Company currently use Bitgo Inc. as its wallet provider.

In the event of a security breach, we may be forced to cease operations, or suffer a reduction in assets, the occurrence of each of which could adversely affect an investment in us.

A loss of confidence in our security system, or a breach of our security system, may adversely affect us and the value of an investment in us.

We will take measures to protect us and our digital assets from unauthorized access, damage or theft; however, it is possible that the security system may not prevent the improper access to, or damage or theft of our digital assets. A security breach could harm our reputation or result in the loss of some or all of our digital assets. A resulting perception that our measures do not adequately protect our digital assets could result in a loss of current or potential shareholders, reducing demand for our Common Stock and causing our shares to decrease in value.

Digital Asset transactions are irrevocable and stolen or incorrectly transferred digital assets may be irretrievable. As a result, any incorrectly executed digital asset transactions could adversely affect an investment in us.

Digital asset transactions are not, from an administrative perspective, reversible without the consent and active participation of the recipient of the transaction or, in theory, control or consent of a majority of the processing power on the respective digital asset network. Once a transaction has been verified and recorded in a block that is added to the blockchain, an incorrect transfer of digital assets or a theft of digital assets generally will not be reversible, and we may not be capable of seeking compensation for any such transfer or theft. Although our transfers of digital assets will regularly be made to or from vendors, consultants, services providers, etc. it is possible that, through computer or human error, or through theft or criminal action, our digital assets could be transferred from us in incorrect amounts or to unauthorized third parties. To the extent that we are unable to seek a corrective transaction with such third party or are incapable of identifying the third party which has received our digital assets through error or theft, we will be unable to revert or otherwise recover incorrectly transferred Company digital assets. To the extent that we are unable to seek redress for such error or theft, such loss could adversely affect an investment in us.

The Company's digital assets may be subject to loss, damage, theft or restriction on access.

There is a risk that part or all of the Company's digital assets could be lost, stolen or destroyed. We believe that our digital assets will be an appealing target to hackers or malware distributors seeking to destroy, damage or steal our digital assets. Although we primarily utilize Bitgo, Inc.'s enterprise multi-signature storage solution, to minimize the risk of loss, damage and theft, we cannot guarantee that it will prevent such loss, damage or theft, whether caused intentionally, accidentally or by act of God. Access to our digital assets could also be restricted by natural events (such as an earthquake or flood) or human actions (such as a terrorist attack). Any of these events may adversely affect the Company's operations and, consequently, an investment in us.

The limited rights of legal recourse against us, and our lack of insurance protection expose us and our shareholders to the risk of loss of our digital assets for which no person is liable.

The digital assets held by us are not insured. Therefore, a loss may be suffered with respect to our digital assets which is not covered by insurance and for which no person is liable in damages which could adversely affect our operations and, consequently, an investment in us.

Digital assets held by us are not subject to FDIC or SIPC protections.

We do not hold our digital assets with a banking institution or a member of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation ("FDIC") or the Securities Investor Protection Corporation ("SIPC") and, therefore, our digital assets are not subject to the protections enjoyed by depositors with FDIC or SIPC member institutions.

We may not have adequate sources of recovery if our digital assets are lost, stolen or destroyed.

If our digital assets are lost, stolen or destroyed under circumstances rendering a party liable to us, the responsible party may not have the financial resources sufficient to satisfy our claim. For example, as to a particular event of loss, the only source of recovery for us might be limited, to the extent identifiable, other responsible third parties (e.g., a thief or terrorist), any of which may not have the financial resources (including liability insurance coverage) to satisfy a valid claim of ours.

⁵ <https://www.bitgo.com/>

The sale of our digital assets to pay expenses at a time of low digital asset prices could adversely affect an investment in us.

We may sell our digital assets to pay expenses on an as-needed basis, irrespective of then-current prices. Consequently, our digital assets may be sold at a time when the prices on the respective digital asset exchange market are low, which could adversely affect an investment in us.

Regulatory changes or actions may restrict the use of bitcoins or the operation of the bitcoin network in a manner that adversely affects an investment in us.

Until recently, little or no regulatory attention has been directed toward bitcoin and the bitcoin network by U.S. federal and state governments, foreign governments and self-regulatory agencies. As bitcoin has grown in popularity and in market size, the Federal Reserve Board, U.S. Congress and certain U.S. agencies (e.g., the CFTC, the Commission, FinCEN and the Federal Bureau of Investigation) have begun to examine the operations of the bitcoin network, bitcoin users and the bitcoin exchange market.

On July 25, 2017, the Commission issued its Report of Investigation, or “Report,” which concluded that digital assets or tokens issued for the purpose of raising funds may be securities within the meaning of the federal securities laws. The Report focused on the activities of a virtual organization which offered tokens in exchange for ether, which is a prominent digital asset. The Report emphasized that whether a digital asset is a security is based on the facts and circumstances. Although our activities are not focused on raising capital or assisting others that do so, the federal securities laws are very broad, and there can be no assurances that the Commission will not take enforcement action against us in the future including for the sale of unregistered securities in violation of the Securities Act or acting as an unregistered investment company in violation of the Investment Company Act. The Commission has taken various actions against persons or entities misusing bitcoin in connection with fraudulent schemes (i.e., Ponzi scheme), inaccurate and inadequate publicly disseminated information, and the offering of unregistered securities. More recently, the Commission suspended trading in three digital asset public companies. The CFTC has determined that bitcoin and other virtual currencies are commodities and the sale of derivatives based on digital currencies must be done in accordance with the provisions of the CEA and CFTC regulations. Also, of significance, is that the CFTC appears to have taken the position that bitcoin is not encompassed by the definition of currency under the CEA and CFTC regulations. The CFTC defined bitcoin and other “virtual currencies” as “a digital representation of value” that functions as a medium of exchange, a unit of account, and/or a store of value, but does not have legal tender status in any jurisdiction. Bitcoin and other virtual currencies are distinct from ‘real’ currencies, which are the coin and paper money of the United States or another country that are designated as legal tender, circulate, and are customarily used and accepted as a medium of exchange in the country of issuance.” To the extent that bitcoin itself is determined to be a security, commodity future or other regulated asset, or to the extent that a U.S. or foreign government or quasi-governmental agency exerts regulatory authority over the bitcoin or bitcoin trading and ownership, trading or ownership in bitcoin or an investment in us may be adversely affected.

The CFTC affirmed its approach to the regulation of bitcoin and bitcoin-related enterprises on June 2, 2016, when the CFTC settled charges against Bitfinex, a bitcoin exchange based in Hong Kong. In its Order, the CFTC found that Bitfinex engaged in “illegal, off-exchange commodity transactions and failed to register as a futures commission merchant” when it facilitated borrowing transactions among its users to permit the trading of bitcoin on a “leveraged, margined or financed basis” without first registering with the CFTC. In 2017, the CFTC stated that it would consider bitcoin and other virtual currencies as commodities or derivatives depending on the facts of the offering. In December 2017, bitcoin futures trading commenced on two CFTC regulated futures markets.

Local state regulators such as the New York State Department of Financial Services, or NYDFS, have also initiated examinations of bitcoin, the bitcoin network and the regulation thereof. In July 2014, the NYDFS proposed the first U.S. regulatory framework for licensing participants in “virtual currency business activity.” The proposed regulations, known as the “BitLicense,” are intended to focus on consumer protection and, after the closure of an initial comment period that yielded 3,746 formal public comments and a re-proposal, the NYDFS issued its final “BitLicense” regulatory framework in June 2015. The “BitLicense” regulates the conduct of businesses that are involved in “virtual currencies” in New York or with New York customers and prohibits any person or entity involved in such activity to conduct activities without a license.

Additionally, a U.S. federal magistrate judge in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas has ruled that “Bitcoin is a currency or form of money,” a Florida circuit court judge determined that bitcoin did not qualify as money or “tangible wealth,” and an opinion from the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois identified bitcoin as “virtual currency.” Additionally, two CFTC commissioners publicly expressed a belief that derivatives based on bitcoin are subject to the same regulation as those based on commodities, and the IRS released guidance treating bitcoin as property that is not currency for U.S. federal income tax purposes. Taxing authorities of a number of U.S. states have also issued their own guidance regarding the tax treatment of bitcoin for state income or sales tax purposes. On June 28, 2014, the Governor of the State of California signed into law a bill that removed state-level prohibitions on the use of alternative forms of currency or value (including bitcoin). The bill indirectly authorizes bitcoin’s use as an alternative form of money in the state. In February 2015, a bill was introduced in the California State Assembly to establish a licensing regime for businesses engaging in “virtual currencies.” In September 2015, the bill was ordered to become an inactive file and as of the date of this registration statement there hasn’t been further consideration by the California State Assembly. As of August 2016, the bill was withdrawn from consideration for vote for the remainder of the year. There is a possibility of future regulatory change altering, perhaps to a material extent, the nature of an investment in us or the ability of us to continue our operations.

Digital assets currently face an uncertain regulatory landscape in not only the United States but also in many foreign jurisdictions such as the European Union, China and Russia. While certain governments such as Germany, where the Ministry of Finance has declared bitcoin to be “*Rechnungseinheiten*” (a form of private money that is recognized as a unit of account, but not recognized in the same manner as fiat currency), have issued guidance as to how to treat bitcoin, most regulatory bodies have not yet issued official statements regarding intention to regulate or determinations on regulation of bitcoin, the bitcoin network and bitcoin users.

Among those for which preliminary guidance has been issued in some form, Canada and Taiwan have labeled bitcoin as a digital or virtual currency, distinct from fiat currency, while Sweden and Norway are among those to categorize bitcoin as a form of virtual asset or commodity. In Australia, a GST (similar to the European value added tax (“VAT”)) is currently applied to bitcoin, forcing a ten (10%) percent markup on top of market price, essentially preventing the operation of any bitcoin exchange. This may be undergoing a change, however, since the Senate Economics References Committee and the Productivity Commission recommended that digital currency be treated as money for GST purposes to remove the double taxation. The United Kingdom determined that the VAT will not apply to bitcoin sales. In China, a recent government notice classified bitcoin as legal and “virtual commodities;” however, the same notice restricted the banking and payment industries from using bitcoin, creating uncertainty and limiting the ability of bitcoin exchanges to operate in the then-second largest bitcoin market. In January 2016, the People’s Bank of China, China’s central bank, disclosed that it has been studying a state-backed electronic monetary system and potentially had plans for its own state-backed electronic money. In January 2017, the People’s Bank of China announced that it had found several violations, including margin financing and a failure to impose anti-money laundering controls, after on-site inspections of two China-based bitcoin exchanges. In response to the Chinese regulator’s oversight, the three largest China-based bitcoin exchanges, OKCoin, Huobi, and BTC China, started charging trading commission fees to suppress speculative trading and prevent price swings which resulted in a significant drop in volume on these exchanges. Since December 2013, China, Iceland, Vietnam and Russia have taken a more restrictive stance toward bitcoin and, thereby, have reduced the rate of expansion of bitcoin use in each country. In May 2014, the Central Bank of Bolivia banned the use of bitcoin as a means of payment. In the summer and fall of 2014, Ecuador announced plans for its own state-backed electronic money, while passing legislation that prohibits the use of decentralized digital assets such as bitcoin. In July 2016, economists at the Bank of England advocated that central banks issue their own digital currency, and the House of Lords and Bank of England started discussing the feasibility of creating a national virtual currency, the BritCoin. As of July 2016, Iceland was studying how to create a system in which all money is created by a central bank, and Canada was beginning to experiment with a digital version of its currency called CAD-COIN, intended to be used exclusively for interbank payments. On August 24, 2017, Canada issued guidance stating the sale of cryptocurrency may constitute an investment contract in accordance with Canadian law for determining if an investment constitutes a security. In July 2016, the Russian Ministry of Finance indicated it supports a proposed law that bans bitcoin domestically but allows for its use as a foreign currency. Russia recently issued several releases indicating they may begin regulating bitcoin and licensing miners and entities engaging in initial coin offerings. Conversely, regulatory bodies in some countries such as India and Switzerland have declined to exercise regulatory authority when afforded the opportunity. In April 2015, the Japanese Cabinet approved proposed legal changes that would reportedly treat bitcoin and other digital assets as included in the definition of currency. These regulations would, among other things, require market participants, including exchanges, to meet certain compliance requirements and be subject to oversight by the Financial Services Agency, a Japanese regulator. In September 2017 Japan began regulating bitcoin exchanges and registered several such exchanges to operate within Japan. In July 2016, the European Commission released a draft directive that proposed applying counter-terrorism and anti-money laundering regulations to virtual currencies, and, in September 2016, the European Banking authority advised the European Commission to institute new regulation specific to virtual currencies, with amendments to existing

regulation as a stopgap measure. Various foreign jurisdictions may, in the near future, adopt laws, regulations or directives that affect the bitcoin network and its users, particularly bitcoin exchanges and service providers that fall within such jurisdictions' regulatory scope. Such laws, regulations or directives may conflict with those of the United States and may negatively impact the acceptance of bitcoin by users, merchants and service providers outside of the United States and may therefore impede the growth of the bitcoin economy. On September 4, 2017, reports were published that China may begin prohibiting the practice of using cryptocurrency for capital fundraising. Additional reports have surfaced that China is considering regulating bitcoin exchanges by enacting a licensing regime wherein bitcoin exchanges may legally operate. In September 2017, the Financial Services Commission of South Korea released a statement that initial coin offerings would be prohibited as a fundraising tool. In January 2018, the South Korean Justice Minister issued remarks about banning bitcoin and other digital assets, although the South Korean President's office clarified that no final decision has been made. In June 2017, India's government ruled in favor of regulating bitcoin and India's ministry of Finance is currently developing rules for such regulation. Australia has previously introduced legislation to regulate bitcoin exchanges and increase anti-money laundering policies.

The effect of any future regulatory change on us, bitcoins, or other digital assets is impossible to predict, but such change could be substantial and adverse to us and could adversely affect an investment in us.

It may be illegal now, or in the future, to acquire, own, hold, sell or use digital assets in one or more countries, and ownership of, holding or trading in our securities may also be considered illegal and subject to sanction.

Although currently digital assets are not regulated or are lightly regulated in most countries, including the United States, one or more countries such as China and Russia may take regulatory actions in the future that severely restricts the right to acquire, own, hold, sell or use digital assets or to exchange digital assets for fiat currency. Such an action may also result in the restriction of ownership, holding or trading in our securities. Such restrictions may adversely affect an investment in us.

If regulatory changes or interpretations of our activities require our registration as a money services business ("MSB") under the regulations promulgated by FinCEN under the authority of the U.S. Bank Secrecy Act, we may be required to register and comply with such regulations. If regulatory changes or interpretations of our activities require the licensing or other registration of us as a money transmitter (or equivalent designation) under state law in any state in which we operate, we may be required to seek licensure or otherwise register and comply with such state law. In the event of any such requirement, to the extent Marathon decides to continue, the required registrations, licensure and regulatory compliance steps may result in extraordinary, non-recurring expenses to us. We may also decide to cease Marathon's operations. Any termination of certain Company operations in response to the changed regulatory circumstances may be at a time that is disadvantageous to investors.

To the extent that the activities of Marathon cause it to be deemed an MSB under the regulations promulgated by FinCEN under the authority of the U.S. Bank Secrecy Act, Marathon may be required to comply with FinCEN regulations, including those that would mandate Marathon to implement anti-money laundering programs, make certain reports to FinCEN and maintain certain records.

To the extent that the activities of Marathon cause it to be deemed a “money transmitter” (“MT”) or equivalent designation, under state law in any state in which Marathon operates, Marathon may be required to seek a license or otherwise register with a state regulator and comply with state regulations that may include the implementation of anti-money laundering programs, maintenance of certain records and other operational requirements. Currently, the NYSDFS has finalized its “BitLicense” framework for businesses that conduct “virtual currency business activity,” the Conference of State Bank Supervisors has proposed a model form of state level “virtual currency” regulation and additional state regulators including those from California, Idaho, Virginia, Kansas, Texas, South Dakota and Washington have made public statements indicating that virtual currency businesses may be required to seek licenses as money transmitters. In July 2016, North Carolina updated the law to define “virtual currency” and the activities that trigger licensure in a business-friendly approach that encourages companies to use virtual currency and blockchain technology. Specifically, the North Carolina law does not require miners or software providers to obtain a license for multi-signature software, smart contract platforms, smart property, colored coins and non-hosted, non-custodial wallets. Starting January 1, 2016, New Hampshire requires anyone exchanges a digital currency for another currency must become a licensed and bonded money transmitter. In numerous other states, including Connecticut and New Jersey, legislation is being proposed or has been introduced regarding the treatment of bitcoin and other digital assets. Marathon will continue to monitor for developments in such legislation, guidance or regulations.

Such additional federal or state regulatory obligations may cause Marathon to incur extraordinary expenses, possibly affecting an investment in the Shares in a material and adverse manner. Furthermore, Marathon and its service providers may not be capable of complying with certain federal or state regulatory obligations applicable to MSBs and MTs. If Marathon is deemed to be subject to and determines not to comply with such additional regulatory and registration requirements, we may act to dissolve and liquidate Marathon. Any such action may adversely affect an investment in us.

Current interpretations require the regulation of bitcoins under the CEA by the CFTC, we may be required to register and comply with such regulations. To the extent that we decide to continue operations, the required registrations and regulatory compliance steps may result in extraordinary, non-recurring expenses to us. We may also decide to cease certain operations. Any disruption of our operations in response to the changed regulatory circumstances may be at a time that is disadvantageous to investors.

Current and future legislation, CFTC and other regulatory developments, including interpretations released by a regulatory authority, may impact the manner in which bitcoins are treated for classification and clearing purposes. In particular, bitcoin derivatives are not excluded from the definition of “commodity future” by the CFTC. We cannot be certain as to how future regulatory developments will impact the treatment of bitcoins under the law.

Bitcoins have been deemed to fall within the definition of a commodity and, we may be required to register and comply with additional regulation under the CEA, including additional periodic report and disclosure standards and requirements. Moreover, we may be required to register as a commodity pool operator and to register us as a commodity pool with the CFTC through the National Futures Association. Such additional registrations may result in extraordinary, non-recurring expenses, thereby materially and adversely impacting an investment in us. If we determine not to comply with such additional regulatory and registration requirements, we may seek to cease certain of our operations. Any such action may adversely affect an investment in us. No CFTC orders or rulings are applicable to our business.

If regulatory changes or interpretations require the regulation of bitcoins under the Securities Act and Investment Company Act by the Commission, we may be required to register and comply with such regulations. To the extent that we decide to continue operations, the required registrations and regulatory compliance steps may result in extraordinary, non-recurring expenses to us. We may also decide to cease certain operations. Any disruption of our operations in response to the changed regulatory circumstances may be at a time that is disadvantageous to investors. This would likely have a material adverse effect on us and investors may lose their investment.

Current and future legislation and the Commission rulemaking and other regulatory developments, including interpretations released by a regulatory authority, may impact the manner in which bitcoins are treated for classification and clearing purposes. The Commission's July 25, 2017 Report expressed its view that digital assets may be securities depending on the facts and circumstances. As of the date of this prospectus, we are not aware of any rules that have been proposed to regulate bitcoins as securities. We cannot be certain as to how future regulatory developments will impact the treatment of bitcoins under the law. Such additional registrations may result in extraordinary, non-recurring expenses, thereby materially and adversely impacting an investment in us. If we determine not to comply with such additional regulatory and registration requirements, we may seek to cease certain of our operations. Any such action may adversely affect an investment in us.

To the extent that digital assets including ether, bitcoins and other digital assets we may own are deemed by the Commission to fall within the definition of a security, we may be required to register and comply with additional regulation under the 1940 Act, including additional periodic reporting and disclosure standards and requirements and the registration of our Company as an investment company. Additionally, one or more states may conclude ether, bitcoins and other digital assets we may own are a security under state securities laws which would require registration under state laws including merit review laws which would adversely impact us since we would likely not comply. As stated earlier in this prospectus, some states including California define the term “investment contract” more strictly than the Commission. Such additional registrations may result in extraordinary, non-recurring expenses of our Company, thereby materially and adversely impacting an investment in our Company. If we determine not to comply with such additional regulatory and registration requirements, we may seek to cease all or certain parts of our operations. Any such action would likely adversely affect an investment in us and investors may suffer a complete loss of their investment.

If federal or state legislatures or agencies initiate or release tax determinations that change the classification of bitcoins as property for tax purposes (in the context of when such bitcoins are held as an investment), such determination could have a negative tax consequence on our Company or our shareholders.

Current IRS guidance indicates that digital assets such as ether and bitcoin should be treated and taxed as property, and that transactions involving the payment of ether or bitcoin for goods and services should be treated as barter transactions. While this treatment creates a potential tax reporting requirement for any circumstance where the ownership of a bitcoin passes from one person to another, usually by means of bitcoin transactions (including off-blockchain transactions), it preserves the right to apply capital gains treatment to those transactions which may adversely affect an investment in our Company.

On December 5, 2014, the New York State Department of Taxation and Finance issued guidance regarding the application of state tax law to digital assets such as ether or bitcoins. The agency determined that New York State would follow IRS guidance with respect to the treatment of digital assets such as ether or bitcoin for state income tax purposes. Furthermore, they defined digital assets such as ether or bitcoin to be a form of “intangible property,” meaning the purchase and sale of ether or bitcoins for fiat currency is not subject to state income tax (although transactions of bitcoin for other goods and services maybe subject to sales tax under barter transaction treatment). It is unclear if other states will follow the guidance of the IRS and the New York State Department of Taxation and Finance with respect to the treatment of digital assets such as ether or bitcoins for income tax and sales tax purposes. If a state adopts a different treatment, such treatment may have negative consequences including the imposition of greater a greater tax burden on investors in bitcoin or imposing a greater cost on the acquisition and disposition of ether or bitcoin, generally; in either case potentially having a negative effect on prices in the digital asset exchange market and may adversely affect an investment in our Company.

Foreign jurisdictions may also elect to treat digital assets such as ether or bitcoin differently for tax purposes than the IRS or the New York State Department of Taxation and Finance. To the extent that a foreign jurisdiction with a

significant share of the market of ether or bitcoin users imposes onerous tax burdens on ether or bitcoin users, or imposes sales or value added tax on purchases and sales of ether or bitcoin for fiat currency, such actions could result in decreased demand for ether or bitcoins in such jurisdiction, which could impact the price of ether, bitcoin or other digital assets and negatively impact an investment in our Company.

The loss or destruction of a private key required to access a digital asset may be irreversible. Our loss of access to our private keys or our experience of a data loss relating to our Company's digital assets could adversely affect an investment in our Company.

Digital assets are controllable only by the possessor of both the unique public key and private key relating to the local or online digital wallet in which the digital assets are held. We are required by the operation of digital asset networks to publish the public key relating to a digital wallet in use by us when it first verifies a spending transaction from that digital wallet and disseminates such information into the respective network. We safeguard and keep private the private keys relating to our digital assets by primarily utilizing Bitgo Inc.'s enterprise multi-signature storage solution; to the extent a private key is lost, destroyed or otherwise compromised and no backup of the private key is accessible, we will be unable to access the digital assets held by it and the private key will not be capable of being restored by the respective digital asset network. Any loss of private keys relating to digital wallets used to store our digital assets could adversely affect an investment in us.

Because many of our digital assets are held by digital asset exchanges, we face heightened risks from cybersecurity attacks and financial stability of digital asset exchanges.

Marathon may transfer their digital asset from its wallet to digital asset exchanges prior to selling them. Digital assets not held in Marathon's wallet are subject to the risks encountered by digital asset exchanges including a DDoS Attack or other malicious hacking, a sale of the digital asset exchange, loss of the digital assets by the digital asset exchange and other risks similar to those described herein. Marathon does not maintain a custodian agreement with any of the digital asset exchanges that hold the Marathon's digital assets. These digital asset exchanges do not provide insurance and may lack the resources to protect against hacking and theft. If this were to occur, Marathon may be materially and adversely affected.

If the award of digital assets for solving blocks and transaction fees for recording transactions are not sufficiently high to cover expenses related to running data center operations, it may have adverse effects on an investment in us.

If the award of new digital assets for solving blocks declines and transaction fees are not sufficiently high, we may not have an adequate incentive to continue our mining operations, which may adversely impact an investment in us.

As the number of digital assets awarded for solving a block in the blockchain decreases, the incentive for miners to continue to contribute processing power to the respective digital asset network will transition from a set reward to transaction fees. Either the requirement from miners of higher transaction fees in exchange for recording transactions in the blockchain or a software upgrade that automatically charges fees for all transactions may decrease demand for digital assets and prevent the expansion of the digital asset networks to retail merchants and commercial businesses, resulting in a reduction in the price of digital assets that could adversely impact an investment in us.

In order to incentivize miners to continue to contribute processing power to any digital asset network, such network may either formally or informally transition from a set reward to transaction fees earned upon solving for a block. This transition could be accomplished either by miners independently electing to record in the blocks they solve only those transactions that include payment of a transaction fee or by the digital asset network adopting software upgrades that require the payment of a minimum transaction fee for all transactions. If transaction fees paid for digital asset transactions become too high, the marketplace may be reluctant to accept digital assets as a means of payment and existing users may be motivated to switch from one digital asset to another digital asset or back to fiat currency. Decreased use and demand for bitcoins or ether that we have accumulated may adversely affect their value and may adversely impact an investment in us.

We initiate legal proceedings against potentially infringing companies in the normal course of our business and we believe that extended litigation proceedings would be time-consuming and costly, which may adversely affect our financial condition and our ability to operate our business.

To monetize our patent assets, we historically have initiated legal proceedings against potential infringing companies, pursuant to which we may allege that such companies infringe on one or more of our patents. Our viability could be highly dependent on the cost and outcome of the litigation, and there is a risk that we may be unable to achieve the results we desire from such litigation, which failure would substantially harm our business. In addition, the defendants in the litigations are likely to be much larger than us and have substantially more resources than we do, which could make our litigation efforts more difficult and impact the duration of the litigation which would require us to devote our limited financial, managerial and other resources to support litigation that may be disproportionate to the anticipated recovery.

These legal proceedings may continue for several years and may require significant expenditures for legal fees, patent related costs, such as inter-parties review, and other expenses. Disputes regarding the assertion of patents and other intellectual property rights are highly complex and technical. Once initiated, we may be forced to litigate against others to enforce or defend our patent rights or to determine the validity and scope of other party's patent rights. The defendants or other third parties involved in the lawsuits in which we are involved may allege defenses and/or file counterclaims or commence re-examination proceedings by patenting issuance authorities in an effort to avoid or limit liability and damages for patent infringement or declare our patents to be invalid or non-infringed. If such defenses or counterclaims are successful, they may preclude our ability to derive revenue from the patents we own. A negative

outcome of any such litigation, or an outcome which affects one or more claims contained within any such litigation or invalidating any patents, could materially and adversely impact our business. Additionally, we anticipate that our legal fees and other expenses will be material and will negatively impact our financial condition and results of operations and may result in our inability to continue our business. We have incurred significant legal expenses in our patent litigation in the past that are liabilities of the Company and may be unable to settle or reduce these expenses, regardless of the outcome of our patent litigation or the inability to license or recover damages from our patents. These liabilities may lead to litigation or claims with respect to the payment or collection of legal expenses.

Variability in intellectual property laws may adversely affect our intellectual property position.

Intellectual property laws, and patent laws and regulations in particular, have been subject to significant variability either through administrative or legislative changes to such laws or regulations or changes or differences in judicial interpretation, and it is expected that such variability will continue to occur. Additionally, intellectual property laws and regulations differ among states, and countries. Variations in the patent laws and regulations or in interpretations of patent laws and regulations in the United States and other countries may diminish the value of our intellectual property and may change the impact of third-party intellectual property on us. Accordingly, we cannot predict the scope of patents that may be granted to us, the extent to which we will be able to enforce our patents against third parties, or the extent to which third parties may be able to enforce their patents against us.

We may seek to internally develop additional new inventions and intellectual property, which would take time and be costly. Moreover, the failure to obtain or maintain intellectual property rights for such inventions would lead to the loss of our investments in such activities.

We may in the future seek to engage in commercial business ventures or seek internal development of new inventions or intellectual property. These activities would require significant amounts of financial, managerial and other resources and would take time to achieve. Such activities could also distract our management team from its present business initiatives, which could have a material and adverse effect on our business. There is also the risk that such initiatives may not yield any viable new business or revenue, inventions or technology, which would lead to a loss of our investment in such activities.

In addition, even if we are able to internally develop new inventions, in order for those inventions to be viable and to compete effectively, we would need to develop and maintain, and we would be heavily reliant upon, a proprietary position with respect to such inventions and intellectual property. However, there are significant risks associated with any such intellectual property we may develop principally including the following:

patent applications we may file may not result in issued patents or may take longer than we expect to result in issued patents;

we may be subject to interference proceedings;

we may be subject to opposition proceedings in the U.S. or foreign countries;

any patents that are issued to us may not provide meaningful protection;

we may not be able to develop additional proprietary technologies that are patentable;

other companies may challenge patents issued to us;

other companies may have independently developed and/or patented (or may in the future independently develop and patent) similar or alternative technologies, or duplicate our technologies;

other companies may design around technologies we have developed; and

enforcement of our patents would be complex, uncertain and very expensive.

We cannot be certain that patents will be issued as a result of any future patent applications, or that any of our patents, once issued, will provide us with adequate protection from competing products. For example, issued patents may be circumvented or challenged, declared invalid or unenforceable or narrowed in scope. In addition, since publication of discoveries in scientific or patent literature often lags behind actual discoveries, we cannot be certain that we will be the first to make our additional new inventions or to file patent applications covering those inventions. It is also possible that others may have or may obtain issued patents that could prevent us from commercializing our products or require us to obtain licenses requiring the payment of significant fees or royalties in order to enable us to conduct our business. As to those patents that we may acquire, our continued rights will depend on meeting any obligations to the seller and we may be unable to do so. Our failure to obtain or maintain intellectual property rights for our inventions would lead to the loss of our investments in such activities, which would have a material adverse effect on us.

Moreover, patent application delays could cause delays in recognizing revenue from our internally generated patents and could cause us to miss opportunities to license patents before other competing technologies are developed or introduced into the market. We are not actively pursuing any commercialization opportunities or internally generated patents.

Our future success depends on our ability to expand our organization to match the growth of our activities.

As our operations grow, the administrative demands upon us will grow, and our success will depend upon our ability to meet those demands. We are organized as a holding company, with numerous subsidiaries. Both the parent company and each of our subsidiaries require certain financial, managerial and other resources, which could create challenges to our ability to successfully manage our subsidiaries and operations and impact our ability to assure compliance with our policies, practices and procedures. These demands include, but are not limited to, increased executive, accounting, management, legal services, staff support and general office services. We may need to hire additional qualified personnel to meet these demands, the cost and quality of which is dependent in part upon market factors outside of our control. Further, we will need to effectively manage the training and growth of our staff to maintain an efficient and effective workforce, and our failure to do so could adversely affect our business and operating results. Currently, we have limited personnel in our organization to meet our organizational and administrative demands.

Potential acquisitions may present risks, and we may be unable to achieve the financial or other goals intended at the time of any potential acquisition.

Our future growth may depend in part on our ability to acquire patented technologies, patent portfolios or companies holding such patented technologies and patent portfolios if we determine to again actively pursue patent monetization activities in the future. Such acquisitions are subject to numerous risks, including, but not limited to the following:

our inability to enter into a definitive agreement with respect to any potential acquisition, or if we are able to enter into such agreement, our inability to consummate the potential acquisition;

difficulty integrating the operations, technology and personnel of the acquired entity including achieving anticipated synergies;

our inability to achieve the anticipated financial and other benefits of the specific acquisition;

difficulty in maintaining controls, procedures and policies during the transition and monetization process;

diversion of our management's attention from other business concerns; and

failure of our due diligence process to identify significant issues, including issues with respect to patented technologies and patent portfolios and other legal and financial contingencies.

If we are unable to manage these risks effectively as part of any acquisition, our business could be adversely affected.

Our exposure to uncontrollable risks, including new legislation, court rulings or actions by the United States Patent and Trademark Office, could adversely affect our activities including our revenues, expenses and results of operations.

Our patent acquisition and monetization business is subject to numerous risks including new legislation, regulations and rules. If new legislation, regulations or rules are implemented either by Congress, the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”), the executive branch, or the courts, that impact the patent application process, the patent enforcement process, the rights of patent holders, or litigation practices, such changes could materially and negatively affect our revenue and expenses and, therefore, our results of operations and the overall success of our Company. On March 16, 2013, the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act or the America Invents Act became effective. The America Invents Act includes a number of significant changes to U.S. patent law. In general, the legislation attempts to address issues surrounding the enforceability of patents and the increase in patent litigation by, among other things, establishing new procedures for patent litigation. For example, the America Invents Act changes the way that parties may be joined in patent infringement actions, increasing the likelihood that such actions will need to be brought against individual allegedly-infringing parties by their respective individual actions or activities. In addition, the America Invents Act enacted a new inter-partes review, or IPR, process at the USPTO which can be used by defendants, and other individuals and entities, to separately challenge the validity of any patent. These legislative changes, at this time, have had an impact on the costs and effectiveness of our patent monetization and enforcement business.

In addition, the U.S. Department of Justice (the “DOJ”), has conducted reviews of the patent system to evaluate the impact of patent assertion entities on industries in which those patents relate. It is possible that the findings and recommendations of the DOJ could impact the ability to effectively monetize and enforce standards-essential patents and could increase the uncertainties and costs surrounding the enforcement of any such patented technologies. Also, the Federal Trade Commission (the “FTC”), has published its intent to initiate a proposed study under Section 6(b) of the Federal Trade Commission Act to evaluate the patent assertion practice and market impact of Patent Assertion Entities, or PAEs.

Finally, judicial rules regarding the burden of proof in patent enforcement actions could substantially increase the cost of our enforcement actions and new standards or limitations on liability for patent infringement could negatively impact our revenue derived from such enforcement actions.

While we have received a going concern opinion for the year ended December 31, 2018 from our independent registered public accounting firm, there can be no assurances about Marathon's ability to continue as a going concern in the future.

The report of our independent registered public accounting firm with respect to our financial statements included in this report includes a “going concern” explanatory paragraph. As reflected in the consolidated financial statements, we had an accumulated deficit of approximately \$102.1 million at December 31, 2018, a net loss of approximately \$12.8 million and \$31.3 million, and approximately \$8.2 million and \$10.8 million net cash used in operating activities for the years ended December 31, 2018 and 2017, respectively. These factors raise substantial doubt about the Company's ability to continue as a going concern.

In the future, conditions may exist that raise substantial doubt about our ability to continue as a going concern due to our recurring losses from operations and substantial decline in our working capital. A “going concern” opinion could impair our ability to finance our operations through the sale of equity, incurring debt, or other financing alternatives. If we are unable to continue as a going concern, we may have to liquidate our assets and may receive less than the value at which those assets are carried on our consolidated financial statements, and it is likely that investors will lose all or a part of their investment.

More patent applications are filed each year resulting in longer delays in getting patents issued by the USPTO.

We hold and continue to acquire pending patents in the application or review phase. We believe there is a trend of increasing patent applications each year, which we believe is resulting in longer delays in obtaining approval of pending patent applications. The application delays could cause delays in monetizing such patents which could cause us to miss opportunities to license patents before other competing technologies are developed or introduced into the market.

Any reductions in the funding of the USPTO could have an adverse impact on the cost of processing pending patent applications and the value of those pending patent applications.

Our ownership or acquisition of pending patent applications before the USPTO is subject to funding and other risks applicable to a government agency. The value of our patent portfolio is dependent, in part, on the issuance of patents in a timely manner, and any reductions in the funding of the USPTO could negatively impact the value of our assets. Further, reductions in funding from Congress could result in higher patent application filing and maintenance fees charged by the USPTO, causing an unexpected increase in our expenses.

Our acquisitions of patent assets may be time consuming, complex and costly, which could adversely affect our operating results.

Acquisitions of patent or other intellectual property assets, are often time consuming, complex and costly to consummate. We may utilize many different transaction structures in our acquisitions and the terms of such acquisition agreements tend to be heavily negotiated. As a result, we expect to incur significant operating expenses and may be required to raise capital during the negotiations even if the acquisition is ultimately not consummated. Even if we are able to acquire particular patent assets, there is no guarantee that we will generate sufficient revenue related to those patent assets to offset the acquisition costs. While we will seek to conduct sufficient due diligence on the patent assets we are considering for acquisition, we may acquire patent assets from a seller who does not have proper title to those assets. In those cases, we may be required to spend significant resources to defend our ownership interest in the patent assets and, if we are not successful, our acquisition may be invalid, in which case we could lose part or all of our investment in the assets.

We may also identify patent or other patent assets that cost more than we are prepared to spend. We may incur significant costs to organize and negotiate a structured acquisition that does not ultimately result in an acquisition of any patent assets or, if consummated, proves to be unprofitable for us. These higher costs could adversely affect our operating results and, if we incur losses, the value of our securities will decline.

In addition, we may acquire patents and technologies that are in the early stages of adoption in the commercial, industrial and consumer markets. Demand for some of these technologies will likely be untested and may be subject to fluctuation based upon the rate at which our companies may adopt our patented technologies in their products and services. As a result, there can be no assurance as to whether technologies we acquire or develop will have value that we can monetize.

In certain acquisitions of patent assets, we may seek to defer payment or finance a portion of the acquisition price. This approach may put us at a competitive disadvantage and could result in harm to our business.

We have limited capital and may seek to negotiate acquisitions of patent or other intellectual property assets where we can defer payments or finance a portion of the acquisition price. These types of debt financing or deferred payment arrangements may not be as attractive to sellers of patent assets as receiving the full purchase price for those assets in cash at the closing of the acquisition. As a result, we might not compete effectively against other companies in the market for acquiring patent assets, many of whom have substantially greater cash resources than we have. In addition, any failure to satisfy any debt repayment obligations that we may incur, may result in adverse consequences to our operating results.

Any failure to maintain or protect our patent assets could significantly impair our return on investment from such assets and harm our brand, our business and our operating results.

Our ability to operate our business and compete in the patent market largely depends on the superiority, uniqueness and value of our acquired patent assets. To protect our proprietary rights, we rely on and will rely on a combination of patent, trademark, copyright and trade secret laws, confidentiality agreements, common interest agreements and agreements with our employees and third parties, and protective contractual provisions. No assurances can be given that any of the measures we undertake to protect and maintain the value of our assets will be successful.

Following the acquisition of patent assets, we will likely be required to spend significant time and resources to maintain the effectiveness of such assets by paying maintenance fees and making filings with the USPTO. We may acquire patent assets, including patent applications that require us to spend resources to prosecute such patent applications with the USPTO. Moreover, there is a material risk that patent related claims (such as, for example, infringement claims (and/or claims for indemnification resulting therefrom), unenforceability claims or invalidity claims) will be asserted or prosecuted against us, and such assertions or prosecutions could materially and adversely affect our business. Regardless of whether any such claims are valid or can be successfully asserted, defending such claims could cause us to incur significant costs and could divert resources away from our core business activities.

Despite our efforts to protect our intellectual property rights, any of the following or similar occurrences may reduce the value of our intellectual property:

our patent applications, trademarks and copyrights may not be granted and, if granted, may be challenged or invalidated;

issued trademarks, copyrights, or patents may not provide us with any competitive advantages when compared to potentially infringing other properties;

our efforts to protect our intellectual property rights may not be effective in preventing misappropriation of our technology; or

our efforts may not prevent the development and design by others of products or technologies similar to or competitive with, or superior to those we acquire and/or prosecute.

Moreover, we may not be able to effectively protect our intellectual property rights in certain foreign countries where we may do business in the future or from which competitors may operate. If we fail to maintain, defend or prosecute our patent assets properly, the value of those assets would be reduced or eliminated, and our business would be harmed.

Risks Related to Marathon's Indebtedness

Our cash flows and capital resources may be insufficient to make required payments on our indebtedness and future indebtedness.

As of March 25, 2019, we had \$2,270,318 of indebtedness outstanding. Our indebtedness could have important consequences to our shareholders. For example, it could:

make it difficult for us to satisfy our debt obligations;

make us more vulnerable to general adverse economic and industry conditions;

limit our ability to obtain additional financing for working capital, capital expenditures, acquisitions and other general corporate requirements;

expose us to interest rate fluctuations;

require us to dedicate a portion of our cash flow from operations to payments on our debt, thereby reducing the availability of our cash flow for operations and other purposes;

limit our flexibility in planning for, or reacting to, changes in our business and the industry in which we operate; and

place us at a competitive disadvantage compared to competitors that may have proportionately less debt and greater financial resources.

In addition, our ability to make payments or refinance our obligations depends on our successful financial and operating performance, cash flows and capital resources, which in turn depend upon prevailing economic conditions and certain financial, business and other factors, many of which are beyond our control. These factors include, among others:

economic and demand factors affecting our industry;

pricing pressures;

increased operating costs;

competitive conditions; and

other operating difficulties.

If our cash flows and capital resources are insufficient to fund our debt service obligations, we may be forced to reduce or delay capital expenditures, sell material assets or operations, obtain additional capital or restructure our debt. In the event that we are required to dispose of material assets or operations to meet our debt service and other obligations, the value realized on such assets or operations will depend on market conditions and the availability of buyers. Accordingly, any such sale may not, among other things, be for a sufficient dollar amount. The foregoing encumbrances may limit our ability to dispose of material assets or operations. We also may not be able to restructure our indebtedness on favorable economic terms, if at all.

We may incur additional indebtedness in the future. Any incurrence of additional indebtedness would intensify the risks described above.

Risks Relating to Marathon's Stock

Exercise or conversion of warrants and other convertible securities will dilute shareholder's percentage of ownership.

We have issued convertible securities, options and warrants to purchase shares of our Common Stock to our officers, directors, consultants and certain shareholders. In the future, we may grant additional options, warrants and convertible securities. The exercise, conversion or exchange of options, warrants or convertible securities, including for other securities, will dilute the percentage ownership of our shareholders. The dilutive effect of the exercise or conversion of these securities may adversely affect our ability to obtain additional capital. The holders of these securities may be expected to exercise or convert such options, warrants and convertible securities at a time when we would be able to obtain additional equity capital on terms more favorable than such securities or when our Common Stock is trading at a price higher than the exercise or conversion price of the securities. The exercise or conversion of outstanding warrants, options and convertible securities will have a dilutive effect on the securities held by our shareholders. We have in the past, and may in the future, exchange outstanding securities for other securities on terms that are dilutive to the securities held by other shareholders not participating in such exchange.

Our Common Stock may be delisted from The NASDAQ Capital Market (“NASDAQ”) if we fail to comply with continued listing standards.

Our Common Stock is currently traded on NASDAQ under the symbol “MARA”. If we fail to meet any of the continued listing standards of NASDAQ, our Common Stock could be delisted from NASDAQ. During 2017, Marathon received multiple notices regarding its failure to meet several continued listing standards, including the \$1.00 minimum closing bid price and the \$2.5 million stockholders’ equity requirements, which were subsequently satisfied. Our repeated failures may impact our ability to continue to list our shares for trading on NASDAQ or to obtain approval of any initial listing application in connection with any acquisitions or other changes that require review and approval by NASDAQ. The continued listing standards include specifically enumerated criteria, such as:

a \$1.00 minimum closing bid price;

stockholders’ equity of \$2.5 million;

500,000 shares of publicly-held Common Stock with a market value of at least \$1 million;

300 round-lot stockholders; and

compliance with NASDAQ’s corporate governance requirements, as well as additional or more stringent criteria that may be applied in the exercise of NASDAQ’s discretionary authority.

Holders of our Common Stock will experience immediate and substantial dilution upon the conversion of convertible notes and the exercise of Marathon’s outstanding options and warrants.

As of March 25, 2019:

5,866,079 shares of our Common Stock issuable upon the exercise of outstanding stock options having a weighted average exercise price of \$1.67 per share;

728,764 shares of our Common Stock issuable upon the exercise of outstanding warrants with a weighted average exercise price of \$6.26;

up to 1,881,016 shares of Common Stock issuable upon conversion of \$999,106 in outstanding convertible notes.

Our stock price may be volatile.

The market price of our Common Stock is likely to be highly volatile and could fluctuate widely in price in response to various factors, many of which are beyond our control, including the following:

changes in our industry including changes which adversely affect bitcoin, ether and other digital assets;

competitive pricing pressures;

our ability to obtain working capital financing;

additions or departures of key personnel;

sales of our Common Stock;

our ability to execute our business plan;

operating results that fall below expectations;

loss of any strategic relationship;

regulatory developments; and

economic and other external factors.

In addition, the securities markets have from time to time experienced significant price and volume fluctuations that are unrelated to the operating performance of particular companies. These market fluctuations may also materially and adversely affect the market price of our Common Stock.

We have never paid nor do we expect in the near future to pay cash dividends.

We have never paid cash dividends on our capital stock and do not anticipate paying any cash dividends on our Common Stock for the foreseeable future. While it is possible that we may declare a dividend after a large settlement, investors should not rely on such a possibility, nor should they rely on an investment in us if they require income generated from dividends paid on our capital stock. Any income derived from our Common Stock would only come from rise in the market price of our Common Stock, which is uncertain and unpredictable.

Offers or availability for sale of a substantial number of shares of our Common Stock may cause the price of our Common Stock to decline.

If our stockholders sell substantial amounts of our Common Stock in the public market upon the expiration of any statutory holding period or lockup agreements, under Rule 144, or issued upon the exercise of outstanding warrants or other convertible securities, it could create a circumstance commonly referred to as an “overhang” and in anticipation of which the market price of our Common Stock could fall. The existence of an overhang, whether or not sales have occurred or are occurring, also could make more difficult our ability to raise additional financing through the sale of equity or equity-related securities in the future at a time and price that we deem reasonable or appropriate. The shares of our restricted Common Stock will be freely tradable upon the earlier of: (i) effectiveness of a registration statement covering such shares and (ii) the date on which such shares may be sold without registration pursuant to Rule 144 (or other applicable exemption) under the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (“Securities Act”).

Because we became a public company in 2011 by means of a reverse merger, we may not be able to attract the attention of major brokerage firms.

There may be risks associated with Marathon having become a public company in 2011 through a reverse merger. Securities analysts of major brokerage firms may not provide coverage of reverse merger companies since there is no incentive to brokerage firms to recommend the purchase of our Common Stock. No assurance can be given that brokerage firms will, in the future, want to conduct any secondary offerings on our behalf.

Investor relations activities and supply and demand factors may affect the price of our Common Stock.

We expect to utilize various techniques such as non-deal road shows and investor relations campaigns in order to generate investor awareness. These campaigns may include personal, video and telephone conferences with investors and prospective investors in which our business practices are described. We may provide compensation to investor relations firms and pay for newsletters, websites, mailings and email campaigns that are produced by third parties based upon publicly-available information concerning us. We do not intend to review or approve the content of such analysts’ reports or other materials based upon analysts’ own research or methods. Investor relations firms should generally disclose when they are compensated for their efforts, but whether such disclosure is made or complete is not under our control. In addition, investors may, from time to time, also take steps to encourage investor awareness through similar activities that may be undertaken at the expense of the investors. Investor awareness activities may also be suspended or discontinued which may impact the trading market of our Common Stock.

ITEM 1B. UNRESOLVED STAFF COMMENTS

Not Applicable

ITEM 2. PROPERTIES

We lease an executive office space on a month to month basis at 1180 North Town Center Drive, Suite 100, Las Vegas, Nevada 89144.

On February 12, 2018, in connection with the intended mining operations of Marathon Crypto Mining, Inc. (“MCM”), the Company assumed a lease contract dated November 11, 2017 (the “Lease Agreement”) by and between 9349-0001 Quebec Inc. (the “Lessor”) and Blocespace Inc., formerly known as Cryptospace Inc. (the “Lessee”). Pursuant to the Lease Agreement, among other things, the Lessee leases a building of 26,700 square feet (the “Property”) in Quebec, Canada, for an initial term of five (5) years (the “Term”), commencing on December 1, 2017 and terminating on November 30, 2022. The Lessee shall pay a monthly rent of \$10,012.50 plus tax, or an annual rent of \$120,150.00 plus tax (“Yearly Rent”).

ITEM 3. LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

Feinberg Litigation

On March 27, 2018, Jeffrey Feinberg, purportedly joined by the Jeffrey L. Feinberg Personal Trust and the Jeffrey L. Feinberg Family Trust, filed a complaint against the Company and certain of its former officers and directors. The complaint was filed in the Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of New York. The plaintiffs purported to state claims under Sections 11, 12(a)(2) and 15 of the federal Securities Act of 1933 and common law claims for “actual fraud and fraudulent concealment,” constructive fraud, and negligent misrepresentation, seeking unspecified money damages (including punitive damages), as well as costs and attorneys’ fees, and equitable or injunctive relief. On June 15, 2018, the defendants filed a motion to dismiss all claims asserted in the complaint and, on July 27, 2018, the plaintiffs filed an opposition to that motion. The court heard argument on the motion and, on January 15, 2019, the court granted the motion to dismiss, allowing 30 days for the filing of an amended complaint. On February 15, 2019, Jeffrey Feinberg, individually and as trustee of the Jeffrey L. Feinberg Personal Trust, and Terrence K. Ankner, as trustee of the Jeffrey L. Feinberg Family Trust, filed an amended complaint that purports to state the same claims and seeks the same relief sought in the original complaint. Defendants have not yet responded to the amended complaint.

Ramirez Litigation

On July 20, 2018, Tony Ramirez filed a complaint against the Company and certain of its former directors. The complaint was filed in the United States District Court for the Central District of California. Mr. Ramirez alleged that he was a shareholder of the Company and purported to assert a single claim under Section 14(a) of the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 and SEC Rule 14a-9 promulgated thereunder. The parties entered into a “Settlement Agreement and Mutual Release” and the case was voluntarily dismissed with prejudice on December 17, 2018.

Amazon Litigation

As part of the cancellation of certain indebtedness owed to Fortress Investment Group, LLC, we transferred ownership of various patents, including U.S. Patent No. 7,177,798, commonly referred to as “Patent 798.” Fortress created a new Special Purpose Entity, CF Dynamic Advances LLC, in which we own a 30% interest. In May 2018, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute and CF Dynamic Advances LLC filed a complaint against Amazon.com, Inc. in the United States District Court for the Northern District of New York, which alleges, among other things, that “Alexa Voice Software and Alexa enabled devices” infringe U.S. Patent No. 7,177,798, entitled “Natural Language Interface Using Constrained Intermediate Dictionary of Results.” The complaint seeks an injunction, monetary damages, an ongoing royalty, pre- and post-judgment interest, attorneys’ fees, and costs. If plaintiffs are successful, and if the recoveries or settlement proceeds are sufficient following litigation expenses and recovery of amounts due in connection with the cancelled loan, the special purpose entity could be entitled to a portion of the net proceeds. There can be no assurance that the plaintiff will be successful or that any recoveries will exceed amounts due under the debt settlement arrangements or that our 30% interest in the special purpose entity will have any value even if the plaintiffs are successful in their case against Amazon.

ITEM 4. MINE SAFETY DISCLOSURES.

Not applicable.

PART II**ITEM 5. MARKET FOR REGISTRANT’S COMMON EQUITY, RELATED STOCKHOLDER MATTERS AND ISSUER PURCHASES OF EQUITY SECURITIES.****Market Information**

Our common stock is currently quoted on The NASDAQ Capital Market under the symbol “MARA”. Previously, our common stock was quoted on the OTC Bulletin Board under the symbol “MARA,” and prior to that, under the symbol “AMSC”.

The following table sets forth the high and low bid quotations for our common stock as reported on The NASDAQ Capital Market for the periods indicated. All per share prices set forth below reflect the 1:2 stock dividend issued on December 22, 2014 and the 1:4 reverse split on October 31, 2017 and all share and per share values for all periods presented in this annual report are retroactively restated for the effect of the reverse stock split.

	High	Low
Fiscal 2019		
First quarter through March 25, 2019	\$ 0.74	\$ 0.34
Fiscal 2018		
First Quarter	\$ 4.32	\$ 1.12
Second Quarter	1.93	0.92
Third Quarter	1.42	0.73
Fourth Quarter	0.87	0.36
Fiscal 2017		
First Quarter	\$ 9.16	\$ 2.52

Second Quarter	4.08	0.52
Third Quarter	2.32	0.88
Fourth Quarter	10.03	1.00

Holders

As of March 25, 2019, there were 43 holders of record of 25,519,940 shares of the Company's Common Stock.

Securities Authorized for Issuance under Equity Compensation Plans

2012, 2014, 2017 and 2018 Equity Incentive Plans

The following table gives information about the Company's common stock that may be issued upon the exercise of options granted to employees, directors and consultants under its 2012, 2014, 2017 and 2018 Equity Incentive Plans as of December 31, 2018. On August 1, 2012, our board of directors and stockholders adopted the 2012 Equity Incentive Plan, pursuant to which 384,616 shares of our common stock are reserved for issuance as awards to employees, directors, consultants, advisors and other service providers. On September 16, 2014, our board of directors adopted the 2014 Equity Incentive Plan, subsequently approved by the shareholders on July 31, 2015, pursuant to which up to 500,000 shares of our common stock, stock options, restricted stock, preferred stock, stock-based awards and other awards are reserved for issuance as awards to employees, directors, consultants, advisors and other service providers. On September 6, 2017, our board of directors adopted the 2017 Equity Incentive Plan, subsequently approved by the shareholders on September 29, 2017, pursuant to which up to 2,500,000 shares of our common stock, stock options, restricted stock, preferred stock, stock-based awards and other awards are reserved for issuance as awards to employees, directors, consultants, advisors and other service providers. On January 1, 2018, our board of directors adopted the 2018 Equity Incentive Plan, subsequently approved by the shareholders on March 7, 2018, pursuant to which up to 10,000,000 shares of our common stock, stock options, restricted stock, preferred stock, stock-based awards and other awards are reserved for issuance as awards to employees, directors, consultants, advisors and other service providers. As of March 25, 2019, the 2012, 2014, 2017 and 2018 Equity Incentive Plans had outstanding grants and remaining unissued shares, taking into account issuance of restricted stock to officers and directors, as follows:

Equity Compensation Plan Information

Plan category	Number of securities to be issued upon exercise of outstanding options, warrants and rights	Weighted-average exercise price of outstanding options, warrants and rights	Number of securities remaining available for future issuance under equity compensation plans
Equity compensation plans approved by security holders	6,594,843	\$ 2.17	6,789,773
Equity compensation plans not approved by security holders	—	\$ —	—
Total	6,594,843	\$ 2.17	6,789,773

Recent issuances of unregistered securities

On April 12, 2017, the Company issued 31,250 shares of the Company's Common Stock pursuant to a settlement agreement with Dominion Harbor Group, LLC. In connection with this issuance, the Company valued the shares at the quoted market price on the date of grant at \$3.32 per share or \$103,750. The transaction did not involve any underwriters, underwriting discounts or commissions, or any public offering. The issuance of these securities was deemed to be exempt from the registration requirements of the Securities Act by virtue of Section 4(a)(2) thereof, as a transaction by an issuer not involving a public offering.

On April 24, 2017, the Company issued 7,500 shares in total of the Company's Common Stock to a vendor in partial or total payment of outstanding invoices. In connection with this issuance, the Company valued the shares at the quoted market price on the date of grant at \$3.32 per share or \$24,900. The transaction did not involve any underwriters, underwriting discounts or commissions, or any public offering. The issuance of these securities was deemed to be exempt from the registration requirements of the Securities Act by virtue of Section 4(a)(2) thereof, as a transaction by an issuer not involving a public offering.

On August 9, 2017, the Company issued 250,000 shares of the Company's Common Stock pursuant to the conversion of 50,000 shares of Series D Convertible Preferred Stock.

On August 29, 2017, the Company issued 200,000 shares in total of the Company's Common Stock to four different vendors in partial or total payment of outstanding invoices. In connection with this issuance, the Company valued the shares at the quoted market price on the date of grant at \$2.04 per share or \$408,000. The transaction did not involve any underwriters, underwriting discounts or commissions, or any public offering. The issuance of these securities was deemed to be exempt from the registration requirements of the Securities Act by virtue of Section 4(a)(2) thereof, as a transaction by an issuer not involving a public offering.

On September 5, 2017, the Company issued 62,500 shares of the Company's Common Stock pursuant to the conversion of 12,500 shares of Series D Convertible Preferred Stock.

On September 5, 2017, the Company issued 44,000 shares of the Company's Common Stock pursuant to the conversion of \$35,200 in principal amount invested in the Convertible Note.

On September 5, 2017, the Company issued 175,000 shares of the Company's Common Stock pursuant to the conversion of \$140,000 in principal amount invested in the Convertible Note.

On September 6, 2017, the Company issued 315,710 shares of the Company's Common Stock pursuant to the conversion of \$252,568 in principal amount invested in the Convertible Note.

On September 13, 2017, the Company issued 315,938 shares of the Company's Common Stock pursuant to the conversion of 63,188 shares of Series D Convertible Preferred Stock.

On September 29, 2017, the Company issued 300,000 shares of the Company's Common Stock to its board members and consultant in lieu of cash compensation.

On October 2, 2017 and October 3, 2017, the Company issued 598,500 shares of the Company's Common Stock to holders of the warrants issued pursuant to the April Purchase Agreement following approval by the Company's shareholders of the warrant exchange at a special meeting held on September 29, 2017.

On October 26, 2017, the Company issued 700,000 and 50,000 shares to Mr. Croxall and Mr. Knuettel, respectively, pursuant to their respective retention agreements. In connection with this issuance, the Company valued the shares at the quoted market price on the date of grant at \$1.08 per share or \$810,000. The transaction did not involve any underwriters, underwriting discounts or commissions, or any public offering. The issuance of these securities was

deemed to be exempt from the registration requirements of the Securities Act by virtue of Section 4(a)(2) thereof, as a transaction by an issuer not involving a public offering.

On October 26, 2017, the Company issued 25,000 shares to Mr. Spangenberg pursuant to his termination agreement. In connection with this issuance, the Company valued the shares at the quoted market price on the date of grant at \$1.48 per share or \$37,000. The transaction did not involve any underwriters, underwriting discounts or commissions, or any public offering. The issuance of these securities was deemed to be exempt from the registration requirements of the Securities Act by virtue of Section 4(a)(2) thereof, as a transaction by an issuer not involving a public offering.

On November 11, 2017, the Company issued 195,500 shares pursuant to the conversion of 195,500 shares of the Company's Series B Convertible Preferred Stock.

On November 20, 2017, the Company issued 325,000 shares of the Company's Common Stock pursuant to the conversion of \$260,000 in principal amount invested in the Convertible Note.

On November 20, 2017, the Company issued 81,699 shares of the Company's Common Stock pursuant to the engagement agreement with Company counsel. In connection with this transaction, the Company valued the shares at the quoted market price on the date of grant at \$2.18 per share or \$178,104. The transaction did not involve any underwriters, underwriting discounts or commissions, or any public offering. The issuance of these securities was deemed to be exempt from the registration requirements of the Securities Act by virtue of Section 4(a)(2) thereof, as a transaction by an issuer not involving a public offering.

On November 22, 2017, the Company issued 335,000 shares of the Company's Common Stock pursuant to the conversion of \$268,000 in principal amount invested in the Convertible Note.

On November 24, 2017, the Company issued 335,000 shares of the Company's Common Stock pursuant to the conversion of \$268,000 in principal amount invested in the Convertible Note.

On November 27, 2017, the Company issued 277,855 shares of the Company's Common Stock pursuant to the conversion of \$222,294 in principal amount invested in the Convertible Note.

On November 27, 2017, the Company issued 20,750 shares of the Company's Common Stock pursuant to the exercise of a warrant.

Edgar Filing: Marathon Patent Group, Inc. - Form 10-K

On December 11, 2017, the Company entered into a securities purchase agreement and issued 1,000,000 shares of the Company's common stock for \$5,000,000.

On December 18, 2017, the Company entered into three securities purchase agreements and issued 1,354,546 shares of the Company's common stock for \$7,450,003.

On January 3, 2018, the Company issued 600,000 shares of the Company's Common Stock pursuant to the conversion of \$480,000 in principal amount invested in the Convertible Note.

On January 4, 2018, the Company issued 600,000 shares of the Company's Common Stock pursuant to the conversion of \$480,000 in principal amount invested in the Convertible Note.

On January 6, 2018, the Company issued 600,000 shares of the Company's Common Stock pursuant to the conversion of \$480,000 in principal amount invested in the Convertible Note.

On January 11, 2018, the Company entered into a Patent Rights Purchase and Assignment Agreement with XpresSpa Group, Inc., a Delaware Corporation and Crypto Currency Patent Holdings Company LLC, a Delaware limited liability company and wholly owned subsidiary of the Company ("CCPHC"). The Company issued 250,000 shares of common stock of the Company, par value \$0.0001 per share, subject to the terms and conditions of a lock-up agreement.

On January 11, 2018, the Company agreed to issue 25,000 shares of the Company's common stock to Andrew Kennedy Lang, one of the named inventors of the patents, in exchange for consulting services, and 50,000 shares of the Company's common stock to another individual in exchange for consulting services, in connection with the acquisition of the Assigned IP.

On February 5, 2018, the Company issued 31,053 shares of the Company's Common Stock pursuant to the conversion of \$24,842 in principal amount invested in the Convertible Note.

On February 27, 2018, the Company issued 700,000 shares of the Company's Common Stock pursuant to the conversion of \$560,000 in principal amount invested in the Convertible Note.

On February 28, 2018, the Company issued 18,400 shares of the Company's Common Stock to board members as compensation earned as members of the board.

On March 6, 2018, the Company issued 17,731 shares of the Company's Common Stock pursuant to the exercise of 44,000 shares of warrants.

On March 8, 2018, the Company issued 50,000 shares of the Company's Common Stock pursuant to the conversion of \$40,000 in principal amount invested in the Convertible Note.

On March 14, 2018, the Company issued 422,543 shares pursuant to the conversion of 423 shares of the Company's Series E Convertible Preferred Stock.

On March 15, 2018, the Company issued 357,000 shares pursuant to the conversion of 357 shares of the Company's Series E Convertible Preferred Stock.

On March 16, 2018, the Company issued 357,000 shares pursuant to the conversion of 357 shares of the Company's Series E Convertible Preferred Stock.

On March 19, 2018, the Company issued 297,000 shares pursuant to the conversion of 297 shares of the Company's Series E Convertible Preferred Stock.

On March 20, 2018, the Company issued 357,000 shares pursuant to the conversion of 357 shares of the Company's Series E Convertible Preferred Stock.

On March 21, 2018, the Company issued 357,000 shares pursuant to the conversion of 357 shares of the Company's Series E Convertible Preferred Stock.

On March 22, 2018, the Company issued 357,000 shares pursuant to the conversion of 357 shares of the Company's Series E Convertible Preferred Stock.

On March 23, 2018, the Company issued 357,000 shares pursuant to the conversion of 357 shares of the Company's Series E Convertible Preferred Stock.

On March 26, 2018, the Company issued 357,000 shares pursuant to the conversion of 357 shares of the Company's Series E Convertible Preferred Stock.

On March 26, 2018, the Company issued 38,432 shares of the Company's Common Stock pursuant to the conversion of \$30,746 in principal amount invested in the Convertible Note.

On March 27, 2018, the Company issued 351,000 shares pursuant to the conversion of 351 shares of the Company's Series E Convertible Preferred Stock.

On April 17, 2018, the Company issued 50,000 shares to Mr. Knuettel pursuant to his termination agreement. In connection with this issuance, the Company valued the shares at the quoted market price on the date of grant at \$1.72 per share or \$86,000. The transaction did not involve any underwriters, underwriting discounts or commissions, or any public offering. The issuance of these securities was deemed to be exempt from the registration requirements of the Securities Act by virtue of Section 4(a)(2) thereof, as a transaction by an issuer not involving a public offering.

On April 27, 2018, the Company issued 1,200,000 shares of the Company's Common Stock pursuant to the conversion of \$960,000 in principal amount invested in the Convertible Note.

On June 28, 2018, the board has determined that it is in the best interests of the Company and its shareholders to allow the Amended Merger Agreement to expire on its current termination date of June 28, 2018 without further negotiation or extension. The Board approved to issue 3,000,000 shares of our common stock to Global Bit Ventures, Inc as a termination fee for canceling the proposed merger between the two companies. The fair value of the common stocks was \$2,850,000.

On August 2, 2018, the Company issued 485,000 shares pursuant to the conversion of 485 shares of the Company's Series E Convertible Preferred Stock.

On August 10, 2018, the Company issued 485,000 shares pursuant to the conversion of 485 shares of the Company's Series E Convertible Preferred Stock.

On August 21, 2018, the Company issued 485,000 shares pursuant to the conversion of 485 shares of the Company's Series E Convertible Preferred Stock.

On August 29, 2018, the Company issued 487,000 shares pursuant to the conversion of 485 shares of the Company's Series E Convertible Preferred Stock.

Recent Repurchases of Securities

None.

ITEM 6. SELECTED FINANCIAL DATA

We are a smaller reporting company as defined by Rule 12b-2 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Exchange Act”) and are not required to provide the information under this item.

ITEM 7. MANAGEMENT’S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL CONDITION AND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS

The following discussion and analysis is intended as a review of significant factors affecting our financial condition and results of operations for the periods indicated. The discussion should be read in conjunction with our consolidated financial statements and the notes presented herein. In addition to historical information, the following Management’s Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations contains forward-looking statements that involve risks and uncertainties. Our actual results could differ significantly from those expressed, implied or anticipated in these forward-looking statements as a result of certain factors discussed herein and any other periodic reports filed and to be filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Cautionary Note Regarding Forward-Looking Statements

This report and other documents that we file with the Securities and Exchange Commission contain forward-looking statements that are based on current expectations, estimates, forecasts and projections about our future performance, our business, our beliefs and our management’s assumptions. Statements that are not historical facts are forward-looking statements. Words such as “expect,” “outlook,” “forecast,” “would,” “could,” “should,” “project,” “intend,” “plan,” “continue,” “sustain”, “on track”, “believe,” “seek,” “estimate,” “anticipate,” “may,” “assume,” and variations of such words and similar expressions are often used to identify such forward-looking statements, which are made pursuant to the safe harbor provisions of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995. These forward- looking statements are not guarantees of future performance and involve risks, assumptions and uncertainties, including, but not limited to, those described in our reports that we file or furnish with the Securities and Exchange Commission. Should one or more of these risks or uncertainties materialize, or should underlying assumptions prove incorrect, actual results may vary materially from those

indicated or anticipated by such forward-looking statements. Accordingly, you are cautioned not to place undue reliance on these forward-looking statements, which speak only as of the date they are made. Except to the extent required by law, we undertake no obligation to update publicly any forward-looking statements after the date they are made, whether as a result of new information, future events, changes in assumptions or otherwise.

Business of the Company

We were incorporated in the State of Nevada on February 23, 2010 under the name Verve Ventures, Inc. On December 7, 2011, we changed our name to American Strategic Minerals Corporation and were engaged in exploration and potential development of uranium and vanadium minerals business. In June 2012, we discontinued our minerals business and began to invest in real estate properties in Southern California. In October 2012, we discontinued our real estate business when our former CEO joined the firm and we commenced our IP licensing operations, at which time the Company's name was changed to Marathon Patent Group, Inc. On November 1, 2017, we entered into a merger agreement with Global Bit Ventures, Inc. ("GBV"), which is focused on mining digital assets. We have since purchased our cryptocurrency mining machines and established a data center in Canada to mine digital assets. Following the merger, we intended to add GBV's existing technical capabilities and digital asset miners and expand our activities in the mining of new digital assets, while at the same time harvesting the value of our remaining IP assets. On June 28, 2018, the board has determined that it is in the best interests of the Company and its shareholders to allow the Amended Merger Agreement to expire on its current termination date of June 28, 2018 without further negotiation or extension. The Board approved to issue 3,000,000 shares of our common stock to GBV as a termination fee for canceling the proposed merger between the two companies. The fair value of the common stocks was \$2,850,000.

Recent Developments

Patent Purchase

On January 11, 2018, the Company entered into a Patent Rights Purchase and Assignment Agreement (the "Agreement"), with XpresSpa Group, Inc., a Delaware Corporation (the "Seller") and Crypto Currency Patent Holdings Company LLC, a Delaware limited liability company and wholly owned subsidiary of the Company ("CCPHC"). Pursuant to the Agreement, the Seller agreed to irrevocably assign, sell, grant, transfer and convey, and CCPHC agreed to accept and acquire, the exclusive right, title and interest in and to certain patents owned by the Seller ("Assigned IP"), subject to the terms and conditions set forth in the Agreement. As consideration for the Assigned IP, the Seller shall receive (i) payment in the amount of \$250,000 from CCPHC and (ii) 250,000 shares of common stock of the Company, par value \$0.0001 per share (the "Consideration Shares"), with piggyback registration rights. The Consideration Shares were issued by the Company to the Seller, subject to the terms and conditions of a lock-up agreement. The fair value of the 250,000 shares was \$960,000 and was based upon the closing price of the Company's common stock.

As a condition to the Agreement, the Seller agreed to enter into a lock-up agreement with the Company, which lock-up agreement is included as an exhibit to the Agreement (the “Lock-up Agreement”). Pursuant to the Lock-up Agreement, the Seller shall not directly or indirectly offer, sell, pledge or transfer, or otherwise dispose of, the Consideration Shares for a period of 180 days commencing on January 11, 2018 and ending on July 11, 2018; provided, however, upon the effective date of the registration for resale of the Consideration Shares, and on each day thereafter, one twentieth (1/20) of the Consideration Shares shall be released from the restrictions contained in the Lock-up Agreement and may be freely sold, transferred, traded or otherwise disposed of. Notwithstanding the foregoing, in the event that the Consideration Shares, in whole or in part, are not registered for resale on the 6-month anniversary of the date of issuance of the Consideration Shares (“Six-Month Date”), the holders thereof may sell, transfer, trade or otherwise dispose of one twentieth (1/20) of the Consideration Shares on the Six-Month Date and on each day thereafter.

In addition, the Company agreed to issue 25,000 shares of the Company’s common stock to Andrew Kennedy Lang, one of the named inventors of the patents, in exchange for consulting services, and 50,000 shares of the Company’s common stock to another individual in exchange for consulting services, in connection with the acquisition of the Assigned IP. The fair value of these shares was \$278,750 and was based upon the closing price of the Company’s common stock on date of agreement. The Company recorded the fair value of these shares as a component of compensation and related taxes expense.

Lease and Purchase of Digital Asset Mining Servers

On February 7, 2018, Marathon Crypto Mining, Inc. (“MCM”), a Nevada corporation and wholly owned subsidiary of the Company, entered into an agreement to acquire 1,400 Bitmain’s Antminer S9 miners (“Antminer S9s”).

On February 12, 2018, in connection with the intended mining operations of MCM, the Company assumed a lease contract dated November 11, 2017 (the “Lease Agreement”) by and between 9349-0001 Quebec Inc. (the “Lessor”) and Blocespace Inc., formerly known as Cryptospace Inc. (the “Lessee”). Pursuant to the Lease Agreement, among other things, the Lessee leases a building of 26,700 square feet (the “Property”) in Quebec, Canada, for an initial term of five (5) years (the “Term”), commencing on December 1, 2017 and terminating on November 30, 2022. The Lessee shall pay a monthly rent of \$10,012.50 plus tax, or an annual rent of \$120,150.00 plus tax (“Yearly Rent”). At the signing of the Lease Agreement, the Lessee paid the Lessor a deposit equal to the Yearly Rent which amount will be dispersed during the Term as set forth in the Lease Agreement.

The Lessee assigned the Lease Agreement to MCM pursuant to an Assignment and Assumption Agreement (the “Assignment”) by and between the Company and the Lessee’s parent company, Bloctechnologies Canada Inc. Subject to the terms and conditions of the Assignment, MCM agreed to observe all the covenants and conditions of the Lease Agreement, including the payment of all rents due. The Company shall be responsible for all necessary capital

expenditures in connection with capital improvements to the Property to set up MCM's mining operations.

The 1,400 Antminer S9s were delivered to the Property and installation commenced on or about March 7, 2018, with the commencement of digital asset mining shortly thereafter.

GBV Merger Termination

On April 3, 2018, the Company and GBV entered into the Amended and Restated Agreement and Plan of Merger (the "Amended Merger Agreement"), which amends certain terms, among others, in the Merger Agreement, as follows: (i) the Outside Closing Date, as amended, shall be further extended to ninety (90) days from April 3, 2018, subject to consecutive 30-day extensions upon mutual written consent of the Parties; (ii) the Company Shareholders shall receive 70,000,000 Parent Common Shares (reduced from 126,674,557 Parent Common Shares) on a fully diluted basis, which include any Parent Common Shares underlying the Parent's Series C Preferred Stock issuable in lieu of the Parent Common Shares at the election of the Company Shareholders who would own more than 2.49% of the Parent Common Shares as a result of the Merger; and (iii) in the event that the Merger fails to close by August 9, 2018 or the Company's Shareholders vote not to approve the Merger, the Parent will issue to the Company, an aggregate of 3,000,000 Parent Common Shares to reimburse GBV for its costs and expenses. All capitalized terms otherwise not defined herein shall have the meanings set forth in the Amended Merger Agreement.

On July 3, 2018, the board has determined that it is in the best interests of the Company and its shareholders to allow the Amended Merger Agreement to expire on its current termination date of June 28, 2018 without further negotiation or extension. The Board approved to issue 3,000,000 shares of the Company's common stock to GBV as a termination fee for the Company canceling the proposed merger between the two companies.

Feinberg Litigation

On March 27, 2018, Jeffrey Feinberg, purportedly joined by the Jeffrey L. Feinberg Personal Trust and the Jeffrey L. Feinberg Family Trust, filed a complaint against the Company and certain of its former officers and directors. The complaint was filed in the Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of New York. The plaintiffs purported to state claims under Sections 11, 12(a)(2) and 15 of the federal Securities Act of 1933 and common law claims for "actual fraud and fraudulent concealment," constructive fraud, and negligent misrepresentation, seeking unspecified money damages (including punitive damages), as well as costs and attorneys' fees, and equitable or injunctive relief. On June 15, 2018, the defendants filed a motion to dismiss all claims asserted in the complaint and, on July 27, 2018, the plaintiffs filed an opposition to that motion. The court heard argument on the motion and, on January 15, 2019, the court granted the motion to dismiss, allowing 30 days for the filing of an amended complaint. On February 15, 2019, Jeffrey Feinberg, individually and as trustee of the Jeffrey L. Feinberg Personal Trust, and Terrence K. Ankner, as trustee of the Jeffrey L. Feinberg Family Trust, filed an amended complaint that purports to state the same claims and seeks the same relief sought in the original complaint. Defendants have not yet responded to the amended complaint.

Ramirez Litigation

On July 20, 2018, Tony Ramirez filed a complaint against the Company and certain of its former directors. The complaint was filed in the United States District Court for the Central District of California. Mr. Ramirez alleged that he was a shareholder of the Company and purported to assert a single claim under Section 14(a) of the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 and SEC Rule 14a-9 promulgated thereunder. The parties entered into a “Settlement Agreement and Mutual Release” and the case was voluntarily dismissed with prejudice on December 17, 2018.

Amazon Litigation

As part of the cancellation of certain indebtedness owed to Fortress Investment Group, LLC, we transferred ownership of various patents, including U.S. Patent No. 7,177,798, commonly referred to as “Patent 798.” Fortress created a new Special Purpose Entity, CF Dynamic Advances LLC, in which we own a 30% interest. In May 2018, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute and CF Dynamic Advances LLC filed a complaint against Amazon.com, Inc. in the United States District Court for the Northern District of New York, which alleges, among other things, that “Alexa Voice Software and Alexa enabled devices” infringe U.S. Patent No. 7,177,798, entitled “Natural Language Interface Using Constrained Intermediate Dictionary of Results.” The complaint seeks an injunction, monetary damages, an ongoing royalty, pre- and post-judgment interest, attorneys’ fees, and costs. If plaintiffs are successful, and if the recoveries or settlement proceeds are sufficient following litigation expenses and recovery of amounts due in connection with the cancelled loan, the special purpose entity could be entitled to a portion of the net proceeds. There can be no assurance that the plaintiff will be successful or that any recoveries will exceed amounts due under the debt settlement arrangements or that our 30% interest in the special purpose entity will have any value even if the plaintiffs are successful in their case against Amazon.

Other than as disclosed herein, we know of no other material, active or pending legal proceedings against us, nor are we involved as a plaintiff in any material proceedings or pending litigation other than in the normal course of business.

Critical Accounting Policies and Estimates

Our critical accounting policies and significant estimates are detailed in our 2017 Annual Report. Our critical accounting policies and significant estimates have not changed from those previously disclosed in our 2017 Annual Report, except for those accounting subjects mentioned in the section of the notes to the consolidated financial statements titled Adoption of Recent Accounting Pronouncements.

Principles of Consolidation

The consolidated financial statements are prepared in accordance with GAAP and present the financial statements of the Company and our wholly-owned and majority owned subsidiaries. In the preparation of our consolidated financial statements, intercompany transactions and balances are eliminated.

Use of Estimates and Assumptions

The preparation of financial statements in conformity with GAAP requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities and disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities at the date of the financial statements and the reported amounts of revenues and expenses during the reporting period. Actual results could differ from those estimates. Significant estimates made by management include, but are not limited to, estimating the useful lives of patent assets, the assumptions used to calculate fair value of warrants and options granted, goodwill and intangible assets impairment, realization of long-lived assets, valuation of Clouding IP earn out liability, deferred income taxes, unrealized tax positions and business combination accounting.

Revenue Recognition

The Company recognizes revenue under ASC 606, Revenue from Contracts with Customers. The core principle of the new revenue standard is that a company should recognize revenue to depict the transfer of promised goods or services to customers in an amount that reflects the consideration to which the company expects to be entitled in exchange for those goods or services. The following five steps are applied to achieve that core principle:

Step 1: Identify the contract with the customer

Step 2: Identify the performance obligations in the contract

Step 3: Determine the transaction price

Step 4: Allocate the transaction price to the performance obligations in the contract

Step 5: Recognize revenue when the Company satisfies a performance obligation

In order to identify the performance obligations in a contract with a customer, a company must assess the promised goods or services in the contract and identify each promised good or service that is distinct. A performance obligation meets ASC 606's definition of a "distinct" good or service (or bundle of goods or services) if both of the following criteria are met: The customer can benefit from the good or service either on its own or together with other resources that are readily available to the customer (i.e., the good or service is capable of being distinct), and the entity's promise to transfer the good or service to the customer is separately identifiable from other promises in the contract (i.e., the promise to transfer the good or service is distinct within the context of the contract).

If a good or service is not distinct, the good or service is combined with other promised goods or services until a bundle of goods or services is identified that is distinct.

The transaction price is the amount of consideration to which an entity expects to be entitled in exchange for transferring promised goods or services to a customer. The consideration promised in a contract with a customer may include fixed amounts, variable amounts, or both. When determining the transaction price, an entity must consider the effects of all of the following:

Variable consideration

Constraining estimates of variable consideration

The existence of a significant financing component in the contract

Noncash consideration

Consideration payable to a customer

Variable consideration is included in the transaction price only to the extent that it is probable that a significant reversal in the amount of cumulative revenue recognized will not occur when the uncertainty associated with the variable consideration is subsequently resolved.

The transaction price is allocated to each performance obligation on a relative standalone selling price basis.

The transaction price allocated to each performance obligation is recognized when that performance obligation is satisfied, at a point in time or over time as appropriate.

Providing computing power in crypto asset transaction verification services is an output of the Company's ordinary activities. The provision of computing power is the only performance obligation in the Company's contracts with pool operators. The transaction consideration the Company receives, if any, is noncash consideration, which the Company measures at fair value on the date received, which is not materially different than the fair value at contract inception. The consideration is all variable. Because it is not probable that a significant reversal of cumulative revenue will not occur, the consideration is constrained until the Company successfully places a block (by being the first to solve an algorithm) and the Company receives confirmation of the consideration it will receive, at which time revenue is recognized. There is no significant financing component in these transactions.

Fair value of the digital asset award received is determined using the average U.S. dollar spot rate of the related digital currency at the time of receipt.

Expenses associated with running the digital currency mining business, such as rent and electricity cost are also recorded as cost of revenues. Depreciation on digital currency mining equipment is recorded as a component of costs and expenses.

Accounting for Acquisitions

In the normal course of its business, the Company makes acquisitions of patent assets and may also make acquisitions of businesses. With respect to each such transaction, the Company evaluates facts of the transaction and follows the guidelines prescribed in accordance with ASC 805 — Business Combinations to determine the proper accounting treatment for each such transaction and then records the transaction in accordance with the conclusions reached in such analysis. The Company performs such analysis with respect to each material acquisition within the consolidated group of entities.

Impairment of Long-lived Assets

Management reviews long-lived assets for impairment whenever events or changes in circumstances indicate that the carrying amount of an asset may not be recoverable. Recoverability of assets to be held and used is measured by a comparison of the carrying amount of an asset to undiscounted future cash flows expected to be generated by the asset. If such assets are considered to be impaired, the impairment to be recognized is measured by the amount by which the carrying amount of the assets exceeds the fair value of the assets. Based on its reviews, management determined that its crypto-currency machines were impaired by a total of \$2,222,688 based upon an assessment as of December 31, 2018, including consideration of the decline in bitcoin values which occurred commencing in late

December 2017 and into 2018.

Fair Value Measurement

The Company measures at fair value certain of its financial and non-financial assets and liabilities by using a fair value hierarchy that prioritizes the inputs to valuation techniques used to measure fair value. Fair value is the price that would be received to sell an asset or paid to transfer a liability in an orderly transaction between market participants at the measurement date, essentially an exit price, based on the highest and best use of the asset or liability. The levels of the fair value hierarchy are:

- Level 1: Observable inputs such as quoted market prices in active markets for identical assets or liabilities
- Level 2: Observable market-based inputs or unobservable inputs that are corroborated by market data
- Level 3: Unobservable inputs for which there is little or no market data, which require the use of the reporting entity's own assumptions.

The carrying amounts reported in the consolidated balance sheet for cash, accounts receivable, accounts payable, and accrued expenses, approximate their estimated fair market value based on the short-term maturity of these instruments. The carrying value of notes payable and other long-term liabilities approximate fair value as the related interest rates approximate rates currently available to the Company.

Financial assets and liabilities are classified in their entirety within the fair value hierarchy based on the lowest level of input that is significant to their fair value measurement. The Company measures the fair value of its marketable securities by taking into consideration valuations obtained from third-party pricing sources. The pricing services utilize industry standard valuation models, including both income and market-based approaches, for which all significant inputs are observable, either directly or indirectly, to estimate fair value. These inputs included reported trades of and broker-dealer quotes on the same or similar securities, issuer credit spreads, benchmark securities and other observable inputs.

Stock-based Compensation

The Company expenses stock-based compensation to employees over the requisite service period based on the estimated grant-date fair value of the awards and forfeiture rates. For stock-based compensation awards to non-employees, the Company remeasures the fair value of the non-employee awards at each reporting period prior to vesting and finally at the vesting date of the award. Changes in the estimated fair value of these non-employee awards are recognized as compensation expense in the period of change.

The Company estimates the fair value of stock options grants using the Black-Scholes option pricing model and the assumptions used in calculating the fair value of stock-based awards represent management's best estimates and involve inherent uncertainties and the application of management's judgment.

Recent Issued Accounting Standards

See Note 2 to our consolidated financial statements.

Results of Operations for the Years Ended December 31, 2018 and December 31, 2017

We generated revenues of \$1.6 million during the year ended December 31, 2018 as compared to \$0.5 million during the year ended December 31, 2017. For the year ended December 31, 2018, this represented an increase of \$1.0 million or 201%. Revenue for the year ended December 31, 2018 were derived primarily from cryptocurrency mining.

Direct cost of revenues during the year ended December 31, 2018 and 2017 amounted to approximately \$3.4 million and \$3.5 million, respectively. For the year ended December 31, 2018, this represented a decrease of \$0.1 million or 3%. Direct costs of revenue include depreciation and amortization expenses of the cryptocurrency mining machines and patents, contingent payments to patent enforcement legal costs, patent enforcement advisors and inventors as well as various non-contingent costs associated with enforcing the Company's patent rights and otherwise in developing and entering into settlement and licensing agreements that generate the Company's revenue.

We incurred other operating expenses of \$10.3 million for the year ended December 31, 2018 and \$11.2 million for the year ended December 31, 2017. For the year ended December 31, 2018, this represented a decrease of \$945,315 or 8%. These expenses primarily consisted of compensation to our officers, directors and employees, professional fees, impairment of the patent and long-lived assets and consulting incurred in connection with the day-to-day operation of our business.

The operating expenses consisted of the following:

	Total Other Operating Expenses	
	For the Year Ended	
	December 31, 2018	December 31, 2017
Compensation and related taxes (1)	\$1,984,301	\$4,362,371
Consulting fees (2)	639,094	537,695
Professional fees (3)	1,216,820	2,797,648
Other general and administrative (4)	1,374,047	831,001
Patent Impairment (5)	-	2,475,149
Goodwill impairment (6)	-	228,401
Impairment of mining equipment (7)	2,222,688	-
Break-up fee - issuance of shares to GBV (8)	2,850,000	-
Total	\$10,286,950	\$11,232,265

Non-cash other operating expenses for the year ended December 31, 2018 include non-cash other operating expenses totaling \$39,053. Non-cash operating expenses consisted of the following:

	Non-Cash Other Operating Expenses	
	For the Year Ended	
	December 31, 2018	December 31, 2017
Compensation and related taxes (1)	\$39,053	\$2,067,719
Consulting fees (2)	-	(91,228)
Professional fees (3)	-	325
Other general and administrative (4)	-	42,860
Patent Impairment (5)	-	2,475,149
Goodwill impairment (6)	-	228,401
Total	\$39,053	\$4,723,226

Compensation expense and related taxes: Compensation expense includes cash compensation and related payroll taxes and benefits, and non-cash equity compensation expenses. For the year ended December 31, 2018 and 2017, compensation expense and related payroll taxes were \$2.0 million and \$4.4 million, a decrease of \$2.4 million or (1) 55% over the comparable periods in 2017. During the year ended December 31, 2018, we recognized non-cash employee and board equity-based compensation of \$39,053 and \$2.1 million for year ended December 31, 2017, respectively.

Consulting fees: For the year ended December 31, 2018 and 2017, we incurred consulting fees of \$0.6 million and \$0.5 million, respectively, an increase of \$0.1 million or 19% over the comparable periods in 2017. Consulting fees include both cash and non-cash related consulting fees primarily for investor relations and public relations services as well as other consulting services. During the year ended December 31, 2017, we recognized non-cash equity-based consulting credit of \$91,228.

Professional fees: For the year ended December 31, 2018 and 2017, professional fees were \$1.2 million and \$2.8 million, respectively, a decrease of \$1.6 million or 57% over the comparable periods in 2017. Professional fees primarily reflect the costs of professional outside accounting fees, legal fees and audit fees.

Other general and administrative expenses: For the year ended December 31, 2018 and 2017, other general and administrative expenses were \$1.4 million and \$0.8 million, respectively, an increase of \$0.5 million or 65% over the comparable periods in 2017. General and administrative expenses reflect the other non-categorized operating costs of the Company and include expenses related to being a public company, rent, insurance, technology and other expenses incurred to support the operations of the Company.

Patent impairment: For the year ended December 31, 2017, the Company took an impairment charge of the carrying value of the Company's Clouding portfolio patents based on changes in the expected timing of proceeds from the Clouding portfolio in the amount of \$2.5 million.

Goodwill impairment: For the years ended December 31, 2017, the Company recorded a loss on the impairment of goodwill in the amounts of \$228,401.

Impairment of mining equipment: For the years ended December 31, 2018, the Company recorded a loss on the impairment of mining equipment in the amounts of \$2.2 million.

Break-up fee – issuance of shares to GBV: For the years ended December 31, 2018, the Board approved to issue (8)3,000,000 shares of our common stock to Global Bit Ventures, Inc as a termination fee for canceling the proposed merger between the two companies. The fair value of the common stocks was \$2.9 million.

Operating Loss

We reported operating loss from continuing operations of \$12.1 million for the year ended December 31, 2018 and operating loss of \$14.2 million, for the year ended December 31, 2017.

Other Expenses

Total other expenses were \$0.7 million and \$17.3 million for the year ended December 31, 2018 and 2017, respectively. The changes were mainly due to the interest expense accrued related to the outstanding notes and amortization of debt discount related to the notes conversions, and change in fair value of the warrant liability which resulting from our lower stock price.

Net Loss Available to Common Shareholders

We reported net loss of \$12.8 million and \$31.3 million for the year ended December 31, 2018 and 2017, respectively.

Liquidity and Capital Resources

The Company's consolidated financial statements have been prepared assuming that it will continue as a going concern, which contemplates continuity of operations, realization of assets, and liquidation of liabilities in the normal course of business.

As reflected in the consolidated financial statements, the Company had and accumulated deficit of approximately \$102.1 million at December 31, 2018, a net loss of approximately \$12.8 million and approximately \$8.2 million net cash used in operating activities for the year ended December 31, 2018. These factors raise substantial doubt about the Company's ability to continue as a going concern.

Liquidity is the ability of a company to generate funds to support its current and future operations, satisfy its obligations, and otherwise operate on an ongoing basis. At December 31, 2018, the Company's cash and cash equivalents balances totaled \$2.6 million compared to \$14.9 million at December 31, 2017.

Net working capital decreased by \$6.6 million, to \$0.7 million at December 31, 2018 from \$7.4 million at December 31, 2017.

Cash used in operating activities was \$8.2 million during the year ended December 31, 2018 and cash used in operating activities of \$10.8 million during the year ended December 31, 2017.

Cash used in investing activities was \$4.2 million during the year ended December 31, 2018 and cash provided by investing activities of \$7,788 for the year ended December 31, 2017.

Cash provided by financing activities was \$0 during the year ended December 31, 2018 compared to cash provided by financing activities in the amount of \$20.4 million during the year ended December 31, 2017. Cash provided by financing activities for the year ended December 31, 2017 resulted from proceeds from issuance of notes payable, the sale of common stock issued pursuant to an ATM offering, offset by payments made for notes payable.

Based on our current revenue and profit projections, we are uncertain that our existing cash will be sufficient to fund its operations through at least the next twelve months, raising substantial doubt regarding our ability to continue operating as a going concern. If we do not meet our revenue and profit projections or the business climate turns negative, then we will need to:

- raise additional funds to support our operations; provided, however, there is no assurance that we will be able to raise such additional funds on acceptable terms, if at all. If we raise additional funds by issuing securities, existing stockholders may be diluted; and

- review strategic alternatives.

If adequate funds are not available, we may be required to curtail our operations or other business activities or obtain funds through arrangements with strategic partners or others that may require us to relinquish rights to certain technologies or potential markets.

Off-Balance Sheet Arrangements

None.

ITEM 7A. QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE DISCLOSURES ABOUT MARKET RISK

We are a smaller reporting company as defined by Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act and are not required to provide the information under this item.

36

ITEM 8. FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AND SUPPLEMENTARY DATA

MARATHON PATENT GROUP, INC.

CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

DECEMBER 31, 2018

Index to Financial Statements

<u>REPORTS OF INDEPENDENT REGISTERED PUBLIC ACCOUNTING FIRM</u>	F-2
<u>CONSOLIDATED BALANCE SHEETS</u>	F-3
<u>CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF OPERATIONS AND COMPREHENSIVE LOSS</u>	F-4
<u>CONSOLIDATED STATEMENT OF STOCKHOLDERS' EQUITY (DEFICIT)</u>	F-5
<u>CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF CASH FLOWS</u>	F-6
<u>NOTES TO THE CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS</u>	F-7 to F-20

F-1

REPORT OF INDEPENDENT REGISTERED PUBLIC ACCOUNTING FIRM

To the Board of Directors and Stockholders of
Marathon Patent Group, Inc. and subsidiaries

Opinion on the Financial Statements

We have audited the accompanying consolidated balance sheets of Marathon Patent Group, Inc. and subsidiaries (the Company) as of December 31, 2018 and 2017, and the related consolidated statements of operations and comprehensive loss, stockholders' equity (deficit) and cash flows for each of the years in the two year period ended December 31, 2018, and the related notes (collectively referred to as the consolidated financial statements). In our opinion, the consolidated financial statements present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the Company as of December 31, 2018 and 2017, and the consolidated results of its operations and its cash flows for each of the years in the two year period ended December 31, 2018, in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

The Company's Ability to Continue as a Going Concern

The accompanying consolidated financial statements have been prepared assuming that the Company will continue as a going concern. As discussed in Note 1 to the consolidated financial statements, the Company has an accumulated deficit, recurring losses, and expects continuing future losses, and has stated that substantial doubt exists about the Company's ability to continue as a going concern. Management's evaluation of the events and conditions and management's plans regarding these matters are also described in Note 1. The consolidated financial statements do not include any adjustments that might result from the outcome of this uncertainty.

Basis for Opinion

These consolidated financial statements are the responsibility of the Company's management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the Company's consolidated financial statements based on our audits. We are a public accounting firm registered with the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (United States) (PCAOB) and are required to be independent with respect to the Company in accordance with the U.S. federal securities laws and the applicable rules and regulations of the Securities and Exchange Commission and the PCAOB.

We conducted our audits in accordance with the standards of the PCAOB. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement, whether due to error or fraud. The Company is not required to have, nor were we engaged to perform, an audit of its internal control over financial reporting. As part of our audits, we are required to obtain an understanding of internal control over financial reporting, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the Company's internal control over financial reporting. Accordingly, we express no such opinion.

Our audits included performing procedures to assess the risks of material misstatement of the financial statements, whether due to error or fraud, and performing procedures that respond to those risks. Such procedures included examining, on a test basis, evidence regarding the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. Our audits also included evaluating the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall presentation of the financial statements. We believe that our audits provide a reasonable basis for our opinion.

/s/RBSM LLP

We have served as the Company's auditor since 2017.

Henderson, NV

March 25, 2019

F-2

MARATHON PATENT GROUP, INC. AND SUBSIDIARIES**CONSOLIDATED BALANCE SHEETS**

	December 31, 2018	December 31, 2017
ASSETS		
Current assets:		
Cash and cash equivalents	\$2,551,171	\$14,948,529
Accounts receivable - net of allowance for bad debt of \$0 and \$387,976 for December 31, 2018 and December 31, 2017, respectively	-	6,826
Prepaid expenses and other current assets	464,006	92,855
Total current assets	3,015,177	15,048,210
Other assets:		
Property and equipment, net of accumulated depreciation and impairment charges of \$4,338,931 and \$134,513 for December 31, 2018 and December 31, 2017, respectively	1,034,575	10,011
Intangible assets, net of accumulated amortization of \$65,245 for December 31, 2018	1,144,755	-
Total other assets	2,179,330	10,011
TOTAL ASSETS	\$5,194,507	\$15,058,221
LIABILITIES AND STOCKHOLDERS' EQUITY		
Current liabilities:		
Accounts payable and accrued expenses	\$1,235,444	\$1,961,784
Litigation liability	-	2,150,000
Warrant liability	39,083	1,794,396
Convertible notes payable, net of discount of \$2,290,028 for December 31, 2017	999,106	1,763,920
Total current liabilities	2,273,633	7,670,100
Total liabilities	2,273,633	7,670,100
Commitments and Contingencies		
Stockholders' Equity:		
Preferred stock, \$0.0001 par value, 50,000,000 shares authorized, 0 and 5,513 issued and outstanding at December 31, 2018 and December 31, 2017, respectively	-	1
Common stock, \$0.0001 par value; 200,000,000 shares authorized; 25,519,940 and 12,477,781 issued and outstanding at December 31, 2018 and December 31, 2017, respectively	2,552	1,248
Additional paid-in capital	105,459,482	97,113,723
Accumulated other comprehensive loss	(450,719)	(450,734)
Accumulated deficit	(102,090,441)	(89,276,117)
Total stockholders' equity	2,920,874	7,388,121

TOTAL LIABILITIES AND STOCKHOLDERS' EQUITY	\$5,194,507	\$15,058,221
--	-------------	--------------

The accompanying notes are an integral part to these audited consolidated financial statements.

F-3

MARATHON PATENT GROUP, INC. AND SUBSIDIARIES

CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF OPERATIONS AND COMPREHENSIVE LOSS

	For the year ended	
	December 31,	
	2018	2017
Revenues		
Cryptocurrency mining revenue	\$ 1,495,402	\$-
Other revenue	66,970	519,622
Total revenues	1,562,372	519,622
Operating costs and expenses		
Cost of revenue	3,351,758	3,470,847
Impairment of mining equipment	2,222,688	-
Compensation and related taxes	1,984,301	4,362,371
Consulting fees	639,094	537,695
Professional fees	1,216,820	2,797,648
General and administrative	1,374,047	831,001
Goodwill impairment	-	228,401
Patent impairment	-	2,475,149
Break-up fee - issuance of shares to GBV	2,850,000	-
Total operating expenses	13,638,708	14,703,112
Operating loss	(12,076,336)	(14,183,490)
Other income (expenses)		
Other income (expenses)	112,471	(3,173,341)
Foreign exchange gain (loss)	28,918	(463,821)
Gain on debt extinguishment	-	2,970,313
Gain on Fortress debt settlement	-	11,940,493
Loss on sale of companies	-	(2,610,783)
Realized loss on sale of digital currencies	(152,485)	-
Change in fair value adjustment of Clouding IP earn out	-	1,482,012
Change in fair value of warrant liability	1,699,522	(21,855,723)
Loss on warrants exchanged for common stock	-	(980,400)
Gain on exchange of warrants to series E	-	305,358
Amortization of debt discount	(2,290,028)	(3,561,109)
Interest income	14,230	2,793
Interest expense	(81,482)	(1,309,823)
Loss before income taxes	(12,745,190)	(31,437,521)
Income tax (expense) benefit	(69,134)	103,952
Net loss attributable to common stockholders	\$(12,814,324)	\$(31,333,569)
Net loss per share, basic and diluted:	\$(0.60)	\$(4.80)
Weighted average shares outstanding, basic and diluted:	21,263,774	6,522,649

Edgar Filing: Marathon Patent Group, Inc. - Form 10-K

Net loss attributable to common stockholders	\$(12,814,324)	\$(31,333,569)
Other comprehensive income:		
Unrealized gain on foreign currency translation	15	609,656
Comprehensive loss attributable to Marathon Patent Group, Inc.	\$(12,814,309)	\$(30,723,913)

The accompanying notes are an integral part to these audited consolidated financial statements.

F-4

MARATHON PATENT GROUP, INC. AND SUBSIDIARIES

CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF STOCKHOLDERS EQUITY (DEFICIT)

	Preferred Stock		Common Stock		Additional Paid-in	Accumulated	Accumulated Other Comprehensive Income (Loss)	Non-Controlling Interest	Total Stockholders' Equity
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Capital	Deficit			Equity
Balance as of December 31, 2016	195,501	\$20	4,638,118	\$463	\$49,879,161	\$(57,942,548)	\$(1,060,390)	\$(163,848)	\$(9,287,000)
Stock-based compensation expense	-	-	775,000	78	1,976,738	-	-	-	1,976,816
Issuance of Series D Preferred Stock	125,688	13	-	-	678,700	-	-	-	678,713
Conversion of Series B Preferred Stock	(195,500)	(20)	195,500	20	-	-	-	-	-
Conversion of Series D Preferred Stock	(125,688)	(13)	628,438	63	107,224	-	-	-	107,274
Warrants converted to Series E preferred stock	5,512	1	-	-	21,525,410	-	-	-	21,525,820
Common stock issued for note conversion	-	-	1,807,565	181	1,445,871	-	-	-	1,446,052
Beneficial conversion feature	-	-	-	-	4,017,729	-	-	-	4,017,729
Proceeds received from private placement	-	-	3,492,047	349	16,074,067	-	-	-	16,074,416
Issue common stock for conversion of warrants	-	-	619,250	62	1,183,966	-	-	-	1,184,028
	-	-	-	-	137,334	-	-	-	137,334

Edgar Filing: Marathon Patent Group, Inc. - Form 10-K

Warrant liability									
Convertible debt warrant repricing	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Common stock issued for account payable	-	-	320,449	32	435,457	-	-	-	435,48
Loss on sale of companies	-	-	-	-	(42,576)	-	-	-	(42,57
Gain on extinguishment of warrant liability	-	-	-	-	(305,358)	-	-	-	(305,3
Par value adjustment and additional shares issued due to reverse split	-	-	1,414	-	-	-	-	-	-
Currency translation loss	-	-	-	-	-	-	609,656	-	609,65
Net loss	-	-	-	-	-	(31,333,569)	-	163,848	(31,16
Balance as of December 31, 2017	5,513	1	12,477,781	1,248	97,113,723	(89,276,117)	(450,734)	\$-	7,388,
Stock based compensation	-	-	443,400	44	1,425,639	-	-	-	1,425,
Conversion of Series E preferred stock	(5,513)	(1)	5,511,543	551	(550)	-	-	-	-
Common stock issued for acquisition of patents	-	-	250,000	25	959,975	-	-	-	960,00
Issue common stock for exercise of warrants	-	-	17,731	2	55,789	-	-	-	55,791
Common stock issuance related to note conversion	-	-	3,819,485	382	3,055,206	-	-	-	3,055,
Break-up fee - issuance of shares to GBV	-	-	3,000,000	300	2,849,700	-	-	-	2,850,
Currency translation gain	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	-	15
Net loss	-	-	-	-	-	(12,814,324)	-	-	(12,81
Balance as of December 31,	-	\$-	25,519,940	\$2,552	\$105,459,482	\$(102,090,441)	\$(450,719)	\$-	\$2,920,

2018

The accompanying notes are an integral part to these audited consolidated financial statements.

F-5

MARATHON PATENT GROUP, INC. AND SUBSIDIARIES**CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF CASH FLOWS**

	For the year ended December 31,	
	2018	2017
CASH FLOWS FROM OPERATING ACTIVITIES		
Net loss	\$(12,814,324)	\$(31,333,569)
Adjustments to reconcile net loss to net cash (used in) operating activities:		
Depreciation	2,003,695	26,106
Amortization of patents and website	66,017	1,824,162
Loss on sale of companies	-	2,610,784
Gain on debt extinguishment	-	(2,970,313)
Gain on extinguishment of warrant liability	-	(305,358)
Gain on Fortress loan extinguishment	-	(11,940,494)
Realized loss on sale of digital currencies	152,485	-
Change in fair value of warrant liability	(1,699,522)	21,855,723
Impairment of intangible assets	-	2,475,149
Impairment of goodwill	-	228,401
Impairment of mining equipment	2,222,688	-
Stock based compensation	1,425,683	1,976,816
Amortization of debt discount	2,290,028	3,561,109
Warrants exchanged for common stock	-	980,400
Bad debt allowance	6,826	-
Change in fair value of Clouding earnout	-	(1,482,012)
Break-up fee - issuance of shares to GBV	2,850,000	-
Non-controlling interest	-	163,848
Litigation liability	-	2,150,000
Changes in operating assets and liabilities:		
Accounts receivables	-	88,243
Digital currencies	(1,495,402)	-
Litigation liability	(2,150,000)	-
Prepaid expenses and other assets	(371,151)	335,194
Other non current assets	-	201,203
Accounts payable and accrued expenses	(725,594)	(1,253,875)
Net cash used in operating activities	(8,238,571)	(10,808,483)
CASH FLOWS FROM INVESTING ACTIVITIES		
Purchase of digital currencies	1,342,917	-
Acquisition of patents	(250,000)	-
Purchase of property and equipment	(5,251,719)	(7,788)
Net cash used in investing activities	(4,158,802)	(7,788)
CASH FLOWS FROM FINANCING ACTIVITIES		
Payment on note payable	-	(1,273,000)
Proceeds received on issuance of notes payable	-	5,488,693

Edgar Filing: Marathon Patent Group, Inc. - Form 10-K

Proceeds received on private placement	-	16,074,416
Proceeds from warrant purchase	-	17,410
Proceeds received on exercise of warrants	-	141,100
Net cash provided by financing activities	-	20,448,619
Effect of foreign exchange rate changes	15	317,867
Net (decrease) increase in cash and cash equivalents	(12,397,358)	9,950,215
Cash and cash equivalents — beginning of period	14,948,529	4,998,314
Cash and cash equivalents — end of period	\$2,551,171	\$14,948,529
SUPPLEMENTAL CASH FLOW INFORMATION		
Cash paid for interest expense	\$-	\$1,543,925
Cash paid during the year for income taxes	\$-	\$5,459
Supplemental schedule of non-cash investing and financing activities:		
Issuance of Series D Preferred Stock	\$-	\$678,713
Conversion of Series B Preferred Stock to common stock	\$-	\$20
Conversion of Series D Preferred Stock to common stock	\$-	\$63
Conversion of Series E Preferred Stock to common stock	\$551	\$-
Warrants converted to Series E preferred stock	\$-	\$21,525,410
Warrants reclassified to equity	\$-	\$18,187
Common stock issued for acquisition of patents	\$960,000	\$-
Common stock issued for note conversion	\$3,055,588	\$1,549,803
Restricted stock issuance	\$44	\$78
Beneficial conversion feature	\$-	\$4,017,729
Common stock issued fro account payable	\$-	\$331,739
Warrants exercised into common shares	\$55,791	\$-

The accompanying notes are an integral part to these audited consolidated financial statements.

MARATHON PATENT GROUP, INC. AND SUBSIDIARIES

Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements

NOTE 1 - ORGANIZATION AND DESCRIPTION OF BUSINESS

Organization

Marathon Patent Group, Inc. (the “Company”) was incorporated in the State of Nevada on February 23, 2010 under the name Verve Ventures, Inc. On December 7, 2011, the Company changed its name to American Strategic Minerals Corporation and were engaged in exploration and potential development of uranium and vanadium minerals business. In June 2012, the Company discontinued the minerals business and began to invest in real estate properties in Southern California. In October 2012, the Company discontinued its real estate business when the former CEO joined the firm and the Company commenced IP licensing operations, at which time the Company’s name was changed to Marathon Patent Group, Inc. On November 1, 2017, the Company entered into a merger agreement with Global Bit Ventures, Inc. (“GBV”), which is focused on mining digital assets. The Company purchased cryptocurrency mining machines and established a data center in Canada to mine digital assets. As part of the cancellation of certain indebtedness owed to Fortress Investment Group, LLC, we transferred ownership of various patents, including U.S. Patent No. 7,177,798, commonly referred to as “Patent 798.” Fortress created a new Special Purpose Entity, CF Dynamic Advances LLC, in which we own a 30% interest. There was no activity in 2018.

On January 1, 2018, our Board adopted the 2018 Equity Incentive Plan, subsequently approved by the stockholders on March 7, 2018, pursuant to which up to 10,000,000 shares of common stock, stock options, restricted stock, preferred stock, stock-based awards and other awards are reserved for issuance as awards to employees, directors, consultants, advisors and other service providers.

On June 28, 2018, the Board has determined that it is in the best interests of the Company and its shareholders to allow the Amended Merger Agreement with GBV to expire on its current termination date of June 28, 2018 without further negotiation or extension. The Board approved to issue 3,000,000 shares of the Company’s common stock to GBV as a termination fee for the Company canceling the proposed merger between the two companies.

All share and per share values for all periods presented in the accompanying consolidated financial statements have been retroactively adjusted to reflect the 1:4 Reverse Split which occurred on October 30, 2017.

Going Concern

The Company's consolidated financial statements have been prepared assuming that it will continue as a going concern, which contemplates continuity of operations, realization of assets, and liquidation of liabilities in the normal course of business.

As reflected in the consolidated financial statements, the Company had an accumulated deficit of approximately \$102.1 million at December 31, 2018, a net loss of approximately \$12.8 million and approximately \$8.2 million net cash used in operating activities for the year ended December 31, 2018. These factors raise substantial doubt about the Company's ability to continue as a going concern.

Based on the Company's current revenue and profit projections, management is uncertain that the Company's existing cash will be sufficient to fund its operations through at least the next twelve months from the issuance date of the financial statements, raising substantial doubt regarding the Company's ability to continue operating as a going concern. If we do not meet our revenue and profit projections or the business climate turns negative, then we will need to:

raise additional funds to support the Company's operations; provided, however, there is no assurance that the Company will be able to raise such additional funds on acceptable terms, if at all. If the Company raises additional funds by issuing securities, existing stockholders may be diluted; and

review strategic alternatives.

If adequate funds are not available, we may be required to curtail our operations or other business activities or obtain funds through arrangements with strategic partners or others that may require us to relinquish rights to certain technologies or potential markets.

NOTE 2 - SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES

Basis of Presentation and Principles of Consolidation

The accompanying consolidated financial statements include the accounts of the Company's subsidiaries, Marathon Crypto Mining, Inc., Crypto Currency Patent Holding Company and Soems Acquisition Corp.. For consolidated entities where the Company owns less than 100% of the subsidiary, the Company records net loss attributable to non-controlling interests in its consolidated statements of operations equal to the percentage of the economic or ownership interest retained in such entities by the respective non-controlling parties.

F-7

MARATHON PATENT GROUP, INC. AND SUBSIDIARIES

Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements

The Company's consolidated financial statements include the accounts of the Company and its subsidiaries. All intercompany balances and transactions have been eliminated.

Use of Estimates and Assumptions

The preparation of financial statements in conformity with US GAAP requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities and disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities at the date of the financial statements and the reported amounts of revenues and expenses during the reporting period. Actual results could differ from those estimates. Significant estimates made by management include, but are not limited to, estimating the useful lives of patent assets, the assumptions used to calculate fair value of warrants and options granted, goodwill impairment, realization of long-lived assets, deferred income taxes, unrealized tax positions and business combination accounting.

Cash and Cash Equivalents

The Company considers all highly liquid debt instruments and other short-term investments with maturity of three months or less, when purchased, to be cash equivalents. The Company maintains cash and cash equivalent balances at one financial institution that is insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The Company's accounts at this institution are insured, up to \$250,000, by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation ("FDIC"). For the years ended December 31, 2018 and 2017, the Company's bank balances exceeded the FDIC insurance limit. To reduce its risk associated with the failure of such financial institution, the Company evaluates at least annually the rating of the financial institution in which it holds deposits. As of December 31, 2018 and 2017, the Company did not have any cash equivalents.

Segment Reporting

Operating segments are defined as components of an enterprise about which separate financial information is available that is evaluated regularly by the chief operating decision maker, or decision-making group in deciding how to allocate resources and in assessing performance. Our chief operating decision-making group ("CODM") is composed of the chief

executive officer and chief financial officer. The Company currently operates in the Digital Currency Blockchain segment. The Company's Crypto-currency Machines are located in Canada and the Company has employees only in the United States and views its operations as one operating segment as the CODM reviews financial information on a consolidated basis in making decisions regarding resource allocations and assessing performance.

Digital Currencies

Digital currencies are included in current assets in the consolidated balance sheets. Digital currencies are recorded at cost less impairment.

An intangible asset with an indefinite useful life is not amortized but assessed for impairment annually, or more frequently, when events or changes in circumstances occur indicating that it is more likely than not that the indefinite-lived asset is impaired. Impairment exists when the carrying amount exceeds its fair value. In testing for impairment, the Company has the option to first perform a qualitative assessment to determine whether it is more likely than not that an impairment exists. If it is determined that it is not more likely than not that an impairment exists, a quantitative impairment test is not necessary. If the Company concludes otherwise, it is required to perform a quantitative impairment test. To the extent an impairment loss is recognized, the loss establishes the new cost basis of the asset. Subsequent reversal of impairment losses is not permitted.

The following table presents the activities of the digital currencies for the year ended December 31, 2018:

Digital currencies at December 31, 2017	\$-
Additions of digital currencies	1,495,402
Realized loss on sale of digital currencies	(152,485)
Sale of digital currencies	(1,342,917)
Digital Currencies at December 31, 2018	\$-

MARATHON PATENT GROUP, INC. AND SUBSIDIARIES

Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements

Crypto-currency Machines

Management has assessed the basis of depreciation of the Company's Crypto-currency Machines used to verify digital currency transactions and generate digital currencies and believes they should be depreciated over a 2 year period. The rate at which the Company generates digital assets and, therefore, consumes the economic benefits of its transaction verification servers are influenced by a number of factors including the following:

the complexity of the transaction verification process which is driven by the algorithms contained within the bitcoin open source software;

the general availability of appropriate computer processing capacity on a global basis (commonly referred to in the industry as hashing capacity which is measured in Petahash units); and

technological obsolescence reflecting rapid development in the transaction verification server industry such that more recently developed hardware is more economically efficient to run in terms of digital assets generated as a function of operating costs, primarily power costs i.e. the speed of hardware evolution in the industry is such that later hardware models generally have faster processing capacity combined with lower operating costs and a lower cost of purchase.

The Company operates in an emerging industry for which limited data is available to make estimates of the useful economic lives of specialized equipment. Management has determined that a two year diminishing value best reflects the current expected useful life of transaction verification servers. This assessment takes into consideration the availability of historical data and management's expectations regarding the direction of the industry including potential changes in technology. Management will review this estimate annually and will revise such estimates as and when data comes available.

To the extent that any of the assumptions underlying management's estimate of useful life of its transaction verification servers are subject to revision in a future reporting period either as a result of changes in circumstances or through the availability of greater quantities of data then the estimated useful life could change and have a prospective impact on depreciation expense and the carrying amounts of these assets.

Intangible Assets

Intangible assets include the Crypto Currency Patent with original estimated useful live of 17 years. The Company amortize the cost of the intangible assets over their estimated useful lives on a straight-line basis. Costs incurred to acquire patents, including legal costs, are also capitalized as long-lived assets and amortized on a straight-line basis with the associated patent.

The Company monitors the carrying value of long-lived assets for potential impairment and tests the recoverability of such assets whenever events or changes in circumstances indicate that the carrying amounts may not be recoverable. If a change in circumstance occurs, the Company will perform a test of recoverability by comparing the carrying value of the asset or asset group to its undiscounted expected future cash flows. If cash flows cannot be separately and independently identified for a single asset, the Company will determine whether impairment has occurred for the group of assets for which we can identify the projected cash flows. If the carrying values are in excess of undiscounted expected future cash flows, the Company will measure any impairment by comparing the fair value of the asset or asset group to its carrying value. During the year ended December 31, 2018, there is no impairment to the intangible assets.

Revenue Recognition

The Company recognizes revenue under ASC 606, Revenue from Contracts with Customers. The core principle of the new revenue standard is that a company should recognize revenue to depict the transfer of promised goods or services to customers in an amount that reflects the consideration to which the company expects to be entitled in exchange for those goods or services. The following five steps are applied to achieve that core principle:

- Step 1: Identify the contract with the customer
- Step 2: Identify the performance obligations in the contract
- Step 3: Determine the transaction price
- Step 4: Allocate the transaction price to the performance obligations in the contract
- Step 5: Recognize revenue when the Company satisfies a performance obligation

In order to identify the performance obligations in a contract with a customer, a company must assess the promised goods or services in the contract and identify each promised good or service that is distinct. A performance obligation meets ASC 606's definition of a "distinct" good or service (or bundle of goods or services) if both of the following criteria are met: The customer can benefit from the good or service either on its own or together with other resources that are readily available to the customer (i.e., the good or service is capable of being distinct), and the entity's promise to transfer the good or service to the customer is separately identifiable from other promises in the contract (i.e., the promise to transfer the good or service is distinct within the context of the contract).

F-9

MARATHON PATENT GROUP, INC. AND SUBSIDIARIES

Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements

If a good or service is not distinct, the good or service is combined with other promised goods or services until a bundle of goods or services is identified that is distinct.

The transaction price is the amount of consideration to which an entity expects to be entitled in exchange for transferring promised goods or services to a customer. The consideration promised in a contract with a customer may include fixed amounts, variable amounts, or both. When determining the transaction price, an entity must consider the effects of all of the following:

Variable consideration

Constraining estimates of variable consideration

The existence of a significant financing component in the contract

Noncash consideration

Consideration payable to a customer

Variable consideration is included in the transaction price only to the extent that it is probable that a significant reversal in the amount of cumulative revenue recognized will not occur when the uncertainty associated with the variable consideration is subsequently resolved.

The transaction price is allocated to each performance obligation on a relative standalone selling price basis.

The transaction price allocated to each performance obligation is recognized when that performance obligation is satisfied, at a point in time or over time as appropriate.

Providing computing power in crypto asset transaction verification services is an output of the Company's ordinary activities. The provision of computing power is the only performance obligation in the Company's contracts with pool operators. The transaction consideration the Company receives, if any, is noncash consideration, which the Company

measures at fair value on the date received, which is not materially different than the fair value at contract inception. The consideration is all variable. Because it is not probable that a significant reversal of cumulative revenue will not occur, the consideration is constrained until the Company successfully places a block (by being the first to solve an algorithm) and the Company receives confirmation of the consideration it will receive, at which time revenue is recognized. There is no significant financing component in these transactions.

Fair value of the digital asset award received is determined using the average U.S. dollar spot rate of the related digital currency at the time of receipt.

Expenses associated with running the digital currency mining business, such as rent and electricity cost are also recorded as cost of revenues. Depreciation on digital currency mining equipment is recorded as a component of costs and expenses.

Related Party Transactions

Parties are considered related to the Company if the parties, directly or indirectly, through one or more intermediaries, control, are controlled by, or are under common control with the Company. Related parties also include principal owners of the Company, its management, members of the immediate families of principal owners of the Company and its management and other parties with which the Company may deal if one party controls or can significantly influence the management or operating policies of the other to an extent that one of the transacting parties might be prevented from fully pursuing its own separate interests. The Company discloses all related party transactions.

On October 11, 2018, the Company entered into a 2-year Employment Agreement, subject to successive 1 year extension, with Merrick Okamoto, pursuant to which Mr. Okamoto will serve as the Executive Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of the Company. Pursuant to the terms of the Agreement, Mr. Okamoto shall receive a base salary at an annual base salary of \$350,000 (subject to annual 3% cost of living increase) and an annual bonus up to 100% of base salary as determined by the Compensation Committee or the Board. As further consideration for Mr. Okamoto's services, the Company agreed to issue Mr. Okamoto 10-year stock options to purchase 5,000,000 shares of Common Stock, with a strike price of \$0.58 per share, vesting 50 % on the date of grant and 25% on each 6 months anniversary of the date of grant. As of December 31, 2018 no bonus has been accrued.

MARATHON PATENT GROUP, INC. AND SUBSIDIARIES

Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements

On October 15, 2018, the Company entered into a 2-year Employment Agreement, subject to successive 1 year extension, with David Lieberman, pursuant to which Mr. Lieberman will serve as the Chief Financial Officer of the Company. Pursuant to the terms of the Lieberman Agreement, Mr. Lieberman shall receive a base salary at an annual base salary of \$180,000 (subject to annual 3% cost of living increase) and an annual bonus up to 100% of base salary as determined by the Compensation Committee or the Board. As further consideration for Mr. Lieberman's services, the Company agreed to issue Mr. Lieberman 10-year stock options to purchase 200,000 shares of Common Stock, with a strike price of \$0.58 per share, vesting 50% on the date of grant and 25% on each 6 months anniversary of the date of grant. As of December 31, 2018 no bonus has been accrued.

At December 31, 2018 and 2017, the Company has fully reserved a Note Receivable on the Balance Sheets which consists of an uncollateralized note receivable in the amount of \$588,864 from nXn, an entity owned or controlled or previously owned or controlled by Erich Spangenberg, the Company's former director. The note receivable does not carry interest and was repayable to the Company at the earlier of March 31, 2018 or based upon certain milestones. The note receivable was not repaid by nXn and the Company took a full reserve for bad debt as of December 31, 2018 and 2017.

At December 31, 2018 and 2017, the Company owed Doug Croxall (former CEO), \$0 and \$124,297, respectively (comprised of \$187,500 bonus payable and \$63,203 advance).

Fair Value of Financial Instruments

The Company measures at fair value certain of its financial and non-financial assets and liabilities by using a fair value hierarchy that prioritizes the inputs to valuation techniques used to measure fair value. Fair value is the price that would be received to sell an asset or paid to transfer a liability in an orderly transaction between market participants at the measurement date, essentially an exit price, based on the highest and best use of the asset or liability. The levels of the fair value hierarchy are:

- Level 1: Observable inputs such as quoted market prices in active markets for identical assets or liabilities
- Level 2: Observable market-based inputs or unobservable inputs that are corroborated by market data

Edgar Filing: Marathon Patent Group, Inc. - Form 10-K

Level 3: Unobservable inputs for which there is little or no market data, which require the use of the reporting entity's own assumptions.

The carrying amounts reported in the consolidated balance sheet for cash, accounts receivable, accounts payable, and accrued expenses, approximate their estimated fair market value based on the short-term maturity of these instruments. The carrying value of notes payable and other long-term liabilities approximate fair value as the related interest rates approximate rates currently available to the Company.

Financial assets and liabilities are classified in their entirety within the fair value hierarchy based on the lowest level of input that is significant to their fair value measurement. The Company measures the fair value of its marketable securities by taking into consideration valuations obtained from third-party pricing sources. The pricing services utilize industry standard valuation models, including both income and market-based approaches, for which all significant inputs are observable, either directly or indirectly, to estimate fair value. These inputs included reported trades of and broker-dealer quotes on the same or similar securities, issuer credit spreads, benchmark securities and other observable inputs.

The following tables present information about the Company's assets and liabilities measured at fair value on a recurring basis and the Company's estimated level within the fair value hierarchy of those assets and liabilities as of December 31, 2018 and December 31, 2017, respectively:

Fair value measured at December 31, 2018

	Total carrying value at December 31, 2018	Quoted prices in active markets (Level 1)	Significant other observable inputs (Level 2)	Significant unobservable inputs (Level 3)
Liabilities				
Warrant liability	\$ 39,083	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 39,083

Fair value measured at December 31, 2017

	Total carrying value at December 31, 2017	Quoted prices in active markets (Level 1)	Significant other observable inputs (Level 2)	Significant unobservable inputs (Level 3)
Liabilities				
Warrant liability	\$ 1,794,396	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,794,396

MARATHON PATENT GROUP, INC. AND SUBSIDIARIES**Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements**

There were no transfers between Level 1, 2 or 3 during the year ended December 31, 2018.

At December 31, 2018, the Company had an outstanding warrant liability in the amount of \$39,083 associated with warrants that were issued in January 2017 and warrants issued related to the Convertible Notes issued in August and September of 2017. The following table rolls forward the fair value of the Company's warrant liability, the fair value of which is determined by Level 3 inputs for the year ended December 31, 2018.

FV of warrant liabilities

	Fair value
Outstanding as of December 31, 2016	\$-
Issued	2,600,930
Equity warrant purchase	(1,118,660)
Exercised	(13,280)
Exchanged to Series E	(21,525,410)
Change to equity	(4,907)
Change in fair value of warrants	21,855,723
Outstanding as of December 31, 2017	1,794,396
Exercised	(55,791)
Change in fair value of warrants	(1,699,522)
Outstanding as of December 31, 2018	\$39,083

Income Taxes

The Company accounts for income taxes pursuant to the provision of ASC 740-10, "Accounting for Income Taxes" which requires, among other things, an asset and liability approach to calculating deferred income taxes. The asset and liability approach requires the recognition of deferred tax assets and liabilities for the expected future tax consequences of temporary differences between the carrying amounts and the tax bases of assets and liabilities. A valuation allowance is provided to offset any net deferred tax assets for which management believes it is more likely than not that the net deferred asset will not be realized.

The Company follows the provision of the ASC 740-10 related to Accounting for Uncertain Income Tax Position. When tax returns are filed, it is more likely than not that some positions taken would be sustained upon examination by the taxing authorities, while others are subject to uncertainty about the merits of the position taken or the amount of the position that would be ultimately sustained. In accordance with the guidance of ASC 740-10, the benefit of a tax position is recognized in the financial statements in the period during which, based on all available evidence, management believes it is most likely that not that the position will be sustained upon examination, including the resolution of appeals or litigation processes, if any. Tax positions taken are not offset or aggregated with other positions.

Tax positions that meet the more-likely-than-not recognition threshold are measured as the largest amount of tax benefit that is more than 50% likely of being realized upon settlement with the applicable taxing authority. The portion of the benefits associated with tax positions taken that exceeds the amount measured as described above should be reflected as a liability for uncertain tax benefits in the accompanying balance sheet along with any associated interest and penalties that would be payable to the taxing authorities upon examination. The Company believes its tax positions will more likely than not be upheld upon examination. As such, the Company has not recorded a liability for uncertain tax benefits.

MARATHON PATENT GROUP, INC. AND SUBSIDIARIES**Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements****Basic and Diluted Net Loss per Share**

Net loss per common share is calculated in accordance with ASC Topic 260: Earnings Per Share (“ASC 260”). Basic loss per share is computed by dividing net loss by the weighted average number of shares of common stock outstanding during the period. The computation of diluted net loss per share does not include dilutive common stock equivalents in the weighted average shares outstanding, as they would be anti-dilutive.

Securities that could potentially dilute loss per share in the future that were not included in the computation of diluted loss per share at December 31, 2018 and 2017 are as follows:

	As of December 31,	
	2018	2017
Warrants to purchase common stock	728,764	773,966
Options to purchase common stock	5,866,079	448,772
Preferred stock to exchange common stock	-	5,511,701
Convertible notes to exchange common stock	1,248,882	3,503,948
Total	7,843,725	10,238,387

The following table sets forth the computation of basic and diluted loss per share:

	For the year ended December 31,	
	2018	2017
Net loss attributable to common shareholders	\$(12,814,324)	\$(31,333,569)
Denominator:		
Weighted average common shares - basic and diluted	21,263,774	6,522,649
Loss per common share - basic and diluted	\$(0.60) \$(4.80

Impairment of Long-lived Assets

Management reviews long-lived assets for impairment whenever events or changes in circumstances indicate that the carrying amount of an asset may not be recoverable. Recoverability of assets to be held and used is measured by a comparison of the carrying amount of an asset to undiscounted future cash flows expected to be generated by the asset. If such assets are considered to be impaired, the impairment to be recognized is measured by the amount by which the carrying amount of the assets exceeds the fair value of the assets. Based on its reviews, management determined that its crypto-currency machines were impaired by a total of \$2,222,688 based upon an assessment as of December 31, 2018, including consideration of the decline in bitcoin values which occurred commencing in late December 2017 and into 2018.

Stock-Based Compensation

The Company expenses stock-based compensation to employees over the requisite service period based on the estimated grant-date fair value of the awards and forfeiture rates. For stock-based compensation awards to non-employees, the Company remeasures the fair value of the non-employee awards at each reporting period prior to vesting and finally at the vesting date of the award. Changes in the estimated fair value of these non-employee awards are recognized as compensation expense in the period of change.

The Company estimates the fair value of stock option grants using the Black-Scholes option pricing model and the assumptions used in calculating the fair value of stock-based awards represent management's best estimates and involve inherent uncertainties and the application of management's judgment.

Recent Accounting Pronouncements

In August 2018, the SEC adopted the final rule under SEC Release No. 33-10532, Disclosure Update and Simplification, amending certain disclosure requirements that were redundant, duplicative, overlapping, outdated or superseded. In addition, the amendments expanded the disclosure requirements on the analysis of stockholders' equity for interim financial statements. Under the amendments, an analysis of changes in each caption of stockholders' equity presented in the balance sheet must be provided in a note or separate statement. The analysis should present a reconciliation of the beginning balance to the ending balance of each period for which a statement of comprehensive income is required to be filed. This final rule is effective on November 5, 2018. We are evaluating the impact of this guidance on our consolidated financial statements.

MARATHON PATENT GROUP, INC. AND SUBSIDIARIES

Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements

In June 2018, the FASB issued ASU 2018-07, “*Improvements to Nonemployee Share-Based Payment Accounting*”, which simplifies the accounting for share-based payments granted to nonemployees for goods and services. Under the ASU, most of the guidance on such payments to nonemployees would be aligned with the requirements for share-based payments granted to employees. The changes take effect for public companies for fiscal years starting after December 15, 2018, including interim periods within that fiscal year. For all other entities, the amendments are effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2019, and interim periods within fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2020. Early adoption is permitted, but no earlier than an entity’s adoption date of Topic 606. The Company adopted of this ASU on January 1, 2019, and the adoption of this ASU did not have a material impact on the Company’s consolidated financial statements.

In July 2017, the FASB issued ASU 2017-11, “*Earnings Per Share (Topic 260) Distinguishing Liabilities from Equity (Topic 480) Derivatives and Hedging (Topic 815)*,” which addresses the complexity of accounting for certain financial instruments with down round features. Down round features are features of certain equity-linked instruments (or embedded features) that result in the strike price being reduced on the basis of the pricing of future equity offerings. Current accounting guidance creates cost and complexity for entities that issue financial instruments (such as warrants and convertible instruments) with down round features that require fair value measurement of the entire instrument or conversion option. For public business entities, the amendments in Part I of this Update are effective for fiscal years, and interim periods within those fiscal years, beginning after December 15, 2018 with early adoption permitted. The Company adopted of this ASU on January 1, 2019, and the adoption of this ASU did not have a material impact on the Company’s consolidated financial statements.

In May 2017, the FASB issued ASU No. 2017-09, *Compensation - Stock Compensation (Topic 718): Scope of Modification Accounting*. This ASU provides clarity about which changes to the terms or conditions of a share-based payment award require the application of modification accounting. Specifically, ASU 2017-09 clarifies that changes to the terms or conditions of an award should be accounted for as a modification unless all of the following are met: 1) the fair value of the modified award is the same as the fair value of the original award immediately before the original award is modified, 2) the vesting conditions of the modified award are the same as the vesting conditions of the original award immediately before the original award is modified and 3) the classification of the modified award as an equity instrument or a liability instrument is the same as the classification of the original award immediately before the original award is modified. ASU 2017-09 is effective for annual reporting periods beginning after December 15, 2017 and early adoption is permitted. The Company adopted ASU 2017-09 on January 1, 2018 and the adoption did not have a material impact on the Company’s accounting for share-based payment awards, as changes to awards’ terms and conditions subsequent to the grant date are unusual and infrequent in nature.

In January 2017, the FASB issued ASU 2017-01 *Business Combinations (Topic 805): Clarifying the Definition of a Business* (“ASU 2017-01”), which clarifies the definition of a business and assists entities with evaluating whether transactions should be accounted for as acquisitions (or disposals) of assets or businesses. Under this guidance, when substantially all of the fair value of gross assets acquired is concentrated in a single asset (or group of similar assets), the assets acquired would not represent a business. In addition, in order to be considered a business, an acquisition would have to include at a minimum an input and a substantive process that together significantly contribute to the ability to create an output. The amended guidance also narrows the definition of outputs by more closely aligning it with how outputs are described in FASB guidance for revenue recognition. This guidance is effective for interim and annual periods beginning after December 15, 2017, with early adoption permitted. The Company adopted ASU 2017-01 on January 1, 2018 and the adoption did not have a material impact on the Company’s consolidated financial statements and notes thereto.

In May 2014, the FASB issued ASU No. 2014-09, *Revenue from Contracts with Customers*, as a new Topic, (ASC) Topic 606. The new revenue recognition standard provides a five-step analysis of transactions to determine when and how revenue is recognized. The core principle is that a company should recognize revenue to depict the transfer of promised goods or services to customers in an amount that reflects the consideration to which the entity expects to be entitled in exchange for those goods or services. In August 2015, the FASB issued ASU No. 2015-14, *Revenue from Contracts with Customers: Deferral of the Effective Date*, which deferred the effective date of the new revenue standard for periods beginning after December 15, 2016 to December 15, 2017, with early adoption permitted but not earlier than the original effective date. This ASU must be applied retrospectively to each period presented or as a cumulative-effect adjustment as of the date of adoption. We are considering the alternatives of adoption of this ASU and we are conducting our review of the likely impact to the existing portfolio of customer contracts entered into prior to adoption. The Company adopted ASU 2014-09 on January 1, 2018 under the modified retrospective approach and the adoption did not have a material impact on the Company’s results of operations, cash flows and financial position.

MARATHON PATENT GROUP, INC. AND SUBSIDIARIES

Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements

In February 2016, the FASB issued ASU 2016-02, *Leases* (Topic 842) in order to increase transparency and comparability among organizations by, among other provisions, recognizing lease assets and lease liabilities on the balance sheet for those leases classified as operating leases under previous GAAP. For public companies, ASU 2016-02 is effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2018 (including interim periods within those periods) using a modified retrospective approach and early adoption is permitted. In transition, entities may also elect a package of practical expedients that must be applied in its entirety to all leases commencing before the adoption date, unless the lease is modified, and permits entities to not reassess (a) the existence of a lease, (b) lease classification or (c) determination of initial direct costs, as of the adoption date, which effectively allows entities to carryforward accounting conclusions under previous U.S. GAAP. In July 2018, the FASB issued ASU 2018-11, *Leases* (Topic 842): Targeted Improvements, which provides entities an optional transition method to apply the guidance under Topic 842 as of the adoption date, rather than as of the earliest period presented. The Company adopted Topic 842 on January 1, 2019, using the optional transition method to apply the new guidance as of January 1, 2019, rather than as of the earliest period presented, and elected the package of practical expedients described above. The Company is still finalizing its analysis, but expects the adoption will not have a material impact on the Company's consolidated financial statements.

Any new accounting standards, not disclosed above, that have been issued or proposed by FASB that do not require adoption until a future date are not expected to have a material impact on the financial statements upon adoption.

NOTE 3 – PATENT PURCHASES

On January 11, 2018, Marathon Patent Group, Inc. (the "Company") entered into a Patent Rights Purchase and Assignment Agreement (the "Agreement"), with XpresSpa Group, Inc., a Delaware Corporation (the "Seller") and Crypto Currency Patent Holdings Company LLC, a Delaware limited liability company and wholly owned subsidiary of the Company ("CCPHC"). Pursuant to the Agreement, the Seller agreed to irrevocably assign, sell, grant, transfer and convey, and CCPHC agreed to accept and acquire, the exclusive right, title and interest in and to certain patents owned by the Seller ("Assigned IP"), subject to the terms and conditions set forth in the Agreement. As consideration for the Assigned IP, the Seller shall receive (i) payment in the amount of \$250,000 from CCPHC and (ii) 250,000 shares of common stock of the Company, par value \$0.0001 per share (the "Consideration Shares"), with piggyback registration rights. The Consideration Shares shall be issued by the Company to the Seller, subject to the terms and conditions of a lock-up agreement. The fair value of the 250,000 shares was \$960,000 and was based upon the closing price of the Company's common stock.

As a condition to the Agreement, the Seller agreed to enter into a lock-up agreement with the Company, which lock-up agreement is included as an exhibit to the Agreement (the “Lock-up Agreement”). Pursuant to the Lock-up Agreement, the Seller shall not directly or indirectly offer, sell, pledge or transfer, or otherwise dispose of, the Consideration Shares for a period of 180 days commencing on January 11, 2018 and ending on July 11, 2018; provided, however, upon the effective date of the registration for resale of the Consideration Shares, and on each day thereafter, one twentieth (1/20) of the Consideration Shares shall be released from the restrictions contained in the Lock-up Agreement and may be freely sold, transferred, traded or otherwise disposed of. Notwithstanding the foregoing, in the event that the Consideration Shares, in whole or in part, are not registered for resale on the 6-month anniversary of the date of issuance of the Consideration Shares (“Six-Month Date”), the holders thereof may sell, transfer, trade or otherwise dispose of one twentieth (1/20) of the Consideration Shares on the Six-Month Date and on each day thereafter.

In addition, the Company agreed to issue 25,000 shares of the Company’s common stock to Andrew Kennedy Lang, one of the named inventors of the patents, in exchange for consulting services, and 50,000 shares of the Company’s common stock to another individual in exchange for consulting services, in connection with the acquisition of the Assigned IP. The fair value of these shares was \$278,750 and was based upon the closing price of the Company’s common stock on date of agreement. The Company recorded the fair value of these shares as a component of compensation and related taxes expense.

NOTE 4 – DIGITAL ASSET MINING

On February 7, 2018, Marathon Crypto Mining, Inc. (“MCM”), a Nevada corporation and wholly owned subsidiary of the Company, entered into an agreement to acquire 1,400 Bitmain’s Antminer S9 miners (“Antminer S9s”). The purchase price was \$4,557,072. The Company also paid installation costs of \$694,647 (total paid and capitalized was \$5,251,719). The Company will depreciate the Antminer S9’s and related installation costs over a two-year period. Depreciation for the year ended December 31, 2018 was \$2,003,696 million. During the year ended December 31, 2018, the Company recorded a \$2,222,688 charge for the impairment of the mining equipment.

On February 12, 2018, in connection with the intended mining operations of MCM, the Company assumed a lease contract dated November 11, 2017 (the “Lease Agreement”) by and between 9349-0001 Quebec Inc. (the “Lessor”) and Blocespace Inc., formerly known as Cryptospace Inc. (the “Lessee”). Pursuant to the Lease Agreement, among other things, the Lessee leases a building of 26,700 square feet (the “Property”) in Quebec, Canada, for an initial term of five (5) years (the “Term”), commencing on December 1, 2017 and terminating on November 30, 2022. The Lessee shall pay a monthly rent of \$10,013 Canadian Dollars (“CAD”) plus tax, or an annual rent of \$120,150 CAD plus tax (“Yearly Rent”). At the signing of the Lease Agreement, the Lessee paid the Lessor a deposit equal to the Yearly Rent which amount will be dispersed during the Term as set forth in the Lease Agreement. Lease expense for the year ended December 31, 2018 was \$88,043.

MARATHON PATENT GROUP, INC. AND SUBSIDIARIES**Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements**

The Lessee assigned the Lease Agreement to MCM pursuant to an Assignment and Assumption Agreement (the “Assignment”) by and between the Company and the Lessee’s parent company, Bloctechnologies Canada Inc. Subject to the terms and conditions of the Assignment, MCM agreed to observe all the covenants and conditions of the Lease Agreement, including the payment of all rents due. The Company shall be responsible for all necessary capital expenditures in connection with capital improvements to the Property to set up MCM’s mining operations.

The components of property, equipment and intangible assets as of December 31, 2018 and 2017 are:

	Useful life (Years)	December 31, 2018	December 31, 2017
Website	7	\$ 121,787	\$ 121,787
Mining equipment	2	3,029,031	-
Mining patent	17	1,210,000	-
Gross property, equipment and intangible assets		4,360,818	121,787
Less: Accumulated depreciation and amortization		(2,181,488)	(111,776)
Property, equipment and intangible assets, net		\$2,179,330	\$ 10,011

The Company’s depreciation expense for the years ended December 31, 2018 and 2017 were \$2.0 million and \$0, and amortization expense were \$66,017 and \$24,802 for the year ended December 31, 2018 and 2017, respectively.

NOTE 5 - STOCKHOLDERS’ EQUITY**Series B Convertible Preferred Stock**

As of December 31, 2018 and 2017, there was no share of Series B Convertible Preferred Stock outstanding.

Series E Preferred Stock

During the year ended December 31, 2018, 5,513 shares of the Series E Convertible Preferred Stock had been converted to the Company's Common Stock and there was no Series E Convertible Preferred Stock outstanding as of December 31, 2018 and 5,513 shares of Series E Convertible Preferred Stock outstanding as of December 31, 2017, respectively.

Common Stock

During the year ended December 31, 2018, the Company issued 3,819,485 shares of Common Stock to Note Holders in connection with debt conversions, 218,400 shares of Common Stock were issued to Board members for their services, 5,511,543 shares of Common Stock with respect to the conversion of Series E Convertible Preferred Stock, 17,731 shares of Common Stock in connection with the exercise of a warrant, 250,000 shares of Common Stock issued pursuant to a patent purchase, 225,000 shares of Common Stock issued to consultants and 3,000,000 to GBV as a termination fee for canceling the merger agreement. The termination fee was valued based upon the closing stock price as of June 28, 2018 or \$0.95 per common share.

During the year ended December 31, 2017, the Company issued 238,750 shares of Common Stock to vendors to settle partial or total payment of outstanding invoices, 1,807,565 shares of Common Stock were issued to Note Holders in connection with debt conversions, 1,631,699 shares of Common Stock were issued to consultants and employees for their services, 628,438 shares of Common Stock with respect to the conversion of Series D Convertible Preferred Stock, 195,500 shares of Common Stock with respect to the conversion of Series B Convertible Preferred Stock, 598,500 shares of Common Stock in connection with the exercise of a warrant.

MARATHON PATENT GROUP, INC. AND SUBSIDIARIES

Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements

Common Stock Warrants

As of December 31, 2018, the Company had warrants outstanding to purchase 728,764 shares of Common Stock with a weighted average remaining life of 3.1 years. A summary of the status of the Company's outstanding stock warrants and changes during year ended is as follows:

	Number of Warrants	Weighted Average Exercise Price	Weighted Average Remaining Contractual Life (in years)
Outstanding as of December 31, 2017	773,966	\$ 5.99	4.1
Expired	(1,202)	15.60	-
Exercised	(44,000)	1.20	-
Outstanding as of December 31, 2018	728,764	\$ 6.26	3.1
Warrants exercisable as of December 31, 2018	728,764	\$ 6.26	3.1

As of December 31, 2017, the Company had warrants outstanding to purchase 773,966 shares of Common Stock with a weighted average remaining life of 4.1 years. A summary of the status of the Company's outstanding stock warrants and changes during year ended is as follows:

	Number of Warrants	Weighted Average Exercise Price	Weighted Average Remaining Contractual Life (in years)
Outstanding as of December 31, 2016	116,519	\$ 15.18	3.2
Granted	7,941,374	1.70	5.0
Expired	(37,177)	15.60	-
Exercised	(7,246,750)	1.38	-

Edgar Filing: Marathon Patent Group, Inc. - Form 10-K

Outstanding as of December 31, 2017	773,966	\$ 5.99	4.1
Warrants exercisable as of December 31, 2017	773,966	\$ 5.99	4.1

Common Stock Options

On October 12, 2018, the Company granted its executive officers and board members 5,450,000 option to purchase 5,450,000 shares of the Company's common stock, with an exercise price of \$0.58 per share, vesting 50 % on the date of grant and 25% on each 6 months anniversary of the date of grant. The options were valued based on the Black-Scholes model, using the strike of \$0.58 per share, an average expected term of 5.19 years, volatility of 39.35% based on the average volatility of comparable companies over the comparable prior period. The grant date fair value of stock options granted to employees during the years ended December 31, 2018 and 2017 were \$1,377,678 and \$0, respectively. Estimated future stock-based compensation expense relating to unvested stock options is approximately \$0.5 million as of December 31, 2018 and will be amortized over the remaining 1.0 years.

A summary of the stock options as of December 31, 2018 and changes during the period are presented below:

	Number of Shares	Weighted Average Exercise Price	Weighted Average Remaining Contractual Life (in years)
Outstanding as of December 31, 2017	448,771	\$ 15.50	6.23
Granted	5,450,000	\$ 0.58	9.78
Expired	(32,692)	10.71	-
Outstanding as of December 31, 2018	5,866,079	\$ 1.67	9.49
Options vested and expected to vest as of December 31, 2018	5,866,079	\$ 1.67	9.49
Options vested and exercisable as of December 31, 2018	3,132,051	\$ 2.58	9.25

MARATHON PATENT GROUP, INC. AND SUBSIDIARIES**Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements**

A summary of the stock options as of December 31, 2017 and changes during the period are presented below:

	Number of Shares	Weighted Average Exercise Price	Weighted Average Remaining Contractual Life (in years)
Outstanding as of December 31, 2016	879,034	\$ 14.34	6.79
Forfeited	(430,263)	13.13	-
Outstanding as of December 31, 2017	448,771	\$ 15.50	6.23
Options vested and expected to vest as of December 31, 2017	448,771	\$ 15.50	6.23
Options vested and exercisable as of December 31, 2017	433,667	\$ 15.53	6.16

NOTE 6 - DEBT, COMMITMENTS AND CONTINGENCIES

Debt consists of the following:

	Maturity Date	Interest Rate	December 31, 2018	December 31, 2017
Convertible Note	4/30/2019	5 %	\$999,106	\$4,053,948
Less: debt discount	and 4/30/2019		-	(2,290,028)
Total Convertible notes, net of discount			\$999,106	\$1,763,920
Total			\$999,106	\$1,763,920
Less: current portion			(999,106)	(1,763,920)
Total, net of current portion			\$-	\$-

On August 14, 2017, the Company entered into a unit purchase agreement (the “Unit Purchase Agreement”) with certain accredited investors providing for the sale of up to \$5,500,000 of 5% secured convertible promissory notes (the “Convertible Notes”), which are convertible into shares of the Corporation’s common stock, and the issuance of warrants

to purchase 6,875,000 shares of the Company's Common Stock (the "Warrants"). The Convertible Notes are convertible into shares of the Company's Common Stock at a price equal to the lesser of (i) \$0.80 per share or (ii) the closing bid price of the Company's common stock on the day prior to conversion of a Convertible Note; provided that such conversion price may not be less than \$0.40 per share. The Convertible Notes contain "blocker" provisions which state that the holder may not initiate any conversion that would result in the holder and its affiliates owning above 4.99% of the issued and outstanding stock of the Company upon effecting the conversion. The holder may increase this limitation with 61 days' prior notice, but in no case, may a conversion be effected if it would result in the holder and affiliates owning more than 9.9% of the issued and outstanding stock of the Company upon completion of the conversion. The Warrants have an exercise price of \$1.20 per share. The Convertible Notes originally matured on May 31, 2018 and bear interest at the rate of 5% per annum. In two closings of the Unit Purchase Agreement, the Company issued all \$5,500,000 in Convertible Notes to the investors. The investor has agreed to an extension of the maturity date of the note to April 30, 2019. As of December 31, 2018, the Company had an outstanding obligation pursuant to the Convertible Notes in the amount of \$999,106. Accrued interest as of December 31, 2018 was \$144,981. During the year ended December 31, 2018 the interest expense was \$72,104, and \$73,622 for the year ended December 31, 2017, respectively.

During the year ended December 31, 2018, the amortization of debt discount was \$2,290,028 million, and \$3,561,109 for the year ended December 31, 2017, respectively.

MARATHON PATENT GROUP, INC. AND SUBSIDIARIES

Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements

Office Lease

Effective June 1, 2018, the Company rented its corporate office at 1180 North Town Center Drive, Suite 100, Las Vegas, Nevada 89144, on a month to month basis. The monthly rent is \$1,907. A security deposit of \$3,815 has been paid.

Legal Proceedings

Feinberg Litigation

On March 27, 2018, Jeffrey Feinberg, purportedly joined by the Jeffrey L. Feinberg Personal Trust and the Jeffrey L. Feinberg Family Trust, filed a complaint against the Company and certain of its former officers and directors. The complaint was filed in the Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of New York. The plaintiffs purported to state claims under Sections 11, 12(a)(2) and 15 of the federal Securities Act of 1933 and common law claims for “actual fraud and fraudulent concealment,” constructive fraud, and negligent misrepresentation, seeking unspecified money damages (including punitive damages), as well as costs and attorneys’ fees, and equitable or injunctive relief. On June 15, 2018, the defendants filed a motion to dismiss all claims asserted in the complaint and, on July 27, 2018, the plaintiffs filed an opposition to that motion. The court heard argument on the motion and, on January 15, 2019, the court granted the motion to dismiss, allowing 30 days for the filing of an amended complaint. On February 15, 2019, Jeffrey Feinberg, individually and as trustee of the Jeffrey L. Feinberg Personal Trust, and Terrence K. Ankner, as trustee of the Jeffrey L. Feinberg Family Trust, filed an amended complaint that purports to state the same claims and seeks the same relief sought in the original complaint. Defendants have not yet responded to the amended complaint.

Ramirez Litigation

On July 20, 2018, Tony Ramirez filed a complaint against the Company and certain of its former directors. The complaint was filed in the United States District Court for the Central District of California. Mr. Ramirez alleged that he was a shareholder of the Company and purported to assert a single claim under Section 14(a) of the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 and SEC Rule 14a-9 promulgated thereunder. The parties entered into a “Settlement Agreement

and Mutual Release” and the case was voluntarily dismissed with prejudice on December 17, 2018.

Amazon Litigation

As part of the cancellation of certain indebtedness owed to Fortress Investment Group, LLC, we transferred ownership of various patents, including U.S. Patent No. 7,177,798, commonly referred to as “Patent 798.” Fortress created a new Special Purpose Entity, CF Dynamic Advances LLC, in which we own a 30% interest. In May 2018, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute and CF Dynamic Advances LLC filed a complaint against Amazon.com, Inc. in the United States District Court for the Northern District of New York, which alleges, among other things, that “Alexa Voice Software and Alexa enabled devices” infringe U.S. Patent No. 7,177,798, entitled “Natural Language Interface Using Constrained Intermediate Dictionary of Results.” The complaint seeks an injunction, monetary damages, an ongoing royalty, pre- and post-judgment interest, attorneys’ fees, and costs. If plaintiffs are successful, and if the recoveries or settlement proceeds are sufficient following litigation expenses and recovery of amounts due in connection with the cancelled loan, the special purpose entity could be entitled to a portion of the net proceeds. There can be no assurance that the plaintiff will be successful or that any recoveries will exceed amounts due under the debt settlement arrangements or that our 30% interest in the special purpose entity will have any value even if the plaintiffs are successful in their case against Amazon.

NOTE 7 - INCOME TAXES

The Company accounts for income taxes under ASC Topic 740: Income Taxes, which requires the recognition of deferred tax assets and liabilities for both the expected impact of differences between the financial statements and the tax basis of assets and liabilities, and for the expected future tax benefit to be derived from tax losses and tax credit carry-forwards. ASC Topic 740 additionally requires the establishment of a valuation allowance to reflect the likelihood of realization of deferred tax assets.

The table below summarizes the differences between the Companies’ effective tax rate and the statutory federal rate as follows for the years ended December 31, 2018 and 2017:

	2018	2017
Computed “expected” tax expense (benefit)	(21.00)%	(34.00)%
State income taxes	- %	(7.99)%
Permanent differences	- %	1.33 %
Change in federal rate	- %	28.52 %
Timing differences	- %	- %
Change in valuation allowance	21.00 %	12.10 %
Effective tax rate	- %	(0.33)%

MARATHON PATENT GROUP, INC. AND SUBSIDIARIES**Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements**

The Company has a deferred tax asset, which is summarized as follows at December 31:

	2018	2017
Deferred tax assets:		
Total deferred tax assets	\$22,907,783	\$21,119,444
Total deferred tax liabilities	-	-
Less: valuation allowance	(22,907,783)	(21,119,444)
Net deferred tax asset	\$-	\$57,349

The Company does not have any taxable income in carryback years in which net operating losses (“NOLs”) can be carried back to. At December 31, 2018, the Company did not have any taxable temporary differences that will reverse and generate taxable income and was still in a cumulative loss position. Based on all the available information, including tax planning strategies and future forecast, the Company does not believe that it is more likely than not that the net deferred tax assets will be realized; therefore, a full valuation allowance has been recorded against its net deferred tax assets.

As of December 31, 2018 and 2017, the Company had NOL carry-forwards for federal and state purposes of approximately \$11.4 million and \$29.9 million, respectively, which will begin to expire in 2033. The utilization of NOL and credit carry-forwards may be limited under the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code (“IRC”) Section 382, as amended, and similar state provisions. IRC Section 382 generally imposes an annual limitation on the amount of NOL carry-forwards that may be used to offset taxable income where a corporation has undergone significant changes in stock ownership.

On December 22, 2017, the U.S. federal government enacted the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, as amended (the “2017 Tax Act”). Management reviewed and incorporated the new tax bill implications in the 2017 financial statements. The main change is the re-measurement of deferred taxes at the new corporate tax rate of 21%, which reduced the Company’s net deferred tax assets, before valuation allowance, by \$1.2 million and \$9.0 million for the years ended December 2018 and 2017, respectively. Due to full valuation allowance, the change in deferred taxes was fully offset by the change in valuation allowance.

As of December 31, 2018 and 2017, the Company has not recorded liability for unrecognized tax benefit. As of December 31, 2018 and 2017 the Company did not increase or decrease penalties or interest in connection with

liability for unrecognized tax benefit. The Company does not expect its unrecognized tax benefits to change significantly over the next 12 months. The Company files U.S. and state income tax returns with varying statutes of limitations. The 2014 through 2017 tax years generally remain subject to examination by federal and state tax authorities.

In 2018, the company dissolved those subsidiaries that were required to file tax returns that had no tax due for 2018. Marathon Patent Group, Inc. moved its headquarters to Las Vegas, Nevada on June 1, 2018 so it is required to file a final tax return with the state of California for 2018. The company believes there will be no tax due the state of California other than the \$800 Franchise fee all companies are required to file.

NOTE 8 – Subsequent Events

The Company has evaluated subsequent events through the date the consolidated financial statements were available to be issued and has concluded that no such events or transactions took place that would require disclosure herein. On March 11, 2019, the board of directors approved a reverse stock split of the Company's Common Stock by a ratio 4-for-1 upon the filing and effectiveness, which shall occur on April 8, 2019 pursuant to the Nevada Revised Statutes of this amendment of the Corporation's Amended and Restated Articles of Incorporations.

ITEM 9. CHANGES IN AND DISAGREEMENTS WITH ACCOUNTANTS ON ACCOUNTING AND FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

None.

ITEM 9A. CONTROLS AND PROCEDURES

Management's Conclusions Regarding Effectiveness of Disclosure Controls and Procedures

We conducted an evaluation of the effectiveness of our “disclosure controls and procedures” (“Disclosure Controls”), as defined by Rules 13a-15(e) and 15d-15(e) of the Exchange Act, as of December 31, 2018, the end of the period covered by this Annual Report on Form 10-K. The Disclosure Controls evaluation was done under the supervision and with the participation of management, including our Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer, with the goal being that the information required to be disclosed by us in reports filed under the Exchange Act is (i) recorded, processed, summarized and reported within the time periods specified in the SEC’s rules and forms and (ii) accumulated and communicated to our management, including our principal executive and principal financial officers, or persons performing similar functions, as appropriate to allow timely decisions regarding disclosure. There are inherent limitations to the effectiveness of any system of disclosure controls and procedures. Accordingly, even effective disclosure controls and procedures can only provide reasonable assurance of achieving their control objectives. Based upon this evaluation, our Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer concluded that, because of a material weakness in our internal control over financial reporting, described below in Management’s Report on Internal Control Over Financial Reporting, our disclosure controls and procedures were not effective as of December 31, 2018.

Management's Report on Internal Control over Financial Reporting

Our management is responsible for establishing and maintaining adequate internal control over financial reporting as defined in Rules 13a-15(f) and 15d-15(f) under the Exchange Act. Our management is also required to assess and report on the effectiveness of our internal control over financial reporting in accordance with Section 404 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (“Section 404”). Our internal control over financial reporting is a process designed to provide reasonable assurance regarding the reliability of financial reporting and the preparation of financial statements for external purposes of accounting principles generally accepted in the United States. Management assessed the effectiveness of our internal control over financial reporting as of December 31, 2018. In making this assessment, we used the criteria set forth by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission (“COSO”) in Internal Control - Integrated Framework in the 2013 COSO framework. During our assessment of the effectiveness of

internal control over financial reporting as of December 31, 2018, management identified a material weakness with respect to the financial reporting and close process, resulting from a lack of segregation of duties within accounting functions and evidence of control review. Accordingly, management concluded that our internal controls over financial reporting were not effective as of December 31, 2018.

Due to our size and nature, segregation of all conflicting duties may not always be possible and may not be economically feasible. However, to the extent possible, we will implement procedures to assure that the initiation of transactions, the custody of assets and the recording of transactions will be performed by separate individuals.

We believe that the foregoing steps if implemented, will help remediate the material weakness identified above, and we will continue to monitor the effectiveness of these steps and make any changes that our management deems appropriate. Due to the nature of this material weakness in our internal control over financial reporting, there is more than a remote likelihood that misstatements which could be material to our annual or interim financial statements could occur that would not be prevented or detected.

A material weakness is a deficiency, or a combination of deficiencies, in internal control over financial reporting, such that there is a reasonable possibility that a material misstatement of our annual or interim financial statements will not be prevented or detected on a timely basis. A significant deficiency is a deficiency, or a combination of deficiencies, in internal control over financial reporting that is less severe than a material weakness, yet important enough to merit attention by those responsible for oversight of the company's financial reporting.

Because of its inherent limitations, internal control over financial reporting may not prevent or detect misstatements. Projections of any evaluation of effectiveness to future periods are subject to the risk that controls may become inadequate because of changes in conditions, or that the degree of compliance with the policies and procedures may deteriorate.

This Annual Report on Form 10-K does not include an attestation report of the Company's independent registered public accounting firm regarding internal control over financial reporting since the Company is a smaller reporting company under the rules of the SEC.

Changes in Internal Control over Financial Reporting.

There have been no changes in our internal control over financial reporting during the year ended December 31, 2018 that have materially affected, or are reasonably likely to materially affect, our internal controls over financial reporting.

ITEM 9B. OTHER INFORMATION

None.

37

PART III**ITEM 10. DIRECTORS, EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AND CORPORATE GOVERNANCE**

The following table presents information with respect to our officers, directors and significant employees as of the date of this Report:

Name and Address	Age	Date First Elected or Appointed	Position(s)
Merrick Okamoto	58	August 13, 2017	Chief Executive Officer
David Lieberman	74	August 13, 2017	Chief Financial Officer and Director
James Crawford	44	March 1, 2013	Chief Operating Officer
Fred Thiel	58	April 24, 2018	Director
Michael Rudolph	68	August 17, 2018	Director
Michael Berg	69	August 17, 2018	Director

Background of officers and directors

The following is a brief account of the education and business experience during at least the past five years of our officers and directors, indicating each person's principal occupation during that period, and the name and principal business of the organization in which such occupation and employment were carried out.

Merrick D. Okamoto - Chief Executive Officer

Mr. Merrick D. Okamoto, age 58, serves as the President at Viking Asset Management which he co-founded in 2002. Mr. Okamoto is responsible for research, due diligence, and structuring potential investment opportunities. He has been instrumental in providing capital to over 200 private and public companies. He is also responsible for the firm's trading operations. Prior to Viking, Mr. Okamoto co-founded TradePortal.com, Inc. in 1999 and served as its President until 2001. He was instrumental in developing the proprietary Trade Matrix software platform offered by TradePortal Securities. Mr. Okamoto's negotiations were key in selling a minority stake in TradePortal.com Inc. to Thomson Financial. Prior to that, he held Vice President positions with Shearson Lehman Brothers, Prudential Securities, and Paine Webber.

David P. Lieberman - Chief Financial Officer and Director

Mr. David Lieberman, age 74, is a seasoned business executive with over 40 years of financial experience beginning with five years as an accountant with Price Waterhouse. He has extensive experience as a senior operational and financial executive serving both multiple public and non-public companies. Mr. Lieberman currently serves as the President of Cobra International and Lieberman Financial Consulting where he acts as administrator for several investment groups. Previously he served as CFO and Director for MEDL Mobile Holdings, Inc., and CFO and Director of Datascension, Inc., a telephone market research company that provides both outbound and inbound services to corporate customers, since January 2008 and a director of that company since 2006. From 2006 to 2007, he served as Chief Financial Officer of Dalrada Financial Corporation, a publicly traded payroll processing company based in San Diego. From 2003 to 2006, he was the Chief Financial Officer for John Goyak & Associates, Inc., a Las Vegas-based aerospace consulting firm. Mr. Lieberman attended the University of Cincinnati, where he received his B.A. in Business, and is a licensed CPA in the State of California.

James Crawford - Chief Operating Officer

Mr. Crawford, age 44, was a founding member of Kino Interactive, LLC, and of AudioEye, Inc. Mr. Crawford's experience as an entrepreneur spans the entire life cycle of companies from start-up capital to compliance officer and director of reporting public companies. Prior to his involvement as Chief Operating Officer of the Company, Mr. Crawford served as a director and officer of Augme Technologies, Inc. beginning March 2006, and assisted the company in maneuvering through the initial challenges of acquisitions executed by the company through 2011 that established the company as a leading mobile marketing company in the United States. Mr. Crawford is experienced in public company finance and compliance functions. He has extensive experience in the area of intellectual property creation, management and licensing. Mr. Crawford also served on the board of directors Modavox and Augme Technologies, and as founder and managing member of Kino Digital, Kino Communications, and Kino Interactive.

Fred Thiel - Director

Mr. Thiel, age 58, has been the Chairman of SPROCKET, INC. since June 2017, a Blockchain/Cryptocurrency technology and financial services company whose mission is to reduce the risk and friction of cryptocurrency trading across marketplaces, regions and exchanges by establishing a federation of exchanges that together create a single aggregated global trading market place with large scale liquidity, rapid execution, minimal counter-party risk, and price transparency. From January 2013 until November 2015, Mr. Thiel served as a director of Local Corporation, which was a NASDAQ listed entity which was a leader in on-line local search and digital media, mobile search monetization and programmatic retargeting markets. He served as Chairman of the Board of LOCAL from January 2014 to November 2015 and as its Chief Executive Officer from May 2014 to November 2015. Mr. Thiel has been the principal of Thiel Advisors Inc. since 2013. Thiel Advisors is a boutique advisory firm providing PE and VC firms, as well as public and private company boards of director, with deep technology industry operating expertise and strategic advisory services.

Michael Rudolph - Director

Mr. Rudolph, age 68, has served as the President and Chief Executive Officer of the Edgehill Group since July 1995, a consulting firm which provides financial management, operational expertise, strategic and tactical advice, project management and change management guidance. In connection therewith, he served as a contract Chief Financial Officer of ConsejoSano, Inc., a Hispanic telehealth provider, from May 2016 to July 2017; as the Chief Financial Officer of Fullbottle Group, Inc., an online advertising agency, from April 2014 to May 2017; as a contract Chief Financial Officer and Chief Administrative Officer of Calaborate Inc., a mobile app developer, from October 2013 to April 2014; and as interim Chief Financial Officer and Chief Administrative Officer of a software subsidiary company, Videro LLC and Videro, Inc from July 2011 to September 2015. In addition, Mr. Rudolph provided interim management as CEO and CFO for several online businesses and firms. From January 2001 until March 2016, Mr. Rudolph co-founded and served as Chief Financial Officer and Managing Member of Viking Asset Management, LLC, an SEC registered investment adviser (“RIA”) where he was responsible for finance, operations, treasury, audit, tax, legal, compliance and investor relations for the funds and the RIA and had direct management responsibility for 17 full time employees. From November 1989 to June 1995, Mr. Rudolph was the managing director at Charles Schwab & Co., Inc., in San Francisco, California, during which he managed non-trading functions for the Institutional Brokerage Division including sales/marketing, operations, compliance, financial planning/reporting and research and managed 10 full time employees and a \$4.5 million budget. Mr. Rudolph attended Washington University in St. Louis, MO, where he received his M.B.A. in Finance/Marketing. He received his B.S. in Biochemistry from Purdue University in West Lafayette, IN, and was a licensed FINRA registered investment advisor from April 2001 to March 2011.

Michael Berg - Director

Mr. Berg, age 69, has been a practicing accountant for over 30 years. Since May of 2011, he has served on the Board of Directors of Sol Array, a high technology company based in China, which develops next generation solar cells, and serves as an advisor to several small public companies. From September of 1977 until June of 1985, he was an audit manager for Coopers & Lybrand (now PWC) in San Francisco and in January 2008, co-founded and served as the West Coast PIC of PMB Helin Donovan, a 100+ person CPA firm. From September 1988 until December 2000, Mr. Berg served as the Chief Financial Officer of a public real estate company and a high tech manufacturer and a research and development company. He has established several independent companies including EXIS in January 1992, which sold and installed a proprietary software product which he helped develop for distributed general ledgers systems. Most recently, in January 2014, he formed the Registry of Accredited Investors that provides services to investors and companies in Reg D offerings. His industry experience ranges from finance and distribution to high tech, pharma, real estate and construction. Mr. Berg has worked extensively with public companies and has participated in many public offerings in national markets. From January 1989 until October 1996, he was the President of the Board of Directors of the Names Project and formed a not-for-profit called the Permanent Display aimed at creating a San Francisco landmark for the AIDs Quilt. In March 2005, Mr. Berg also helped found Welcome, a 501C (3) that provides homeless outreach in the Upper Polk Street area of San Francisco. Mr. Berg attended San Francisco State University, where he received his B.A. in Accounting, and is a licensed CRFA, CFF and CPA in the States of California and New York.

Code of Business Conduct and Ethics

We have adopted a Code of Business Conduct and Ethics that applies to our principal executive officer, principal financial officer, principal accounting officer or controller or persons performing similar functions and also to other employees. Our Code of Business Conduct and Ethics can be found on the Company's website at www.marathonpg.com.

Family Relationships

There are no family relationships between any of our directors, executive officers or directors.

Involvement in Certain Legal Proceedings

During the past ten years, none of our officers, directors, promoters or control persons have been involved in any legal proceedings as described in Item 401(f) of Regulation S-K.

Term of Office

Our Board of Directors is comprised of five directors, of which all five seats are currently occupied, and is divided among three classes, Class I, Class II and Class III. Class I directors will serve until the 2021 annual meeting of stockholders and until their respective successors have been duly elected and qualified, or until such director's earlier resignation, removal or death. Class III directors will serve until the 2020 annual meeting of stockholders and until their respective successors have been duly elected and qualified, or until such director's earlier resignation, removal or death. Class II directors, elected at the Company's annual shareholder meeting held on September 28, 2016, will serve until the 2019 annual meeting of stockholders and until their respective successors have been duly elected and qualified, or until such director's earlier resignation, removal or death. All officers serve at the pleasure of the Board.

Director Independence

Mr. Fred Thiel, Mr. Michael Berg and Mr. Michael Rudolph are "independent" directors based on the definition of independence in the listing standards of the NASDAQ Stock Market LLC ("NASDAQ").

Committees of the Board of Directors

Our Board has established three standing committees: an audit committee, a nominating and corporate governance committee and a compensation committee, which are described below. Members of these committees are elected annually at the regular board meeting held in conjunction with the annual stockholders' meeting. The charter of each committee is available on our website at www.marathonpg.com.

Audit Committee

The Audit Committee members are currently Mr. Fred Thiel, Mr. Michael Berg and Mr. Michael Rudolph, with Mr. Michael Berg as Chairman. The Audit Committee has authority to review our financial records, deal with our independent auditors, recommend to the Board policies with respect to financial reporting, and investigate all aspects of our business. All of the members of the Audit Committee currently satisfy the independence requirements and other established criteria of NASDAQ.

The Audit Committee Charter is available on the Company's website at <http://www.marathonpg.com/>. The Audit Committee has sole authority for the appointment, compensation and oversight of the work of our independent registered public accounting firm, and responsibility for reviewing and discussing with management and our independent registered public accounting firm our audited consolidated financial statements included in our Annual Report on Form 10-K, our interim financial statements and our earnings press releases. The Audit Committee also reviews the independence and quality control procedures of our independent registered public accounting firm, reviews management's assessment of the effectiveness of internal controls, discusses with management the Company's policies with respect to risk assessment and risk management and will review the adequacy of the Audit Committee charter on an annual basis.

Nominating and Governance Committee

The Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee members are currently Mr. Fred Thiel, Mr. Michael Berg and Mr. Michael Rudolph, with Mr. Michael Rudolph as Chairman. The Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee has the following responsibilities: (a) setting qualification standards for director nominees; (b) identifying, considering and nominating candidates for membership on the Board; (c) developing, recommending and evaluating corporate governance standards and a code of business conduct and ethics applicable to the Company; (d) implementing and overseeing a process for evaluating the Board, Board committees (including the Committee) and overseeing the Board's evaluation of the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of the Company; (e) making recommendations regarding the structure and composition of the Board and Board committees; (f) advising the Board on corporate governance matters and any related matters required by the federal securities laws; and (g) assisting the Board in identifying individuals qualified to become Board members; recommending to the Board the director nominees for the next annual meeting of shareholders; and recommending to the Board director nominees to fill vacancies on the Board.

The Nominating and Governance Committee Charter is available on the Company's website at <http://www.marathonpg.com/>. The Nominating and Governance Committee determines the qualifications, qualities, skills, and other expertise required to be a director and to develop, and recommend to the Board for its approval, criteria to be considered in selecting nominees for director (the "Director Criteria"); identifies and screens individuals qualified to become members of the Board, consistent with the Director Criteria. The Nominating and Governance Committee considers any director candidates recommended by the Company's shareholders pursuant to the procedures described in the Company's proxy statement, and any nominations of director candidates validly made by shareholders in accordance with applicable laws, rules and regulations and the provisions of the Company's charter documents. The Nominating and Governance Committee makes recommendations to the Board regarding the selection and approval of the nominees for director to be submitted to a shareholder vote at the Annual Meeting of shareholders, subject to approval by the Board.

Compensation Committee

The Compensation Committee oversees our executive compensation and recommends various incentives for key employees to encourage and reward increased corporate financial performance, productivity and innovation. Its members are currently Mr. Fred Thiel, Mr. Michael Berg and Mr. Michael Rudolph with Mr. Fred Thiel as Chairman. All of the members of the Compensation Committee currently satisfy the independence requirements and other established criteria of NASDAQ.

The Compensation Committee Charter is available on the Company's website at <http://www.marathonpg.com/>. The Compensation Committee is responsible for: (a) assisting our Board in fulfilling its fiduciary duties with respect to the oversight of the Company's compensation plans, policies and programs, including assessing our overall compensation structure, reviewing all executive compensation programs, incentive compensation plans and equity-based plans, and determining executive compensation; and (b) reviewing the adequacy of the Compensation Committee charter on an annual basis. The Compensation Committee, among other things, reviews and approves the Company's goals and objectives relevant to the compensation of the Chief Executive Officer, evaluate the Chief Executive Officer's performance with respect to such goals, and set the Chief Executive Officer's compensation level based on such evaluation. The Compensation Committee also considers the Chief Executive Officer's recommendations with respect to other executive officers and evaluates the Company's performance both in terms of current achievements and significant initiatives with long-term implications. It assesses the contributions of individual executives and recommend to the Board levels of salary and incentive compensation payable to executive officers of the Company; compares compensation levels with those of other leading companies in similar or related industries; reviews financial, human resources and succession planning within the Company; recommend to the Board the establishment and administration of incentive compensation plans and programs and employee benefit plans and programs; recommends to the Board the payment of additional year-end contributions by the Company under certain of its retirement plans; grants stock incentives to key employees of the Company and administer the Company's stock incentive plans; and reviews and recommends for Board approval compensation packages for new corporate officers and termination packages for corporate officers as requested by management.

Changes in Nominating Procedures

None.

Board Leadership Structure and Role in Risk Oversight

Although we have not adopted a formal policy on whether the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer positions should be separate or combined, we have traditionally determined that it is in the best interests of the Company and its shareholders to partially combine these roles. Due to the small size of the Company, we believe it is currently most effective to have the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer positions partially combined.

Our Board is primarily responsible for overseeing our risk management processes. The Board receives and reviews periodic reports from management, auditors, legal counsel, and others, as considered appropriate regarding the Company's assessment of risks. The Board focuses on the most significant risks facing the Company and our general risk management strategy, and also ensures that risks undertaken by us are consistent with the Board's risk parameters. While the Board oversees the Company, our management is responsible for day-to-day risk management processes. We believe this division of responsibilities is the most effective approach for addressing the risks facing the Company and that our board leadership structure supports this approach.

Compliance with Section 16(a) of the Exchange Act

Section 16(a) of Exchange Act requires our executive officers and directors and persons who beneficially own more than 10% of a registered class of our equity securities to file with the Commission initial statements of beneficial ownership, statements of changes in beneficial ownership and annual statement of changes in beneficial ownership with respect to their ownership of the Company's securities, on Form 3, 4 and 5 respectively. Executive officers, directors and greater than 10% shareholders are required by the Securities and Exchange Commission regulations to furnish our Company with copies of all Section 16(a) reports they file.

Based solely on our review of the copies of such reports received by us, and on written representations by our officers and directors regarding their compliance with the applicable reporting requirements under Section 16(a) of the Exchange Act and without conducting any independent investigation of our own, we believe that with respect to the fiscal year ended December 31, 2018, our officers and directors, and all of the persons known to us to beneficially own more than 10% of our common stock filed all required reports on a timely basis.

ITEM 11. EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION

The following summary compensation table sets forth information concerning compensation for services rendered in all capacities during 2018 and 2017 awarded to, earned by or paid to our executive officers or most highly paid individuals. The value attributable to any option awards and stock awards reflects the grant date fair values of stock awards calculated in accordance with FASB Accounting Standards Codification Topic 718. As described further in “Note 5 — Stockholders’ Equity - Common Stock Options” in our Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements, the assumptions made in the valuation of these option awards and stock awards is set forth therein.

Name and Principal Position	Year	Salary	Bonus Awards	Stock Awards	Option Awards	Non-Equity Plan Compensation	Nonqualified Deferred Earnings	All Other Compensation	Total
		(\$)	(\$)	(\$)	(\$)	(\$)	(\$)	(\$)	(\$)
Merrick Okamoto (1) CEO	2018	58,333	250,000	-	1,263,925	-	-	223,308	1,795,566
	2017	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
David Lieberman (2) CFO & Director	2018	127,500	35,000	-	50,577	-	-	-	213,077
	2017	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
James Crawford (3) COO	2018	110,000	5,000	-	25,278	-	-	-	215,000
	2017	152,622	50,000	-	-	-	-	22,058	224,680
Doug Croxall (4) Former CEO and Chairman	2018	-	-	-	-	-	-	80,000	80,000
	2017	366,256	459,000	756,000	-	-	-	76,881	1,658,137
Francis Knuettel II (5) CFO & Secretary	2018	64,477	75,000	86,000	-	-	-	-	225,477
	2017	282,917	185,000	54,000	-	-	-	41,537	563,453
David Liu (6) CTO	2018	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2017	52,083	-	-	-	-	-	15,711	67,794
Erich Spangenberg (7) Dir. of Acquisitions & Licensing	2018	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2017	142,728	200,000	-	-	-	-	21,550	364,277

(1) Merrick Okamoto entered into a new employment agreement in October 11, 2018 which replaced his prior employment agreement.

(2) David Lieberman entered into a new employment agreement in October 15, 2018 which replaced his prior employment agreement.

(3)

James Crawford entered into a new employment agreement in August 30, 2017 which replaced his prior employment agreement.

- (4) Doug Croxall entered into a Retention Agreement on August 22, 2017, as amended, pursuant to which his employment with the Company terminated on December 31, 2017.
- (5) Francis Knuettel II entered into a Retention Agreement on August 30, 2017 which replaced his prior employment agreement, and his employment with the Company was terminated on April 22, 2018.
- (6) David Liu was appointed as the Chief Technology Officer of the Company on July 18, 2016, and his employment with the Company was terminated on March 15, 2017.
- (7) Erich Spangenberg was appointed as the Director of Acquisitions and Licensing on May 11, 2016 and his employment with the Company was terminated on August 3, 2017.

Employment Agreements

On October 11, 2018, we entered into a 2-year Employment Agreement, subject to successive one year extensions, with Merrick Okamoto, pursuant to which Mr. Okamoto will serve as the Executive Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of the Company. Pursuant to the terms of the Agreement, Mr. Okamoto shall receive a base salary at an annual base salary of \$350,000 (subject to annual 3% cost of living increase) and an annual bonus up to 100% of base salary as determined by the Compensation Committee or the Board. As further consideration for Mr. Okamoto's services, we agreed to issue Mr. Okamoto 10-year stock options to purchase 5,000,000 shares of Common Stock, with a strike price of \$0.58 per share, vesting 50 % on the date of grant and 25% on each 6 months anniversary of the date of grant.

On October 15, 2018, we entered into a 2-year Employment Agreement, subject to successive one year extensions, with David Lieberman, pursuant to which Mr. Lieberman will serve as the Chief Financial Officer of the Company. Pursuant to the terms of the Lieberman Agreement, Mr. Lieberman shall receive a base salary at an annual base salary of \$180,000 (subject to annual 3% cost of living increase) and an annual bonus up to 100% of base salary as determined by the Compensation Committee or the Board. As further consideration for Mr. Lieberman's services, we agreed to issue Mr. Lieberman 10-year stock options to purchase 200,000 shares of Common Stock, with a strike price of \$0.58 per share, vesting 50% on the date of grant and 25% on each 6 months anniversary of the date of grant.

Directors' Compensation

The following summary compensation table sets forth information concerning compensation for services rendered in all capacities during 2018 and 2017 awarded to, earned by or paid to our directors. The value attributable to any warrant awards reflects the grant date fair values of stock awards calculated in accordance with FASB Accounting Standards Codification Topic 718. As described further in "Note 5 — Stockholders' Equity (Deficit) — Common Stock Warrants" in our Consolidated Financial Statements, a discussion of the assumptions made in the valuation of these warrant awards.

Name		Fees Earned or paid in cash (\$)	Stock awards (\$)	Option awards (\$)	Non-equity incentive plan compensation (\$)	Non-qualified deferred compensation earnings (\$)	All other compensation (\$)	Total (\$)
Merrick Okamoto	2018	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2017	31,903	150,500	-	-	-	-	182,403
David Lieberman	2018	5,430	-	-	-	-	-	5,430
	2017	6,467	64,500	-	-	-	-	70,967
Richard Chernicoff (1)	2018	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2017	28,797	-	-	-	-	-	28,797
Edward Kovalik	2018	8,000	-	-	-	-	-	8,000
	2017	41,750	64,500	-	-	-	-	106,250
Michael Rudolph (2)	2018	7,500	-	-	-	-	-	7,500
	2017	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Michael Berg (3)	2018	7,500	-	-	-	-	-	7,500
	2017	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Edgar Filing: Marathon Patent Group, Inc. - Form 10-K

Christopher Robichaud	2018	8,000	-	-	-	-	-	8,000
	2017	25,346	64,500	-	-	-	-	89,846
Richard Tyler (4)	2018	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2017	28,500	-	-	-	-	-	28,500
Fred Thiel (5)	2018	13,069	-	-	-	-	-	13,069
	2017	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

(1) Mr. Richard Chernicoff resigned as a member of the Company's Board of Directors on August 13, 2017.

(2) Mr. Rudolph was appointed on August 17, 2018.

(3) Mr. Berg was appointed on August 17, 2018.

(4) Mr. Richard Tyler resigned as a member of the Company's Board of Directors on August 13, 2017.

(5) Mr. Fred Thiel was appointed on April 24, 2018.

Employee Grants of Plan Based Awards and Outstanding Equity Awards at Fiscal Year-End

On August 1, 2012, our Board and stockholders adopted the 2012 Equity Incentive Plan, pursuant to which 384,616 shares of our common stock are reserved for issuance as awards to employees, directors, consultants, advisors and other service providers, after giving effect to the Reverse Split.

On September 16, 2014, our Board adopted the 2014 Equity Incentive Plan (the “2014 Plan”), and only July 31, 2015, the shareholders approved the 2014 Plan at the Company’s annual meeting. The 2014 Plan authorizes the Company to grant stock options, restricted stock, preferred stock, other stock-based awards, and performance awards to purchase up to 500,000 shares of common stock. Awards may be granted to the Company’s directors, officers, consultants, advisors and employees. Unless earlier terminated by the Board, the 2014 Plan will terminate, and no further awards may be granted, after September 16, 2024.

On September 6, 2017, our Board adopted the 2017 Equity Incentive Plan, subsequently approved by the shareholders on September 29, 2017, pursuant to which up to 2,500,000 shares of our common stock, stock options, restricted stock, preferred stock, stock-based awards and other awards are reserved for issuance as awards to employees, directors, consultants, advisors and other service providers.

On January 1, 2018, our Board adopted the 2018 Equity Incentive Plan, subsequently approved by the shareholders on March 7, 2018, pursuant to which up to 10,000,000 shares of our common stock, stock options, restricted stock, preferred stock, stock-based awards and other awards are reserved for issuance as awards to employees, directors, consultants, advisors and other service providers.

As of December 31, 2018, and within sixty (60) days thereafter, the following sets forth the option and stock awards to officers of the Company:

Option Awards

Number of securities underlying unexercised options (1)

Number of securities underlying unexercised options

Equity incentive plan awards:
Number of securities underlying unexercised unearned

Option exercise price

Option expiration date

Stock awards

Number of units of stock that have not
Market value of shares of units of stock
Equity incentive plan awards:
Number of unearned shares,

Equity incentive plan awards:
Market value of unearned

		options			vested	that have not vested	units or other rights that have not vested	share units other rights that h not veste	
	(#) exercisable	(#) unexercisable	(#) unexercisable	(\$)		(#)	(\$)	(#)	(\$)
Merrick Okamoto	2,500,000	-	-	\$0.58	10/12/28	-	-	-	-
David Lieberman	100,000	-	-	\$0.58	10/12/28	-	-	-	-
James Crawford	20,000	-	-	\$25.60	10/31/24	-	-	-	-
James Crawford	8,750	-	-	\$7.44	10/14/25	-	-	-	-
James Crawford	7,500	-	-	\$16.66	05/14/24	-	-	-	-
James Crawford	50,000	-	-	\$0.58	10/12/28	-	-	-	-

Compensation Committee Interlocks and Insider Participation

None of our executive officers serves as a member of the Board or Compensation Committee of any other entity that has one or more of its executive officers serving as a member of our Board.

ITEM 12. SECURITY OWNERSHIP OF CERTAIN OWNERS AND MANAGEMENT AND RELATED STOCKHOLDER MATTERS

The following table sets forth certain information regarding beneficial ownership of our Common Stock as of March 25, 2019: (i) by each of our directors, (ii) by each of the named executive officers, (iii) by all of our executive officers and directors as a group, and (iv) by each person or entity known by us to beneficially own more than five percent (5%) of any class of our outstanding shares. As of March 25, 2019, there were 25,519,940 shares of our common stock outstanding.

Amount and Nature of Beneficial Ownership as of March 25, 2019 (1)

Name and Address of Beneficial Owner (1)	Common Stock	Options	Warrants	Total	Percentage of Common Stock (%)	
Officers and Directors						
Merrick Okamoto (1)	87,500	2,500,000	-	2,587,500	10.1	%
David Lieberman (2)	37,500	100,000	-	137,500	0.5	%
James Crawford (Chief Operating Officer) (3)	-	76,250	-	76,250	0.3	%
Fred Thiel (4)	-	25,000	-	25,000	0.1	%
Michael Berg	-	25,000	-	25,000	0.1	%
Michael Rudolph	-	25,000	-	25,000	0.1	%
All Directors and Executive Officers (three persons)	125,000	2,751,250	-	2,876,250	11.2	%

(1) Represents options to purchase 2,500,000 shares of Common Stock at an exercise price of \$0.58 per share.

(2) Represents options to purchase 100,000 shares of Common Stock at an exercise price of \$0.58 per share.

(3) Represents options to purchase (i) 20,000 shares of Common Stock at an exercise price of \$25.60 per share, (ii) 7,500 shares of Common Stock at an exercise price of \$16.66 per share, (iii) 50,000 shares of Common Stock at an

exercise price of \$0.58 per share and (iv) 8,750 shares of Common Stock at an exercise price of \$7.44 per share.

(4) Represents options to purchase 25,000 shares of Common Stock at an exercise price of \$0.58 per share.

ITEM 13. CERTAIN RELATIONSHIPS AND RELATED TRANSACTIONS, AND DIRECTOR INDEPENDENCE

Other than disclosed herein, there were no transactions during the year ended December 31, 2018 or any currently proposed transactions, in which the Company was or is to be a participant and the amount involved exceeds \$120,000, and in which any related person had or will have a direct or indirect material interest.

ITEM 14. PRINCIPAL ACCOUNTING FEES AND SERVICES

For the years ended December 31, 2018 and 2017, we engaged RBSM LLP, as our independent auditor . For the years ended December 31, 2018 and 2017, we incurred fees for our current auditor, RBSM as set forth below :

	Fiscal Year Ended	
	December	December
	31, 2018	31, 2017
Audit fees	\$218,031	\$327,805
Tax fees	31,365	44,390
All other fees	-	-

Audit fees consist of fees related to professional services rendered in connection with the annual audit of our annual financial statements, review of our quarterly financial statements and review of the Company’s registration statements and other filings.

Our policy is to pre-approve all audit and permissible non-audit services performed by the independent accountants. These services may include audit services, audit-related services, tax services and other services. Under our Audit Committee’s policy, pre-approval is generally provided for particular services or categories of services, including planned services, project-based services and routine consultations. In addition, the Audit Committee may also pre-approve particular services on a case-by-case basis. Our Audit Committee approved all services that our independent accountants provided to us in the past two fiscal years.

PART IV**ITEM 15. EXHIBITS**

The following exhibits are filed as part of this Annual Report on Form 10-K.

Exhibit No.	Description
3.1	<u>Amended and Restated Articles of Incorporation of the Company dated November 25, 2011. (1)</u>
3.2	<u>Certificate of Amendment to Articles of Incorporation dated February 15, 2013. (2)</u>
3.3	<u>Certificate of Amendment to Amended and Restated Articles of Incorporation dated July 18, 2013 (3)</u>
3.4	<u>Certificate of Amendment to Articles of Incorporation dated October 25, 2017. (4)</u>
3.5	<u>Amended and Restated Bylaws of the Company dated November 25, 2011. (5)</u>
4.1	<u>Certificate of Designation of Preferences, Rights and Limitations of Series B Convertible Preferred Stock. (6)</u>
4.2	<u>Certificate of Designation of Rights, Powers, Preferences, Privileges and Restrictions of 0% Series E Convertible Preferred Stock. (7)</u>
4.3	<u>Certificate of Correction to Certificate of Designation of Rights, Powers, Preferences, Privileges and Restrictions of 0% Series E Convertible Preferred Stock. (8)</u>
4.4	<u>Form of proposed Certificate of Designation of Preferences, Rights and Limitations of 0% Series E-1 Convertible Preferred Stock. (9)</u>
10.1	<u>Form of Unit Purchase Agreement dated as of August 14, 2017. (10)</u>
10.2	<u>Form of Registration Rights Agreement dated as of August 14, 2017. (11)</u>
10.3	<u>Form of 5% Convertible Promissory Note dated August 14, 2017. (12)</u>
10.4	<u>Form of Common Stock Purchase Warrant dated August 14, 2017. (13)</u>
10.5	<u>Form of Exchange Agreement dated as of July 16, 2017. (14)</u>
10.6	<u>Form of Exchange Agreement dated as of August 7, 2017. (15)</u>
10.7	<u>Form of Exchange Agreement dated as of November 28, 2017. (16)</u>
10.8	<u>Amended and Restated Croxall Retention Agreement dated August 30, 2017. (17)</u>
10.9	<u>Retention Agreement with Francis Knuettel II dated August 31, 2017. (18)</u>
10.10	<u>Employment Agreement with James Crawford dated August 31, 2017. (19)</u>
10.11	<u>Consulting Termination and Release Agreement with Erich Spangenberg dated August 31, 2017. (20)</u>
10.12	<u>Consulting Agreement dated August 31, 2017 with Page Innovations, LLC. (21)</u>
10.13	<u>Form of Lock-up Agreement with Doug Croxall dated September 7, 2017. (22)</u>
10.14	<u>Letter agreement with Revere Investments L.P., dated October 31, 2017. (23)</u>
10.15	<u>Agreement and Plan of Merger dated as of November 1, 2017. (24)</u>
10.16	<u>Amendment to Croxall Retention Agreement dated November 1, 2017. (25)</u>
10.17	<u>Voting and Standstill Agreement with Doug Croxall dated November 1, 2017. (26)</u>
10.18	<u>CF Marathon LLC Limited Liability Company Agreement dated as of October 20, 2017. (27)</u>
10.19	<u>First Amendment to Amended and Restated Revenue Sharing and Securities Purchase Agreement and Restructuring Agreement dated as of August 3, 2017. (28)</u>
10.20	<u>M&A Advisory Agreement with Palladium Capital Advisors, LLC, dated November 13, 2017. (29)</u>

Edgar Filing: Marathon Patent Group, Inc. - Form 10-K

- 10.21 CIARA Technologies Agreement. (Confidential Treatment Requested) (30)
- 10.22 Master Services Agreement with Hypertec Systems Inc. dated December 15, 2017. (Confidential Treatment Requested) (31)
- 10.23 Engagement Letter with Roth Capital Partners, LLC dated December 7, 2017. (32)
- 10.24 Fairness Opinion dated December 13, 2017. (33)
- 10.25 Form of Securities Purchase Agreement. (34)
- 10.26 Form of Securities Purchase Agreement. (35)
- 10.27 Patent Rights Purchase and Assignment Agreement with XpresSpa Group, Inc. dated January 11, 2018. (36)
- 10.28 Amendment No. 1 to Agreement and Plan of Merger dated January 23, 2018. (37)
- 10.29 Lease Agreement, by and between 9349-0001 Quebec Inc. and Cryptoespace Inc., dated November 11, 2017. (38)
- 10.30 Assignment and Assumption Agreement, by and between Blocespace Inc. and Marathon Crypto Mining, Inc., dated February 12, 2018 (39)
- 10.31 Settlement Agreement and Release of Claims, dated March 8, 2018. (40)
- 10.32 Amendment No. 2 to Agreement and Plan of Merger, dated March 19, 2018. (41)
- 10.33 Amended and Restated Agreement and Plan of Merger, dated April 3, 2018. (42)
- 10.34 Executive Employment Agreement (46)
- 10.35 Executive Employment Agreement (47)
- 14.1 Code of Business Conduct and Ethics (43)

16.1	<u>SingerLewak LLP letter to the Securities and Exchange Commission. (44)</u>
16.2	<u>Letter from BDO USA, LLP dated November 30, 2017. (45)</u>
23.1	<u>Consent of RBSM LLP.*</u>
31.1	<u>Certification of Chief Executive Officer pursuant to Section 302 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act 2002*</u>
31.2	<u>Certification of Chief Financial Officer pursuant to Section 302 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act 2002*</u>
32.1	<u>Section 1350 Certification of the Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer*</u>
101.INS	XBRL Instance Document
101.SCH	XBRL Taxonomy Extension Schema Document
101.CAL	XBRL Taxonomy Calculation Linkbase Document
101.LAB	XBRL Taxonomy Label Linkbase Document
101.PRE	XBRL Taxonomy Presentation Linkbase Document
101.DEF	XBRL Taxonomy Extension Definition Document

* Filed herein.

- (1) Previously filed as Exhibit 3.1 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed December 9, 2011 and incorporated herein by reference.
- (2) Previously filed as Exhibit 3.1 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed February 20, 2013 and incorporated herein by reference.
- (3) Previously filed as Exhibit 3.1 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed July 19, 2013 and incorporated herein by reference.
- (4) Previously filed as Exhibit 3.4 to Registration Statement on Form S-4 filed January 24, 2018 and incorporated herein by reference.
- (5) Previously filed as Exhibit 3.2 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed December 9, 2011 and incorporated herein by reference.
- (6) Previously filed as Exhibit 3.2 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed May 7, 2014 and incorporated herein by reference.
- (7) Previously filed as Exhibit 4.1 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed December 1, 2017 and incorporated herein by reference.
- (8) Previously filed as Exhibit 4.1 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed December 22, 2017 and incorporated herein by reference.
- (9) Previously filed as Exhibit 4.4 to Registration Statement on Form S-4 filed January 24, 2018 and incorporated herein by reference.
- (10) Previously filed as Exhibit 10.1 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed August 15, 2017 and incorporated herein by reference.
- (11) Previously filed as Exhibit 10.2 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed August 15, 2017 and incorporated herein by reference.
- (12) Previously filed as Exhibit 4.1 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed August 15, 2017 and incorporated herein by reference.
- (13) Previously filed as Exhibit 4.2 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed August 15, 2017 and incorporated herein by reference.
- (14) Previously filed as Exhibit 10.1 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed July 18, 2017 and incorporated herein by reference.

Edgar Filing: Marathon Patent Group, Inc. - Form 10-K

- (15) Previously filed as Exhibit 10.1 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed August 9, 2017 and incorporated herein by reference.
- (16) Previously filed as Exhibit 10.1 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed December 1, 2017 and incorporated herein by reference.
- (17) Previously filed as Exhibit 10.1 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed September 5, 2017 and incorporated herein by reference.
- (18) Previously filed as Exhibit 10.2 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed September 5, 2017 and incorporated herein by reference.
- (19) Previously filed as Exhibit 10.3 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed September 5, 2017 and incorporated herein by reference.

- (20) Previously filed as Exhibit 10.4 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed September 5, 2017 and incorporated herein by reference.
- (21) Previously filed as Exhibit 10.5 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed September 5, 2017 and incorporated herein by reference.
- (22) Previously filed as Exhibit 10.1 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed September 12, 2017 and incorporated herein by reference.
- (23) Previously filed as Exhibit 10.14 to Registration Statement on Form S-4 filed January 24, 2018 and incorporated herein by reference.
- (24) Previously filed as Exhibit 10.1 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed November 2, 2017 and incorporated herein by reference.
- (25) Previously filed as Exhibit 10.2 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed November 2, 2017 and incorporated herein by reference.
- (26) Previously filed as Exhibit 10.3 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed November 2, 2017 and incorporated herein by reference.
- (27) Previously filed as Exhibit 10.18 to Registration Statement on Form S-4 filed January 24, 2018 and incorporated herein by reference.
- (28) Previously filed as Exhibit 10.1 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed August 9, 2017 and incorporated herein by reference.
- (29) Previously filed as Exhibit 10.20 to Registration Statement on Form S-4 filed January 24, 2018 and incorporated herein by reference.
- (30) Previously filed as Exhibit 10.21 to Registration Statement on Form S-4 filed January 24, 2018 and incorporated herein by reference.
- (31) Previously filed as Exhibit 10.22 to Registration Statement on Form S-4 filed January 24, 2018 and incorporated herein by reference.
- (32) Previously filed as Exhibit 10.23 to Registration Statement on Form S-4 filed January 24, 2018 and incorporated herein by reference.
- (33) Previously filed as Exhibit 10.24 to Registration Statement on Form S-4 filed January 24, 2018 and incorporated herein by reference.
- (34) Previously filed as Exhibit 10.1 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed December 12, 2017 and incorporated herein by reference.
- (35) Previously filed as Exhibit 10.1 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed December 19, 2017 and incorporated herein by reference.
- (36) Previously filed as Exhibit 10.1 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed January 18, 2018 and incorporated herein by reference.
- (37) Previously filed as Exhibit 10.28 to Registration Statement on Form S-4 filed January 24, 2018 and incorporated herein by reference.
- (38) Previously filed as Exhibit 10.2 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed February 15, 2018 and incorporated herein by reference.
- (39) Previously filed as Exhibit 10.2 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed February 15, 2018 and incorporated herein by reference.
- (40) Previously filed as Exhibit 10.2 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed July 31, 2018 and incorporated herein by reference.
- (41) Previously filed as Exhibit 10.2 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed March 20, 2018 and incorporated herein by reference.
- (42) Previously filed as Exhibit 10.4 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed April 4, 2018 and incorporated herein by reference.
- (43) Previously filed as Exhibit 14.1 to Annual Report on 10-K filed March 31, 2014 and incorporated herein by reference.

Edgar Filing: Marathon Patent Group, Inc. - Form 10-K

- (44) Previously filed as Exhibit 16.1 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed January 17, 2017 and incorporated herein by reference.
- (45) Previously filed as Exhibit 16.1 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed December 1, 2017 and incorporated herein by reference.
- (46) Previously filed as Exhibit 10.1 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed October 16, 2018 and incorporated herein by reference.
- (47) Previously filed as Exhibit 10.2 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed on October 16, 2018 and incorporated herein by reference.

ITEM 16. FORM 10-K SUMMARY

None.

48

SIGNATURES

Pursuant to the requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the Registrant has duly caused this report to be signed on its behalf by the undersigned thereunto duly authorized.

Date: March 25, 2019

MARATHON PATENT GROUP, INC.

By: */s/ Merrick Okamoto*

Name: Merrick Okamoto

Title: Chief Executive Officer and Executive Chairman

(Principal Executive Officer)

By: */s/ David Lieberman*

Name: David Lieberman

Title: Chief Financial Officer

(Principal Financial and Accounting Officer)

Pursuant to the requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, this report has been signed below by the following persons on behalf of the registrant and in the capacities and on the dates indicated.

Signature	Title	Date
<i>/s/ Merrick Okamoto</i> Merrick Okamoto	Chief Executive Officer and Executive Chairman (Principal Executive Officer)	March 25, 2019
<i>/s/ David Lieberman</i> David Lieberman	Chief Financial Officer (Principal Financial and Accounting Officer)	March 25, 2019
<i>/s/ Fred Thiel</i> Fred Thiel	Director	March 25, 2019
<i>/s/ Michael Rudolph</i> Michael Rudolph	Director	March 25, 2019
<i>/s/ Michael Berg</i> Michael Berg	Director	March 25, 2019

