

BLUE CALYPSO, INC.
Form 10-K
March 22, 2016

UNITED STATES
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20549

FORM 10-K

ANNUAL REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

For the fiscal year ended: December 31, 2015

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

For the transition period from _____ to _____

Commission File Number 333-143570

BLUE CALYPSO, INC.
(Exact name of registrant as specified in its charter)

Delaware
(State or other jurisdiction of incorporation or
organization)

20-8610073

(I.R.S. Employer Identification No.)

101 W. Renner Rd., Suite 200
Richardson, TX
(Address of principal executive offices)

75082
(Zip Code)

(800) 378-2297
(Registrant's telephone number, including area code)

Securities Registered pursuant to Section 12(b) of the Act: None

Securities Registered pursuant to Section 12(g) of the Exchange Act: Common Stock, \$0.0001 par value

Indicate by check mark if the registrant is a well-known seasoned issuer, as defined in Rule 405 of the Securities Act. Yes . No

Indicate by check mark if the registrant is not required to file reports pursuant to Section 13 or Section 15(d) of the Act. Yes No

Edgar Filing: BLUE CALYPSO, INC. - Form 10-K

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant (1) has filed all reports required to be filed by Section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 during the preceding 12 months (or for such shorter period that the registrant was required to file such reports), and (2) has been subject to such filing requirements for the past 90 days. Yes No

Indicate by check mark if disclosure of delinquent filers pursuant to Item 405 of Regulations S-K (§ 229.405 of this chapter) is not contained herein, and will not be contained, to the best of registrant's knowledge, in definitive proxy or information statements incorporated by reference in Part III of this Form 10-K or any amendment to this Form 10-K.

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a large accelerated filer, an accelerated filer, a non-accelerated filer, or a smaller reporting company. See the definitions of "large accelerated filer," "accelerated filer" and "smaller reporting company" in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act.

| | | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|
| Large accelerated filer | <input type="checkbox"/> | Accelerated filer | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Non-accelerated filer | <input type="checkbox"/> | (Do not check if a smaller reporting company) | Smaller reporting company <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

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

On June 30, 2015, the last business day of the registrant's most recently completed second fiscal quarter, the aggregate market value (based on the closing sales price on that date) of the voting stock held by non-affiliates of the registrant was \$17,418,543. Shares of common stock held by each current executive officer and director and by each person who is known by the registrant to own 5% or more of the outstanding common stock have been excluded from this computation in that such persons may be deemed to be affiliates of the registrant. This determination of affiliate status is not a conclusive determination for other purposes.

The number of outstanding shares of the registrant's common stock as of March 17, 2016, was 6,007,443.

Table of Contents

BLUE CALYPSO, INC.
INDEX TO ANNUAL REPORT ON FORM 10-K
FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2015

| | | Page |
|----------|---|------|
| PART I | | |
| Item 1. | <u>Business</u> | 3 |
| Item 1A. | <u>Risk Factors</u> | 11 |
| Item 1B. | <u>Unresolved Staff Comments</u> | 23 |
| Item 2. | <u>Properties</u> | 23 |
| Item 3. | <u>Legal Proceedings</u> | 24 |
| Item 4. | <u>Mine Safety Disclosures</u> | 24 |
| PART II | | |
| Item 5. | <u>Market for Registrant's Common Equity, Related Stockholder Matters and Issuer Purchases of Equity Securities</u> | 25 |
| Item 6. | <u>Selected Financial Data</u> | 26 |
| Item 7. | <u>Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operation</u> | 26 |
| Item 7A. | <u>Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures About Market Risk</u> | 32 |
| Item 8. | <u>Financial Statements and Supplementary Data</u> | 32 |
| Item 9. | <u>Changes in and Disagreements with Accountants on Accounting and Financial Disclosure</u> | 32 |
| Item 9A. | <u>Controls and Procedures</u> | 32 |
| Item 9B. | <u>Other Information</u> | 33 |
| PART III | | |
| Item 10. | <u>Directors, Executive Officers and Corporate Governance</u> | 34 |
| Item 11. | <u>Executive Compensation</u> | 37 |
| Item 12. | <u>Security Ownership of Certain Beneficial Owners and Management and Related Stockholder Matters</u> | 40 |
| Item 13. | <u>Certain Relationships and Related Transactions, and Director Independence</u> | 41 |
| Item 14. | <u>Principal Accounting Fees and Services</u> | 41 |
| PART IV | | |
| Item 15. | <u>Exhibits and Financial Statement Schedules</u> | 42 |

Table of Contents

PART I

ITEM 1. BUSINESS

OUR COMPANY

Blue Calypso, Inc. (the “Company,” “Blue Calypso,” “we,” or “us”) develops and delivers mobile shopper marketing and analytics solutions for the business-to-consumer (B2C) marketplace leveraging mobile, social media, gamification and our intellectual property portfolio. We have developed a patented technology platform that enables brands and retailers to engage with shoppers when they are on the path-to-purchase products and services. Our technology also allows brands to leverage customer relationships to increase brand loyalty and drive revenue through sharing and influencer marketing. We generate revenue from the mobile and cloud-based consumption of our technology platform, consulting/services fees, and licensing and/or enforcement of our patented technologies. Our intellectual property portfolio consists of five US patents (an appeal at the Federal Circuit as a result of the PTAB ruling in December 2014 is in progress, which may affect the validity of one of the patents) and eleven pending patent applications that generally cover methods and systems for communicating and syndicating electronic offers and advertisements. One of the applications has recently been allowed by the patent office and we expect it to issue as a patent in the near future. Once granted the number of patents held by the Company will increase to six. All of the patents and patent applications that cover the core of our business, i.e., a “System and Method for Peer-to-Peer Advertising Between Mobile Communication Devices”, have been developed internally by our Founder and Chief Executive Officer, Andrew Levi, and our Director of Innovation, Bradley Bauer, and assigned to our wholly owned subsidiary, Blue Calypso, LLC. In September 2013, we acquired proprietary mobile gamification technology and subsequently applied for two additional patents based upon the enhancement and integration of this technology into our platform.

Our proprietary technology platform enables retailers to harness the power and adoption that today’s mobile devices bring to the consumer shopping experience. We connect brands with store visitors when they are on the path-to-purchase and enable those customers to engage with, and redeem brand content as well as leverage their brand affinity across the most popular social media channels. Our platform tracks performance, monitors engagement, manages attribution and delivers robust, real-time analytics that provide acute insight regarding the adoption, performance and return on investment of our client’s promotions and location-based content. Our technology is designed to help clients target their marketing messages, attract new customers, increase awareness and drive product sales. For example, campaigns facilitated through our platform can encourage consumers to learn more about products, watch promotional videos about particular products, see product reviews and comparative pricing or click to buy products. All delivered through a highly engaging mobile “kiosk” or “digital concierge” type experience.

Over the last five years, the world has seen mobile, social media, and digital advertising evolve dramatically and actually converge. Through this technological evolution, a sociological shift has occurred in how influential digital media can be when deployed strategically with hyper-targeted content.

Today retailers are aggressively exploring mobile shopper engagement as the next frontier of the shopping experience. In an article issued by Reuters on December 2, 2014 titled, “Majority of Mobile Shoppers Turn To Their Devices Over Store Employees And In-Store Info, according to CEA Survey”, more than half (58 percent) of shoppers who use mobile devices, such as smartphones and tablets, indicate they prefer to look up information on their devices while shopping, rather than talk to store employees – especially among men and shoppers aged 25-44. However we believe that retailers have yet to find a comfortable way of co-existing in this ecosystem of traditional consumer engagement.

Through mobile and social media, consumers and brands have their own unique and significant digital audience. According to Statista, the average Facebook user has 350 Friends. As reported in an article published by The Telegraph, the average Twitter user is an American woman with an iPhone and 208 followers. The claims in the

article are based on data culled from a sample of 36 million Twitter profiles by Beevolve, a social media marketing firm. We believe that on average an individual has 25 unique frequent contacts they communicate with weekly via text messages or mobile calls. We also believe that active participation in LinkedIn, Google+, Tumblr and/or a personal blog can further extend one's direct social reach significantly. With our platform, brand content is not bound by any single app, social media community, website, carrier or device. As a result, brand influencers have the capability to immediately reach hundreds or even thousands of people through their direct personal and digital social relationships.

As a by-product of campaign delivery and recipient interaction, we deliver real-time analytics and business intelligence capabilities, which provide brands the ability to see how campaigns are deployed, where they are getting the most traction, and which are seeing the most activity. The platform also allows brands to assess the conversational response and sentiment to their messages which enables them to adjust their campaigns based on performance.

Table of Contents

OUR PRODUCTS AND SERVICES

Our core platform called KIOSENTRIX® is the basis for our business model. Additionally, we offer outsourced consulting and customized software development services through our Blue Calypso Labs (“BC Labs”) services.

KIOSENTRIX® provides manufacturers and brick-and-mortar retailers with a highly targeted and personalized way of engaging with store visitors when they are on the path-to-purchase. There are several methods of activation with store visitors including but not limited to short-code messaging, iBeacons, Near Field Communications (NFC), Quick Response (QR) codes, wifi and Geo-fencing. Once invited through store messaging and activated, a store visitor is guided by store-centric content through their shopping experience which is unique for each retailer. All interactions with the store shopper are tracked in order to deliver targeted content which is both circumstantially and geographically relevant and ultimately drives more store visits and increases the purchase size while creating a higher degree of customer affinity and satisfaction.

Blue Calypso Labs™, or BC Labs, was launched in October 2013 to offer software development, innovation and related consulting services to clients. BC Lab’s mission is to help clients develop unique software solutions that solve strategic business problems, focus on integrating our digital marketing and analytics technologies into various client applications as well as seek licensing revenue from our broad portfolio of intellectual property.

We intend to continue to develop new technology and expand on our intellectual property portfolio and product offerings to meet the needs of companies seeking to amplify their brand messages through social media networks.

Our principal executive offices are located at 101 W. Renner Rd. Suite 200, Richardson, Texas 75082. Our telephone number is (800) 378-2297. Our website address is <http://www.bluecalypso.com>.

MARKET OPPORTUNITY

We believe that the market opportunities for our existing products and technology are significant and continuing to expand. According to the figure below, Forrester Research estimates that in 2015, approximately \$67 billion will be spent in the United States on interactive marketing. Forrester estimates this amount will increase to approximately \$103 billion by 2019. We believe social media marketing is experiencing rapid growth because consumers are much more receptive to recommendations from their friends and family. The below chart demonstrates these trends.

Source: Forrester Research, Inc.

Table of Contents

We believe that as advertisers adapt to the changing media and content distribution landscape, they will place an increasing priority on the next frontier of mobile while leveraging social media communities and properties.

We believe that historical advertising media such as print, television and radios, and even Internet banner ads, are beginning to shift to mobile platforms and generally explore alternatives to traditional advertising techniques. Mobile platforms enable advertisers to put relevant messages out to a more highly targeted buyer community, while encouraging branded and personal content syndication. In addition, mobile devices have become a ubiquitous extension of many target buyers and a critical part of the lifestyle of most generations.

We believe that one of the most attractive characteristics of mobile consumers for advertisers is the opportunity for more accurate content targeting. Typical parameters include carrier, device type and mobile channel, with the possibility to add geo-location, behavioral, demographic and interest-based information (the latter two generally require user opt in) infused with a user's actual purchase history. For instance, mobile technology can enable relevant promotional offers and coupons to be delivered to shoppers' phones while they are in the store. That level of personalization will likely affect purchase behavior. According to the Telemetrics/xAd report, coupons and relevant targeting also motivate consumers to take further action.

Mobile marketing has the ability to connect brands with consumers on an intimate one-to-one basis, providing relevant information that is important to them when it interests them the most. While the sector is still in its infancy, we believe that brands, retailers, advertising executives, content publishers and technology enablers have high expectations regarding the potential of the mobile advertising market. We believe that our platform offers an effective tool for advertisers seeking to enter or expand their advertising presence in the mobile market, target specific customers with selected messages, and capitalize on the power of peer recommendations. In fact, according to an article published by eMarketer on January 5, 2015 titled, In-Store Mobile Use Redefines Customer Service, a Deloitte study found that mobile devices used before or during in-store shopping trips converted or helped to convert nearly \$600 billion in US in-store retail sales in 2013 or 19% of total brick-and-mortar sales.

We also believe that peer-to-peer or "friend-to-friend" advertising (also known as influencer marketing) is the most powerful and effective form of communicating with consumers. According to eMarketer's October 24, 2014 report titled, Millennials' Social Shares Don't Stop with the Post, two thirds of 18-34-year-olds were at least somewhat likely to make a purchase based on content shared by one of their peers on social. According to Nielsen as published in the Simply Measured report titled, Influencer Marketing: Stats and Quotes You Need to Know, 90% of consumers trust peer recommendations but only 33% trust ads. We believe that this ability to share retail offers and product information in real-time with friends and family, makes mobile content delivery even more valuable. Our products enable our customers to combine great mobile-targeted content with word-of-mouth recommendations.

COMPETITIVE STRENGTHS

Mobile shopper engagement, digital market awareness and branding through mobile and digital media is an extremely competitive and fragmented industry. Adequate protection of intellectual property, successful product development, adequate funding and retention of experienced personnel are critical to our success. We believe that we have the following strengths:

- **Prominent Intellectual Property Position.** We believe that our patents provide us with broad and comprehensive coverage for the electronic delivery of brand content and electronic offers on any electronic communication device. Our policy is to seek to protect our proprietary position by filing patent applications related to our proprietary technology and improvements that we believe are important to the development of our business. We also pursue companies that we believe are infringing on our intellectual property in order to protect our intellectual property assets and our

competitive position.

- **Extensive Knowledge and Experience in Product Advertising, Awareness and Branding.** We believe that our management and personnel have extensive knowledge and experience in product advertising, digital marketing and awareness and branding which significantly adds to our competitive position.
- **Highly Scalable Platform.** We have the ability to rapidly customize products to meet our client's diverse needs. Our technology platform has evolved and matured as we have refined our go-to-market strategy and target market.

Table of Contents

OUR STRATEGY

We intend to continue innovating and will attempt to maximize the economic benefits of our intellectual property. We currently have two key areas of operation:

Development and Delivery of Mobile Shopper Engagement Solutions- We have developed a proprietary platform that enables brands to engage with shoppers when they are on the path-to-purchase in order to deliver a unique shopper experience, increase brand loyalty and drive revenue.

We believe that our strong intellectual property and our extensive experience in mobile technologies, affinity/advocacy, awareness and branding will enable us to continue to develop new products and services. We will execute on this strategy through a combination of: organic customer acquisition; indirect customer acquisition through strategic partners such as IntegraColor; and through synergistic acquisitions.

Our direct to market approach includes aggressive market awareness through public relations, and digital and traditional marketing awareness such as mailings, calls, email campaigns, social media, trade show attendance, and industry association participation. Partnering with organizations that are part of the marketing supply chain who focus on our target market (multi-location brick-and-mortar retailers) gives us immediate access to and credibility with a portfolio of existing customers. Furthermore, by aligning with the right partners, our solutions become part of a larger program which drives revenue for our customers. These programs include our customer's branding, demand generation, marketing programs/campaigns, deals/offers/coupons, customer affinity programming and other initiatives already in existence with their brands. Finally, we expect to identify and pursue strategic acquisitions that help us grow our feature set, customer base, services capabilities, and our intellectual property portfolio.

Maximization of the Economic Benefits of Our Intellectual Property- The Company was founded based on the opportunities created when the vision and opportunity for mobile adoption caused our founders to file our first patent in 2004. Since then we have expanded our portfolio and will continue to innovate and file for additional patent protection of our inventions. This IP portfolio is a very valuable asset and we have a duty to the Company and to the shareholders to protect these assets. Therefore we intend to continue to identify and pursue those in the marketplace that are infringing our IP.

In summary, we have developed a proprietary platform that enables brands to engage with shoppers when they are on the path-to-purchase in order to deliver a unique shopper experience, increase brand loyalty and drive revenue. We believe that our strong intellectual property and our extensive experience in mobile technologies, awareness and branding will enable us to continue to develop new products and services.

We intend to expand our intellectual property portfolio through both internal development and acquisition. Our goal is to monetize our intellectual property through licensing and strategic partnerships.

Marketing

We target multi-location brick-and-mortar retailers as well as product manufacturers through partnerships and indirect sales channels as well as brand-direct. We have a multi-touch marketing and branding strategy as well as exhibit at trade shows and market directly utilizing current digital techniques such as social media and pay-per-click advertising.

Customers

We enter into written agreements with each of our customers, which vary in term. Customers' fees are based on the complexity of the solution we deliver for them and generally include a setup fee, monthly service fee and sometimes

a performance fee. Further, our test programs tend to be much smaller as we seek to prove the concept with a particular customer before rolling out a full national campaign. We have also entered into license agreements pursuant to which we derive revenue for the use of our intellectual property on a perpetual license basis. Through BC Labs we provide consulting and software development services.

Technology to Capture Data

Our platform allows the collection of business intelligence and analytics resulting from data accumulated as content is deployed, adopted, consumed and shared. Our technology allows the brand/advertiser to monitor the full cycle of a campaign, from the first engagement to the final redemption or intent to purchase. With this data, we show each client the return on investment (ROI) of each dollar spent using our unique platform. This allows us to prove the effectiveness of the engagement in near real time and enables clients to quickly improve their campaign effectiveness.

Table of Contents

Intellectual Property

We believe we have advantages over competitors in the mobile advertising industry due to the intellectual property we possess and have on file with the United States Patent and Trademark Office. In February 2010, we received United States Patent number 7,664,516.

Subsequently we have received continuation-in-part (CIP) patents 8,155,679, 8,438,055, 8,452,646 and 8,457,670. With the payment of all maintenance fees, '516, '679, '055 and '646 patents will not expire until December 14, 2026.

We believe that the patents cover the core of our business, i.e., a basic method and system for peer-to-peer advertising between mobile communications devices. We also have four (4) additional CIP patent applications pending which build on the functionality of our issued patents, one patent application which covers a digital game of tag played on mobile devices through which participants can earn points and incentives from game sponsors, and one patent application that covers cumulative incentives.

On December 17, 2014, the Patent Trial and Appeal Board issued final decisions in Covered Business Method Review proceedings CBM2013-00035, CBM2013-00033, CBM2013-00034, CBM2013-00046 and CBM2013-00044. In each case, certain claims of each patent were held to be invalid for various reasons. With respect to the '516, '679, '055 and '646 patents, many of the claims survived and the patents remain enforceable. All of the claims of the '670 patent were held invalid. The Company appealed each of the final decisions to the United States Federal Circuit Court of Appeals. The Company appealed the unpatentability determinations including the decision of invalidity based on anticipation of several claims of the patents by prior art (the Paul reference). The Company also appealed the decision to review its patents under the provisions for CBMR and that the '516 patent lacked sufficient written description under § 112 to support the claims. Groupon appealed the Board's decision that the patents were not valid under § 103 and the determination by the PTAB that the Ratismor reference was not publically available prior art.

On March 1, 2016, the Federal Circuit overturned the PTAB decision as to insufficient written description but upheld the decision that the Ratismore reference was not publically available prior art. However, the Federal Circuit confirmed the Board's decision to institute the CBMR process on the basis that Blue Calypso's patent portfolio qualified as a business method patent which was financial in nature. The Federal Circuit also upheld the decision of invalidity based on anticipation of several claims of the patents by the prior art Paul reference.

The Company has an option to pursue an en banc review of the holding with respect to anticipation by the Paul reference. An en banc review would occur before a panel of eight judges of the Federal Circuit as compared to the recently completed appeals process which utilized three. We also have the option of requesting that the Supreme Court review the Federal Circuit's decision. These options for appeal must be filed within 30 and 90 days respectively from the date of the March 1, 2016 decision.

The reversal of the written description matter is significant as it re-establishes the '516 parent patent issue date of February 2010 as the date that damages begin to accrue. Prior to this reversal, the first date of infringement was relegated to the later issue date of the '679 patent on April 2012.

The court dockets for each case, including the parties' briefs are publicly available on the Public Access to Court Electronic Records website, or PACER, www.pacer.gov, which is operated by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts.

Below is a brief overview of our issued patents:

U.S. Patent No. 7,644,516

The '516 Patent discloses a method and system for communicating advertisements between mobile communication devices. An advertising campaign and a set of incentives are arranged between an advertiser and an intermediary, such as Blue Calypso. A subscriber is identified for the advertiser based on a profile of a subscriber. A subscriber, once qualified for the advertising campaign, is presented with an opportunity to participate. In operation, when a communication transmission is received from the participant, the advertisement is associated with the communication transmission and sent to a destination.

U.S. Patents 8,155,679 and 8,457,670 are continuations of the '516 Patent and include claims which disclose similar subject matter.

U.S. Patent No. 8,438,055

The '055 Patent discloses a system and method for distribution of advertisements between communication devices. The system and method provides for accounting and distribution of incentives related to distribution of the advertisements. The system further provides for association of testimonials from advertising recipients related to the advertisement and for distribution of the testimonials to communication devices. A bi-lateral selection between subscribers and advertisers using the system is created whereby both advertisers and subscribers agree to participate in the distribution of advertisements and testimonials.

Table of Contents

U.S. Patent No. 8,452,646

The '646 Patent discloses a system and method for distribution of advertisements and electronic offers between communication devices. The system and method provides for accounting and distribution of incentives related to distribution of the advertisements and offers. A bi-lateral selection between subscribers and advertisers using the system is created whereby both advertisers and subscribers agree to participate in the distribution of advertisements and offers. The system further provides for a means of redeeming offers utilizing points of sale and analytics associated to the redemption of electronic offers.

We believe that all of the technology that delivers our platform to both advertisers and endorsers has been developed and is fully owned by us with the exception of several web controls that are licensed by us pursuant to a royalty-free license with unlimited distribution rights. The architecture of the platform was designed to support millions of participants through server and application clustering and load-balancing. We believe the elegance of the data flow makes for an extremely light-weight and highly scalable system that can easily be enhanced. By using a standards-based SMS protocol coupled with tight integration to social communities such as Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn and blogs as the primary delivery mechanisms, and by serving the dynamic content via a standard mobile web browser, we are capable of supporting most any receiving mobile device with Internet access. Platform smartphone support is available for Apple iPhone and Google Android devices as well as through a standard desktop web browser.

We own twelve registered trademarks in the United States: "BLUE CALYPSO®," "WHEN FRIENDS TALK, FRIENDS LISTEN®," "CALYP®," "POWER TO THE PEOPLE®," "SOCIALY YOURS®," "ENDORSE SHARE EARN®," "EMGAGE®," "DASHTAGG®" (two registrations for different classes), "POPSHARE®," "SHARE ADVERTISING®," and "KIOSENTRIX®." In addition, we have four pending trademark applications for the following: "SOCIALECHO™," "MOBILE ADVANTAGE™," "OFTIN™," and "POPTRAX™."

We also believe that we have common law rights in these trademarks that arise from use of the marks in commerce. The trademark registrations will continue in force as long as all renewals are timely paid and use of the marks continues. Our common law trademark rights will continue as long as the marks are used in commerce.

Employees

As of December 31, 2015, we had a total of 17 full-time employees. We also utilize the services of independent contractors. We have no labor union contracts and believe relations with our employees are satisfactory.

Competition

We face formidable competition in every aspect of our business, particularly from other companies that seek to deliver a mobile targeted brand-driven experience for consumers. First and foremost, we consider ourselves a next generation mobile shopping experience including customer engagement, customer presentation, social sharing, brand loyalty and rewards so we believe our primary competitors are companies that embrace true brand loyalty, not just providers of discounted transactions. We believe that our space is large and has no first movers or any company with a notable share of the market. We believe that our approach to the market, value proposition to large retail brands, combined with our strong intellectual property are clear differentiators in a nascent yet quickly evolving industry for mobile shopper marketing.

We also face competition from other mobile and Internet advertising providers, including companies that are not yet known to us. We may compete with companies that sell products and services online, because these companies, like us, are trying to attract users to their websites to search for information about products and services. Our biggest

competitor is each of the retail brands for which we are in pursuit as many of them have or are building their own mobile apps. The problem we predict most of them will face at some point is the fact that consumers do not want a mobile app on their phone for every retailer they shop at. Therefore, with few exceptions, the adoption has been and will continue to be poor. Thus, we expect that retailers will abandon this expensive route for mobile engagement and transition to what we believe is a much more effective route to success by partnering with Blue Calypso.

We believe that we compete favorably on the factors described above. However, product advertising, marketing, awareness and branding through social media sites is an extremely competitive space. As we expand our product offerings to include private branded products, instant access products, as well as other technology offerings, we will continue to face new competitors. Further, as the technology marketplace is always expanding, new competitors continuously innovate, and can become a competitor in the future.

Table of Contents

Government Regulation

Aspects of the digital marketing and advertising industry and how our business operates are highly regulated. We are subject to a number of domestic and, to the extent our operations are conducted outside the U.S., foreign laws and regulations that affect companies conducting business on the Internet and through other electronic means, many of which are still evolving and could be interpreted in ways that could harm our business. In particular, we are subject to rules of the Federal Trade Commission (“FTC”), the Federal Communications Commission (“FCC”) and potentially other federal agencies and state laws related to our advertising content and methods, the Controlling the Assault of Non-Solicited Pornography and Marketing Act of 2003, or CAN-SPAM Act, which became effective on January 1, 2004, establishes certain requirements for commercial electronic mail messages and specifies penalties for the transmission of commercial electronic mail messages that follow a recipient’s opt-out request or are intended to deceive the recipient as to source or content, federal and state regulations covering the treatment of member data that we collect from endorsers.

U.S. and foreign regulations and laws potentially affecting our business are evolving frequently. We are, and will continue to update and improve our regulatory compliance features and functionality, and we will need to continue to identify and determine how to effectively comply with all the regulations to which we are subject now or in the future. If we are unable to identify all regulations to which our business is subject and implement effective means of compliance, we could be subject to enforcement actions, lawsuits and penalties, including but not limited to fines and other monetary liability or injunction that could prevent us from operating our business or certain aspects of our business. In addition, compliance with the regulations to which we are subject now or in the future may require changes to our products or services, restrictor impose additional costs upon the conduct of our business or cause users to abandon material aspects of our services. Any such action could have a material adverse effect on our business, results of operations and financial condition.

The FTC adopted Guides Concerning the Use of Endorsements and Testimonials in Advertising (“Guides”) on October 5, 2009. The Guides recommend that advertisers and publishers clearly disclose in third-party endorsements made online, such as in social media, if compensation was received in exchange for said endorsements. Because our business connects endorsers and advertisers, relies on endorsers sharing their brand endorsements within their digital social circles, and both we and endorsers may earn cash and other incentives, any failure on our part to comply with the Guides may be damaging to our business. We are currently taking several steps to ensure that our endorsers indicate in social media posts that compensation is being provided to the endorsers, including by listing the phrase “paid” or “ad” or other appropriate language in advertisements that our endorsers circulate on social media. We also advise endorsers of the need to comply with the Guides, and we can terminate accounts with endorsers for noncompliance. Nonetheless, the FTC could potentially identify a violation of the Guides, which could subject us to a financial penalty or loss of endorsers or advertisers.

In the area of information security and data protection, many states have passed laws requiring notification to users when there is a security breach for personal data, such as the 2002 amendment to California’s Information Practices Act, or requiring the adoption of minimum information security standards that are often vaguely defined and difficult to practically implement. The costs of compliance with these laws may increase in the future as a result of changes in interpretation. Furthermore, any failure on our part to comply with these laws may subject us to significant liabilities.

We are also subject to federal, state, and foreign laws regarding privacy and protection of member data. Any failure by us to comply with these privacy-related laws and regulations could result in proceedings against us by governmental authorities or others, which could harm our business. In addition, the interpretation of data protection laws, and their application to the Internet is unclear and in a state of flux. There is a risk that these laws may be interpreted and applied in conflicting ways from state to state, country to country, or region to region, and in a manner that is not consistent with our current data protection practices. Complying with these varying international requirements could

cause us to incur additional costs and change our business practices. Further, any failure by us to adequately protect our members' privacy and data could result in a loss of member confidence in our services and ultimately in a loss of members and customers, which could adversely affect our business.

We post on our website our privacy policy and user agreement, which describe our practices concerning the use, transmission and disclosure of member data. Any failure by us to comply with our privacy policy and user agreement could result in proceedings against us by members, customers, governmental authorities or others, which could harm our business.

Table of Contents

Many states have passed laws requiring notification to subscribers when there is a security breach of personal data. There are also a number of legislative proposals pending before the United States Congress, various state legislative bodies and foreign governments concerning data protection. In addition, data protection laws in Europe and other jurisdictions outside the United States may be more restrictive, and the interpretation and application of these laws are still uncertain and in flux. It is possible that these laws may be interpreted and applied in a manner that is inconsistent with our data practices. If so, in addition to the possibility of fines, this could result in an order requiring that we change our data practices, which could have an adverse effect on our business. Furthermore, the Digital Millennium Copyright Act has provisions that limit, but do not necessarily eliminate, our liability for linking to third-party websites that include materials that infringe copyrights or other rights, so long as we comply with the statutory requirements of this Act. Complying with these various laws could cause us to incur substantial costs or require us to change our business practices in a manner adverse to our business.

Our client's consumers/brand advocates communicate across email, mobile, social and/or web-based channels. These communications are governed by a variety of U.S. federal, state, and foreign laws and regulations. With respect to email campaigns, for example, in the United States, the CAN-SPAM Act, establishes certain requirements for the distribution of "commercial" email messages for the primary purpose of advertising or promoting a commercial product, service, or Internet website and provides for penalties for transmission of commercial email messages that are intended to deceive the recipient as to source or content or that do not give opt-out control to the recipient. The U.S. Federal Trade Commission, a federal consumer protection agency, is primarily responsible for enforcing the CAN-SPAM Act, and the U.S. Department of Justice, other federal agencies, state attorneys general, and Internet service providers also have authority to enforce certain of its provisions.

The CAN-SPAM Act's main provisions include:

- prohibiting false or misleading email header information;
- prohibiting the use of deceptive subject lines;
- ensuring that recipients may, for at least 30 days after an email is sent, opt out of receiving future commercial email messages from the sender, with the opt-out effective within 10 days of the request;
- requiring that commercial email be identified as a solicitation or advertisement unless the recipient affirmatively assented to receiving the message; and
- requiring that the sender include a valid postal address in the email message.

The CAN-SPAM Act preempts most state restrictions specific to email marketing. However, some states have passed laws regulating commercial email practices that are significantly more punitive and difficult to comply with than the CAN-SPAM Act, particularly Utah and Michigan, which have enacted do-not-email registries listing minors who do not wish to receive unsolicited commercial email that markets certain covered content, such as adult content or content regarding harmful products. Some portions of these state laws may not be preempted by the CAN-SPAM Act.

Violations of the CAN-SPAM Act's provisions can result in criminal and civil penalties, including statutory penalties that can be based in part upon the number of emails sent, with enhanced penalties for commercial email senders who harvest email addresses, use dictionary attack patterns to generate email addresses, and/or relay emails through a network without permission.

With respect to text message campaigns, for example, the CAN-SPAM Act and regulations implemented by the U.S. Federal Communications Commission pursuant to the CAN-SPAM Act, and the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, also known as the Federal Do-Not-Call law, among other requirements, prohibit companies from sending specified types of commercial text messages unless the recipient has given his or her prior express consent.

We, our clients and our client's consumers/brand advocates may all be subject to various provisions of the CAN-SPAM Act. If we are found to be subject to the CAN-SPAM Act, we may be required to change one or more aspects of the way we operate our business.

If we were found to be in violation of the CAN-SPAM Act, other federal laws, applicable state laws not preempted by the CAN-SPAM Act, or foreign laws regulating the distribution of commercial email, whether as a result of violations by our endorsers or any determination that we are directly subject to and in violation of these requirements, we could be required to pay penalties, which would adversely affect our financial performance and significantly harm our reputation and our business.

In addition, because our services are accessible worldwide, certain foreign jurisdictions may claim that we are required to comply with their laws, including in jurisdictions where we have no local entity, employees, or infrastructure.

Table of Contents

Corporate History

We were incorporated as a Nevada corporation on March 2, 2007 under the name JJ&R Ventures, Inc. for the purpose of developing and marketing an educational book series, consisting of books, presentations and flash cards focusing on healthy nutrition for children. On or about July 2011, we were presented with a business opportunity by the management of a privately held Texas company named Blue Calypso Holdings, Inc. that upon evaluation was determined to be more desirable than our previous business plan. As a result, we suspended our efforts in relation to our original business plan and entered into negotiations with Blue Calypso Holdings, Inc. to consummate a reverse merger transaction.

In contemplation of a possible transaction with Blue Calypso Holdings, Inc., we changed our name from “JJ&R Ventures, Inc.” to “Blue Calypso, Inc.” on July 21, 2011 and completed a three and four tenths (3.4) for one (1) forward stock split of our common stock.

On September 1, 2011, we entered into an Agreement of Merger and Plan of Reorganization (the “Merger Agreement”) with Blue Calypso Holdings, Inc. and our newly formed wholly-owned subsidiary, Blue Calypso Acquisition Corp. Upon the closing of the transactions contemplated under the Merger Agreement, Blue Calypso Acquisition Corp. merged with and into Blue Calypso Holdings, Inc., and Blue Calypso Holdings, Inc. as the surviving corporation became our wholly-owned subsidiary. In connection with this merger, we discontinued all of our prior operations and assumed the business of Blue Calypso Holdings, Inc. as our sole line of business. We refer to this merger transaction as the “reverse merger.”

Immediately following the closing of the reverse merger, we transferred all of our pre-merger assets and liabilities to JJ&R Ventures Holdings, Inc., a wholly-owned subsidiary, and transferred all of the outstanding stock of JJ&R Ventures Holdings, Inc. to Deborah Flores, our then majority stockholder and our former president, secretary, treasurer and sole director, in exchange for the cancellation of 51,000,000 shares of our common stock then owned by Ms. Flores.

On October 17, 2011, we merged with and into Blue Calypso, Inc., a Delaware corporation and wholly-owned subsidiary, for the sole purpose of changing our state of incorporation from Nevada to Delaware. We refer to this merger transaction as the “reincorporation merger.”

ITEM 1A. RISK FACTORS.

Investing in our common stock involves a high degree of risk. Before investing in our common stock, you should carefully consider the risks described below and the financial and other information included in this Annual report. If any of the following risks, or any other risks not described below, actually occur, it is likely that our business, financial condition, and/or operating results could be materially adversely affected. In such case, the trading price and market value of our common stock could decline and you may lose part or all of your investment in our common stock. The risks and uncertainties described below include forward-looking statements and our actual results may differ from those discussed in these forward-looking statements.

Risks Relating to our Business

We have a history of losses which may continue, which may negatively impact our ability to achieve our business objectives.

We incurred net losses of \$3,303,150 and \$7,735,464 for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014, respectively. While a significant portion of the losses for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014 is attributed to non-cash

equity compensation expense, we cannot assure you that we can achieve or sustain profitability on a quarterly or annual basis in the future. Our operations are subject to the risks and competition inherent in the establishment of a business enterprise in the relatively new and volatile market for product marketing and branding through social media communities. Revenues and profits, if any, will depend upon various factors, including whether we will be able to continue expansion of our revenue model. We may not achieve our business objectives and the failure to achieve such goals would have an adverse impact on us.

Our limited operating history makes it difficult to evaluate our current business and future prospects.

We are an early stage company and we have generated very limited revenue to date. To date, our business focuses on the development of our patented proprietary technology platform, through which we offer various shopper marketing, social media advertising and loyalty campaigns, and the assertion of our patents. Therefore, we not only have a very limited operating history, but also a limited track record of executing our business model which includes, among other things, creating, prosecuting, licensing, litigating or otherwise monetizing our patent assets. Our limited operating history and limited revenues generated to date make it difficult to evaluate our current business model and future prospects.

Table of Contents

In light of the costs, uncertainties, delays and difficulties frequently encountered by companies in the early stages of development with minimal operating history, there is a significant risk that we will not be able to:

implement or execute our current business plan, or demonstrate that our business plan is sound; and/or raise sufficient funds in the capital markets to effectuate our long-term business plan.

If we are unable to execute any one of the foregoing or similar matters relating to our operations, our business may fail.

We will require additional capital to support our present business plan and our anticipated business growth, and such capital may not be available on acceptable terms, or at all, which would adversely affect our ability to operate.

Based on our current operating plans, our current resources are expected to be sufficient to fund our planned operations into May 2016. We may also need to raise additional funds in connection with any acquisitions of technology or intellectual property assets that we pursue for a new opportunity to innovate our platform, a change in our approach to the market or to fund licensing and enforcement actions.

While we will need to seek additional funding, we may not be able to obtain financing on acceptable terms, or at all. If we are unable to obtain additional funding on a timely basis, we may be required to curtail or terminate some or all of our business plans.

Our independent registered public accounting firm's report contains an explanatory paragraph that expresses substantial doubt about our ability to continue as a going concern.

As of December 31, 2015, our accumulated deficit was \$35,470,384. Primarily as a result of our recurring losses from operations, negative cash flows and our accumulated deficit, our independent registered public accounting firm has included in its report for the year ended December 31, 2015 an explanatory paragraph expressing substantial doubt about our ability to continue as a going concern. Our ability to continue as a going concern is contingent upon, among other factors, our ability to obtain sufficient financing to support our operations. If we are not able to obtain sufficient financing to support our operations, we may be forced to limit or cease our operations.

The markets that we are targeting for revenue opportunities may change before we can access them.

The markets for traditional Internet and mobile web products and services that we target for revenue opportunities change rapidly and are being pursued by many other companies. Further, the barriers to entry are relatively low. Therefore, we cannot provide assurance that we will be able to realize our targeted revenue opportunities before they change or before other companies dominate the market. With the introduction of new technologies and the influx of new entrants to the market, we expect competition to persist and intensify in the future, which could harm our ability to increase sales, limit client attrition and maintain our prices.

We operate within a highly competitive and complex market, which could have an adverse effect on our business.

Technology for retail, product advertising, marketing, awareness and branding is an extremely competitive and fragmented industry. The industry can be significantly affected by many factors, including changes in local, regional, and national economic conditions, changes in consumer preferences, brand name recognition, marketing and the development of new and competing products or technologies. We expect that existing businesses that compete with us and have greater financial resources will be able to undertake more extensive marketing campaigns and more aggressive advertising strategies than us, thereby generating more attention to their companies. These competitive pressures could have a material adverse effect on our business, prospects, financial condition, and results of

operations.

We are presently reliant exclusively on a limited number of patented technologies.

We derive substantially all of our revenue from a relatively small number of key technologies. As new technological advances occur, many of our patented technologies may become obsolete before they are completely monetized. If we are unable to monetize our current patent assets for any reason, including obsolescence of our technology, the expiration of our patents or any other reason, we may be unable to acquire additional assets. If this occurs, our business and prospects would be materially harmed.

12

Table of Contents

Any failure to protect or enforce our patent or other intellectual property rights could significantly impair our business.

Our ability to successfully operate our business depends largely on the validity and enforceability of our patent rights and the relevance of our patent rights to commercially viable products or services. Third parties have challenged, and we expect will continue to challenge, the infringement, validity and enforceability of certain of our patents. In some instances, our patent claims could be substantially narrowed or declared invalid, unenforceable, not essential or not infringed. We cannot assure you that the validity and enforceability of our patents will be maintained or that our patent claims will be applicable to any particular product or service. In addition, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, or the "USPTO," could invalidate or render unenforceable our current or future patents (if any) or materially narrow the scope of their claims during the course of a re-examination. Any significant adverse finding as to the validity, enforceability or scope of certain of our patents and/or any successful design around certain of our patents could materially and adversely affect our ability to secure future settlements or licenses on beneficial terms, if at all, and otherwise harm our business.

On December 17, 2014, the Patent Trial and Appeal Board issued final decisions in Covered Business Method Review proceedings CBM2013-00035, CBM2013-00033, CBM2013-00034, CBM2013-00046 and CBM2013-00044. In each case, certain claims of each patent were held to be invalid for various reasons. With respect to the '516, '679, '055 and '646 patents, many of the claims survived and the patents remain enforceable. All of the claims of the '670 patent were held invalid. The Company appealed each of the final decisions to the United States Federal Circuit Court of Appeals. The Company appealed the unpatentability determinations including the decision of invalidity based on anticipation of several claims of the patents by prior art (the Paul reference). The Company also appealed the decision to review its patents under the provisions for CBMR and that the '516 patent lacked sufficient written description under § 112 to support the claims. Groupon appealed the Board's decision that the patents were not valid under § 103 and the determination by the PTAB that a certain reference (the Ratismor reference) was not publically available prior art.

On March 1, 2016, the Federal Circuit overturned the PTAB decision as to insufficient written description but upheld the decision that the Ratismore reference was not publically available prior art. However, the Federal Circuit confirmed the Board's decision to institute the CBMR process on the basis that Blue Calypso's patent portfolio qualified as a business method patent which was financial in nature. The Federal Circuit also upheld the decision of invalidity based on anticipation of several claims of the patents by the prior art (the Paul reference).

The Company has an option to pursue an en banc review of the holding with respect to anticipation by the Paul reference. An en banc review would occur before a panel of eight judges of the Federal Circuit as compared to the recently completed appeals process which utilized three. We also have the option of requesting that the Supreme Court review the Federal Circuit's decision. These options for appeal must be filed within 30 and 90 days respectively from the date of the March 1, 2016 decision.

The reversal of the written description matter is significant as it re-establishes the '516 parent patent issue date of February 2010 as the date that damages begin to accrue. Prior to this reversal the first date of infringement was relegated to the later issue date of the '679 patent on April 2012.

The court dockets for each case, including the parties' briefs are publicly available on the Public Access to Court Electronic Records website, or PACER, www.pacer.gov, which is operated by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts.

The value of our patent assets may decline.

We will likely be required to spend significant time and resources to maintain the effectiveness of our issued patents by paying maintenance fees and making filings with the USPTO as well as prosecuting our patent applications. In the future, we may acquire patent assets, including patent applications, which require us to spend resources to prosecute the applications with the USPTO.

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

- our applications for patents may not be granted and, if granted, may be challenged or invalidated;
- issued patents may not provide us with any competitive advantages versus potentially infringing parties;
- 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 where 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.

Table of Contents

We commenced legal proceedings against several companies and we expect such proceedings to be time-consuming, which may adversely affect our ability to operate our business.

We commenced legal proceedings against certain daily deal, social promotion and check-in applications (including Groupon, LivingSocial, Yelp, IZEA, MyLikes, and Foursquare), pursuant to which we alleged that such companies infringe on our patents. Certain of these defendants have substantially more resources than we do, which could make our litigation efforts more difficult. We reached settlement in our patent infringement disputes with MyLikes in July 2013, with LivingSocial in August 2013 with IZEA in August 2015, and with Yelp in September 2015.

We anticipate that certain of our ongoing legal proceedings may continue for several years and will require significant attention from our senior management. 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 intellectual property rights or to determine the validity and scope of other parties' proprietary rights. The defendants or other third parties involved in the lawsuits in which we are involved may allege defenses and/or file counterclaims in an effort to avoid or limit liability and damages for patent infringement. If such defenses or counterclaims are successful, they may preclude our ability to derive licensing revenue from the patents. A negative outcome of any such litigation, or one or more claims contained within any such litigation, could materially and adversely impact our business. Our failure to monetize our patent assets could significantly harm our business and financial position.

While we believe that the patents we own are being infringed by certain leading daily deal, social promotion and check-in applications, there is a risk that a court will find the patents invalid, not infringed or unenforceable and/or that the U.S. Patent Office (USPTO) will either invalidate the patents or materially narrow the scope of their claims during the course of a re-examination. In addition, even with a positive trial court verdict, the patents may be invalidated, found not infringed or rendered unenforceable on appeal. This risk may occur either presently or from time to time in connection with future litigations we may bring. If this were to occur, it could have a material adverse effect on the viability of our company and our operations.

We believe that there are companies that have, and continue to, infringe our patents, but actually obtaining and collecting a judgment against such companies may be difficult or impossible. Patent litigation is inherently risky and the outcome is uncertain. Some of the parties we believe infringe on our patents are large and well-financed companies with substantially greater resources than ours. We believe that these parties would devote a substantial amount of resources in an attempt to avoid or limit a finding that they are liable for infringing our patents or, in the event liability is found, to avoid or limit the amount of associated damages. In addition, there is a risk that these parties may file re-examinations or other proceedings with the USPTO or other government agencies in an attempt to invalidate, narrow the scope or render unenforceable the patents we own.

Moreover, in connection with any of our present or future patent enforcement actions, it is possible that a defendant may request and/or a court may rule that we violated statutory authority, regulatory authority, federal rules, local court rules, or governing standards relating to the substantive or procedural aspects of such enforcement actions. In such event, a court may issue monetary sanctions against us or our operating subsidiaries or award attorneys' fees and/or expenses to one or more defendants, which could be material, and if we or our subsidiaries are required to pay such monetary sanctions, attorneys' fees and/or expenses, such payment could materially harm our operating results and financial position.

In addition, it is difficult in general to predict the outcome of patent enforcement litigation at the trial or appellate level. There is a higher rate of appeals in patent enforcement litigation than standard business litigation. The defendants in any patent action we bring in the United States may file an appeal to the Court of Appeals to the Federal Circuit and possibly in the United States Supreme Court. Such appeals are expensive and time-consuming, and the

outcomes of such appeals are sometimes unpredictable, resulting in increased costs and reduced or delayed revenue.

Finally, we believe that the more prevalent patent enforcement actions become, the more difficult it will be for us to license our patents without engaging in litigation. As a result, we may need to increase the number of our patent enforcement actions to cause infringing companies to license the patent or pay damages for lost royalties. This will adversely affect our operating results due to the high costs of litigation and the uncertainty of the results.

Trial judges and juries often find it difficult to understand complex patent enforcement litigation, and as a result, we may need to appeal adverse decisions by lower courts in order to successfully enforce our patents.

It is difficult to predict the outcome of patent enforcement litigation at the trial level. It is often difficult for juries and trial judges to understand complex, patented technologies, and as a result, there is a higher rate of successful appeals in patent enforcement litigation than more standard business litigation. Such appeals are expensive and time consuming, resulting in increased costs and delayed revenue. Although we will diligently pursue enforcement litigation, we cannot predict with significant reliability the decisions made by juries and trial courts.

Table of Contents

Federal courts are becoming more crowded, and as a result, patent enforcement litigation is taking longer.

Federal trial courts that hear our patent enforcement actions also hear criminal cases. Criminal cases always take priority over patent enforcement actions. As a result, it is difficult to predict the length of time it will take to complete an enforcement action. Moreover, we believe there is a trend in increasing numbers of civil lawsuits and criminal proceedings before federal judges, and as a result, we believe that the risk of delays in our patent enforcement actions will have a greater effect on our business in the future unless this trend changes.

If a court finds that any of our patents are invalid or narrows their scope over the course of a re-examination or we are otherwise unable to protect our proprietary rights, our ability to competitively conduct our business will be adversely effected.

We rely on our proprietary rights to deliver our platform. To protect our proprietary rights, we rely on a combination of patent and trade secret laws, confidentiality agreements, and protective contractual provisions. Despite these efforts, our patents and intellectual property relating to our business may not provide us with adequate protection of our platform or any competitive advantages.

Our five issued patents have been and may be subjected to further challenge and possibly invalidated by third parties. Changes in either the patent laws or in the interpretations of patent laws in the United States or other countries may diminish the value of our intellectual property.

We own eleven pending patent applications in the United States. We cannot assure that these patent applications will be issued, in whole or in part, as patents. Patent applications in the United States are maintained in secrecy until the patents are published or issued. Since publication of discoveries in the scientific or patent literature tends to lag behind actual discoveries by several months, we cannot be certain that we are the first creator of the inventions covered by pending patent applications.

The status of patents involves complex legal and factual questions and the breadth of claims allowed is uncertain. Accordingly, we cannot be certain that the patent applications that we file will actually afford protection against competitors with similar technology. Others may independently develop similar or alternative products and technologies that may be outside the scope of our intellectual property. In addition, patents issued to us may be infringed upon or designed around by others and others may obtain blocking patents that we need to license or design around, either of which would increase costs and may adversely affect our operations.

Further, effective protection of intellectual property rights may be unavailable or limited in some foreign countries. Our inability to adequately protect our proprietary rights would have an adverse impact on our ability to competitively market our platform on a world-wide basis.

We also rely on trade secrets law to protect our technology. Trade secrets, however, are difficult to protect. While we believe that we use reasonable efforts to protect our trade secrets, our or our strategic partners' employees, consultants, contractors or advisors may unintentionally or willfully disclose our information to competitors. We seek to protect this information, in part, through the use of non-disclosure and confidentiality agreements with employees, consultants, advisors, and others. However, these agreements may be breached and we may not have adequate remedies for a breach. In addition, we cannot ensure that those agreements will provide adequate protection for our trade secrets, know-how or other proprietary information or prevent their unauthorized use or disclosure.

If our trade secrets become known to competitors with greater experience and financial resources, the competitors may copy or use our trade secrets and other proprietary information in the advancement of their products, methods or technologies. If we were to prosecute a claim that a third party had illegally obtained and was using our trade secrets,

it could be expensive and time consuming and the outcome could be unpredictable. In addition, courts outside the United States are sometimes less willing to protect trade secrets than courts in the United States. Moreover, if our competitors independently develop equivalent knowledge, we would lack any contractual claim to this information, and our business could be harmed.

To the extent that consultants and key employees apply technological information independently developed by them or by others to our potential products, disputes may arise as to the proprietary rights of the information, which may not be resolved in our favor. Consultants and key employees that work with our confidential and proprietary technologies are required to assign all intellectual property rights in their discoveries to us. However, these consultants and key employees may terminate their relationship with us, and we cannot preclude them indefinitely from dealing with our competitors.

Table of Contents

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

Members of our management team have significant experience as inventors. As such, part of our business may include the internal development of new inventions or intellectual property that we will seek to monetize. However, this aspect of our business would likely require significant capital and would be time consuming. 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 our initiatives in this regard would not yield any viable new inventions or technology, which would lead to a loss of our investments in time and resources 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 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 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 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 license or otherwise monetize, our rights will depend on maintaining our obligations to the licensor under the applicable license agreement, 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 and adverse effect on our company.

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 could become involved in intellectual property disputes that create a drain on our resources and could ultimately impair our assets.

We do not knowingly infringe on any patents, copyrights or other intellectual property rights owned by other parties; however, in the event of an infringement claim, we may be required to spend a significant amount of

money to defend a claim, develop a non-infringing alternative or to obtain licenses. We may not be successful in developing such an alternative or obtaining licenses on reasonable terms, if at all. Any litigation, even if without merit, could result in substantial costs and diversion of our resources and could materially and adversely affect our business and operating results.

Third-party intellectual property rights in our field are complicated and continuously evolving. We have not performed searches for third-party intellectual property rights that may raise freedom-to-operate issues, and we have not obtained legal opinions regarding commercialization of our potential products. As such, there may be existing patents that may affect our ability to commercialize our potential products.

In addition, because patent applications are published up to 18 months after their filing, and because applications can take several years to issue, there may be currently pending third-party patent applications that are unknown to us, which may later result in issued patents that result in challenges to our use of intellectual property.

Table of Contents

If a third party claims that we infringe on its patents or other proprietary rights, we could face a number of issues that could seriously harm our competitive position, including:

infringement claims, with or without merit, which can be costly and time consuming to litigate, delay any regulatory approval process and divert management's attention from our core business strategy;
substantial damages for past infringement, which we may have to pay if a court determines that our products or technologies infringe upon a competitor's patent or other proprietary rights; and
a court order prohibiting us from commercializing our potential products or technologies unless the holder licenses the patent or other proprietary rights to us, which such holder is not required to do.

Future competitive technology for advertising, branding and awareness campaigns in the mobile device market may render our technology obsolete.

Newer technology may render our technology obsolete which would have a material adverse effect on our business and results of operations. In addition, in order to adapt to new technology, we may be required to collaborate with third parties to develop and deploy our services, and we may not be able to do so on a timely and cost-effective basis, if at all.

New legislation, regulations or court rulings related to enforcing patents could harm our business and operating results.

If Congress, the USPTO or courts implement new legislation, regulations or rulings that impact the patent enforcement process or the rights of patent holders, these changes could negatively affect our business model. For example, limitations on the ability to bring patent enforcement claims, limitations on potential liability for patent infringement, lower evidentiary standards for invalidating patents, increases in the cost to resolve patent disputes and other similar developments could negatively affect our ability to assert our patent or other intellectual property rights.

Recently, United States patent laws were amended with the enactment of the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act, or the America Invents Act, which took effect on March 16, 2013. 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 parties allegedly infringing by their respective individual actions or activities. At this time, it is not clear what, if any, impact the America Invents Act will have on the operation of our enforcement business. However, the America Invents Act and its implementation could increase the uncertainties and costs surrounding the enforcement of our patented technologies, which could have a material adverse effect on our business and financial condition.

On December 5, 2013, the United States House of Representatives passed a patent reform titled the Innovation Act by a vote of 325-91. Representative Bob Goodlatte, with bipartisan support, introduced the Innovation Act on October 23, 2013. The Innovation Act, as passed by the House, has a number of major changes. Some of the changes include a heightened pleading requirement for the filing of patent infringement claims. It requires a particularized statement with detailed specificity regarding how each asserted claim term corresponds to the functionality of each accused instrumentality. The Innovation Act, as passed by the House, also includes fee-shifting provisions which provide that, unless the non-prevailing party of a patent infringement litigation positions were objectively reasonable, such non-prevailing party would have to pay the attorney's fees of the prevailing party.

The Innovation Act also calls for discovery to be limited until after claim construction. The patent infringement plaintiff must also disclose anyone with a financial interest in either the asserted patent or the patentee and must

disclose the ultimate parent entity. When a manufacturer and its customers are sued at the same time, the suit against the customer would be stayed as long as the customer agrees to be bound by the results of the case.

On April 29, 2014, the U.S. Supreme Court relaxed the standard for fee shifting in patent infringement cases. Section 285 of the Patent Act provides that attorneys' fees may be awarded to a prevailing party in a patent infringement case in "exceptional cases."

In *Octane Fitness, LLC v. Icon Health & Fitness, Inc.*, the Supreme Court overturned the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit decisions limiting the meaning of "exceptional cases." The U.S. Supreme Court held that an exceptional case "is simply one that stands out from others with respect to the substantive strength of a party's litigation position" or "the unreasonable manner in which the case was litigated." The U.S. Supreme Court also rejected the "clear and convincing evidence" standard for making this inquiry. The Court held that the standard should be a "preponderance of the evidence."

Table of Contents

In *Highmark Inc. v. Allcare Health Mgmt. Sys., Inc.*, the U.S. Supreme Court held that a district court's grant of attorneys' fees is reviewable by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit only for "abuse of discretion" by the district court instead of the de novo standard that gave no deference to the district court.

These pair of decisions lowered the threshold for obtaining attorneys' fees in patent infringement cases and increased the level of deference given to a district court's fee-shifting determination.

These two cases will make it much easier for district courts to shift a prevailing party's attorneys' fees to a non-prevailing party if the district court believes that the case was weak or conducted in an abusive manner. Defendants that get sued for patent infringement by non-practicing entities may elect to fight rather than settle the case because these U.S. Supreme Court decisions make it much easier for defendants to get attorneys' fees.

On June 19, 2014, the U.S. Supreme Court decided *Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank International* in which the Court addressed the question of whether patents related to software are patent eligible subject matter. The Supreme Court did not rule that patents related to software were per se invalid or that software-related inventions were unpatentable. The Supreme Court outlined a test that the courts and the USPTO must apply in determining whether software-related inventions qualify as patent eligible subject matter. We must now wait and see how the federal district courts and the USPTO will apply this ruling. The test outlined by the Supreme Court could potentially affect the value of some of the patents we hold.

On December 16, 2014, the USPTO published a new set of guidelines directed at its patent examiners in response to solicited and received feedback from the public. The guidelines significantly changed what examiners can and cannot consider patent eligible material in applications based on recent Court decisions. The guidelines summarize recent court decisions with explanations of the facts, and include a discussion of claims and how to apply them to similar situations moving forward. Because the guidelines are new, it is difficult to foresee with clarity how they will be applied.

On February 5, 2015 House Judiciary Committee Chairman Bob Goodlatte (R-Va.) reintroduced a patent reform bill, now called the Innovation Act of 2015. The bill, as introduced, includes the following provisions:

Heightened pleading requirements – A patent holder filing an infringement suit, at the time of filing, must include a set of infringement charts showing how each limitation of each asserted claims in each asserted patent is found within each accused product or instrumentality.

Presumption of attorney fees – A court would be required to award attorney fees and "other expenses" to the prevailing party unless a judge "finds the position and conduct of the non-prevailing reasonably justified in law and fact or under special circumstances."

IPR claim construction – The USPTO would be required to construe claims in post-issuance reviews in the same manner as a district court.

Discovery limits – Discovery in litigation would be limited until after a claim construction ruling.

Willful infringement – Can lead to treble damages.

Transparency of ownership – The patent owner must disclose "the ultimate parent entity" of any assignee of the patent.

Stay of customer suits – In limited cases, the courts will stay customer lawsuits when the manufacturing of the accused product steps up to challenge the patent.

Foreign Bankruptcy – The bill would stop the practice of a bankruptcy executor canceling US IP licenses in foreign bankruptcies.

Codifying double patenting – The proposal would allow prior filings by overlapping inventors to count as prior art unless a terminal disclaimer is filed.

The bill is not yet law, but enjoys wide support in both houses and may soon become law.

Further, and in general, it is impossible to determine the extent of the impact of any new laws, regulations or initiatives that may be proposed, or whether any of the proposals will become enacted as laws. Compliance with any new or existing laws or regulations could be difficult and expensive, affect the manner in which we conduct our business and negatively impact our business, prospects, financial condition and results of operations.

Table of Contents

Our dependence on the continued growth in the use of the web and mobile smartphone networking could adversely affect our results of operations.

Our business depends on consumers continuing to increase their use of the mobile smartphone for social networking, to obtain product content, reward type offers as well as for conducting commercial transactions. The rapid growth and use of the smartphone as an information conduit is a relatively recent phenomenon. As a result, the acceptance and use of smartphones may not continue to develop at historical rates. Mobile web usage may be inhibited for a number of reasons, such as inadequate network infrastructure, security concerns, inconsistent quality of service and availability of cost-effective, high-speed service or smart mobile devices.

If mobile web usage grows, the mobile Internet infrastructure may not be able to support the demands placed on it by this growth or its performance and reliability may decline. In addition, websites and mobile networks have experienced interruptions in their service as a result of outages and other delays occurring throughout the Internet and mobile network infrastructure. If these outages and delays occur frequently in the future, web usage, as well as usage of our website, could grow more slowly or decline, which could adversely affect our results of operations.

Difficulty accommodating increases in the number of users of our services and Internet service problems outside of our control ultimately could result in the reduction of users.

Our platform must accommodate a high volume of mobile traffic and deliver frequently updated information. Our platform may in the future experience slower response times or other problems for a variety of reasons. In addition, our platform could experience disruptions or interruptions in service due to the failure or delay in the transmission or receipt of this information. In addition, our users depend on Internet and mobile service providers, online service providers and other website operators for access to our platform. Each of them has experienced significant outages in the past, and could experience outages, delays and other difficulties due to system failures unrelated to our systems.

Given our early stage of development, we are still developing our regulatory compliance program and our failure to comply with existing and future regulatory requirements could adversely affect our business, results of operations and financial condition.

Aspects of the digital marketing and advertising industry and how our business operates are highly regulated. We are subject to a number of domestic and, to the extent our operations are conducted outside the U.S., foreign laws and regulations that affect companies conducting business on the Internet and through other electronic means, many of which are still evolving and could be interpreted in ways that could harm our business. In particular, we are subject to rules of the FTC, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and potentially other federal agencies and state laws related to our advertising content and methods, the Controlling the Assault of Non-Solicited Pornography and Marketing Act of 2003, or CAN-SPAM Act, which establishes certain requirements for commercial electronic mail messages and specifies penalties for the transmission of commercial electronic mail messages that follow a recipient's opt-out request or are intended to deceive the recipient as to source or content, federal and state regulations covering the treatment of member data that we collect from endorsers.

U.S. and foreign regulations and laws potentially affecting our business are evolving frequently. We are, and will continue to update and improve our regulatory compliance features and functionality, and we will need to continue to identify and determine how to effectively comply with all the regulations to which we are subject now or in the future. If we are unable to identify all regulations to which our business is subject and implement effective means of compliance, we could be subject to enforcement actions, lawsuits and penalties, including but not limited to fines and other monetary liability or injunction that could prevent us from operating our business or certain aspects of our business. In addition, compliance with the regulations to which we are subject now or in the future may require changes to our products or services, restrict or impose additional costs upon the conduct of our business or cause users

to abandon material aspects of our services. Any such action could have a material adverse effect on our business, results of operations and financial condition.

Table of Contents

Existing federal, state and foreign laws regulating email and text messaging marketing practices impose certain obligations on the senders of commercial emails and text messages, which could minimize the effectiveness of our on-demand software or increase our operating expenses to the extent financial penalties are triggered.

The CAN-SPAM Act, establishes certain requirements for commercial email messages and specifies penalties for the transmission of commercial email messages that are intended to deceive the recipient as to source or content. The CAN-SPAM Act, among other things, obligates the sender of commercial emails, and someone who initiates commercial emails, to provide recipients with the ability to opt out of receiving future emails from the sender. In addition, some states have passed laws regulating commercial email practices that are significantly more punitive and difficult to comply with than the CAN-SPAM Act, particularly Utah and Michigan, which have enacted do-not-email registries listing minors who do not wish to receive unsolicited commercial email that markets certain covered content, such as adult content or content regarding harmful products. Some portions of these state laws may not be preempted by the CAN-SPAM Act. We, our clients and our client's consumers/brand advocates may all be subject to various provisions of the CAN-SPAM Act. If we are found to be subject to the CAN-SPAM Act, we may be required to change one or more aspects of the way we operate our business, including by eliminating the option for endorsers to send emails containing our advertisers' messages or by not allowing endorsers to receive compensation directly or indirectly as a result of distributing emails containing our advertisers' messages.

If we were found to be in violation of the CAN-SPAM Act, other federal laws, applicable state laws not preempted by the CAN-SPAM Act, or foreign laws regulating the distribution of commercial email, whether as a result of violations by our endorsers or any determination that we are directly subject to and in violation of these requirements, we could be required to pay penalties, which would adversely affect our financial performance and significantly harm our reputation and our business.

Security breaches and other disruptions could compromise our information and expose us to liability, which could cause our business and reputation to suffer.

In the ordinary course of our business, we collect and store sensitive data, including intellectual property, our proprietary business information and that of our endorsers, and personally identifiable information of our endorsers and employees in our data center and on our network. The secure processing, maintenance and transmission of this information is critical to our operations and business strategy. Despite our security measures, our information technology and infrastructure may be vulnerable to attacks by hackers or breached due to employee error, malfeasance or other disruptions. Any such breach could compromise our network and the information stored there could be accessed, publicly disclosed, lost or stolen. Any such access, disclosure or other loss of information could result in legal claims or proceedings, liability under laws that protect the privacy of information, disrupt our operations and the services we provide to customers, and damage our reputation, which could adversely affect our business, revenues and competitive position.

We could be subject to enforcement action or civil liability under federal and state law regarding privacy and the use and sharing of personal information.

Our business model includes the collection of certain personal information from our customers and platform users. Federal and state privacy laws regulate the circumstances under which we may use or share this information. We take steps to ensure our compliance with these laws, and we take steps to ensure compliance by those with whom we share personal information through non-disclosure agreements and contract provisions. Nonetheless, we may be subject to federal or state governmental enforcement action or civil litigation for improper use or sharing of personal identifying information. This risk could result in substantial costs to our business and materially and adversely affect our business and operating results. Further, if any party overcomes our physical, electronic, and procedural safeguards implemented to protect personal information, we may be subject to federal or state governmental enforcement action or civil

litigation for inadequately protecting personal identifying information.

Risks Relating to Our Common Stock

We have not paid dividends in the past and do not expect to pay dividends in the future. Any return on investment may be limited to the value of our common stock.

We have never paid cash dividends on our common stock and do not anticipate doing so in the foreseeable future. The payment of dividends on our common stock will depend on earnings, financial condition and other business and economic factors affecting us at such time as our board of directors may consider relevant. If we do not pay dividends, our common stock may be less valuable because a return on your investment will only occur if our stock price appreciates.

Table of Contents

Because we became public 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 us becoming public through a “reverse merger” with a shell company. Although the shell company did not have recent or past operations or assets and we performed a due diligence review of the shell company, there can be no assurance that we will not be exposed to undisclosed liabilities resulting from the prior operations of the shell company. Securities analysts of major brokerage firms and securities institutions may also not provide coverage of us because there were no broker-dealers who sold our stock in a public offering that would be incentivized to follow or recommend the purchase of our common stock. The absence of such research coverage could limit investor interest in our common stock, resulting in decreased liquidity. No assurance can be given that established brokerage firms will, in the future, want to cover our securities or conduct any secondary offerings or other financings on our behalf.

The public trading market for our common stock is volatile and may result in higher spreads in stock prices, which may limit the ability of our investors to sell their Shares at a profit, if at all.

Our common stock trades in the over-the-counter market and is quoted on the Over-the-Counter Bulletin Board, or OTCBB, and in the Over-the-Counter Markets on the OTCQB. The over-the-counter market for securities has historically experienced extreme price and volume fluctuations during certain periods. These broad market fluctuations may adversely affect the market price of our common stock and result in substantial losses to our investors. In addition, the spreads on stock traded through the over-the-counter market are generally unregulated and higher than on national stock exchanges, which means that the difference between the price at which shares could be purchased by investors in the over-the-counter market compared to the price at which they could be subsequently sold would be greater than on these exchanges. Significant spreads between the bid and asked prices of the stock could continue during any period in which a sufficient volume of trading is unavailable or if the stock is quoted by an insignificant number of market makers. Historically our trading volume has been insufficient to significantly reduce this spread and we have had a limited number of market makers sufficient to affect this spread. These higher spreads could adversely affect investors who purchase the shares at the higher price at which the shares are sold, but subsequently sell the shares at the lower bid prices quoted by the brokers. Unless the bid price for the stock exceeds the price paid for the shares by the investor, plus brokerage commissions or charges, the investor could lose money on the sale. For higher spreads such as those on over-the-counter stocks, this is likely a much greater percentage of the price of the stock than for exchange listed stocks. There is no assurance that at the time an investor in our common stock wishes to sell the shares, the bid price will have sufficiently increased to create a profit on the sale.

We do not know whether a market for our common stock will be sustained or what the market price of our common stock will be and as a result it may be difficult for you to sell your shares of our common stock.

Although our common stock now trades on the OTCBB and OTCQB, an active trading market for our shares may not be sustained. It may be difficult for our stockholders to sell their shares without depressing the market price for our shares or at all. As a result of these and other factors, our stockholders may not be able to sell their shares. Further, an inactive market may also impair our ability to raise capital by selling shares of our common stock and may impair our ability to enter into strategic partnerships or acquire companies or products by using our shares of common stock as consideration. If an active market for our common stock does not develop or is not sustained, it may be difficult for our stockholders to sell shares of our common stock.

Our cash flows are unpredictable, and this may harm our financial condition or the market price for our common stock.

The amount and timing of cash flows from our licensing and enforcement activities are subject to uncertainties stemming primarily from uncertainties regarding the rates of adoption of our patented technologies, the growth rates of our licensees, the outcome of enforcement actions and certain other factors. As such, our income and cash flows may vary significantly from period to period, which could make our business difficult to manage, adversely affect our business and operating results, cause our annual or quarterly results to fall below market expectations and adversely affect the market price of our common stock.

Table of Contents

The market price for our common stock may fluctuate significantly, which could result in substantial losses by our investors.

The market price of our common stock may fluctuate significantly in response to numerous factors, some of which are beyond our control, such as:

- the outcomes of our current and potential future patent litigation;
- our ability to monetize our patents;
- changes in our industry;
- announcements of technological innovations, new products or product enhancements by us or others;
- announcements by us of significant strategic partnerships, out-licensing, in-licensing, joint ventures, acquisitions or capital commitments;
- changes in earnings estimates or recommendations by security analysts, if our common stock is covered by analysts;
- investors' general perception of us;
- future issuances of common stock;
- the addition or departure of key personnel;
- general market conditions, including the volatility of market prices for shares of technology companies, generally, and other factors, including factors unrelated to our operating performance; and
- the other factors described in this "Risk Factors" section.

These factors and any corresponding price fluctuations may materially and adversely affect the market price of our common stock and result in substantial losses by our investors.

Further, the stock market in general, and the market for technology companies in particular, has experienced extreme price and volume fluctuations in the past. Continued market fluctuations could result in extreme volatility in the price of our common stock, which could cause a decline in the value of our common stock.

Price volatility of our common stock might be worse if the trading volume of our common stock is low. In the past, following periods of market volatility, stockholders have often instituted securities class action litigation. If we were involved in securities litigation, it could have a substantial cost and divert resources and attention of management from our business, even if we are successful. Future sales of our common stock could also reduce the market price of such stock.

Moreover, the liquidity of our common stock is limited, not only in terms of the number of shares that can be bought and sold at a given price, but by delays in the timing of transactions and reduction in security analysts' and the media's coverage of us, if any. These factors may result in lower prices for our common stock than might otherwise be obtained and could also result in a larger spread between the bid and ask prices for our common stock. In addition, without a large float, our common stock is less liquid than the stock of companies with broader public ownership and, as a result, the trading prices of our common stock may be more volatile. In the absence of an active public trading market, an investor may be unable to liquidate its investment in our common stock. Trading of a relatively small volume of our common stock may have a greater impact on the trading price of our stock than would be the case if our public float were larger. We cannot predict the prices at which our common stock will trade in the future.

Some or all of the "restricted" shares of our common stock issued in connection with the closing of the reverse acquisition transaction in September 2011 or held by other of our stockholders may be offered from time to time in the open market pursuant to an effective registration statement or Rule 144 promulgated under Regulation D of the Securities Act, or Rule 144, and these sales may have a depressive effect on the market for our common stock.

Our common stock is a "penny stock," which makes it more difficult for our investors to sell their shares.

Our common stock is subject to the “penny stock” rules adopted under Section 15(g) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended. The penny stock rules generally apply to companies whose common stock is not listed on The NASDAQ Stock Market or other national securities exchange and trades at less than \$5.00 per share, other than companies that have had average revenue of at least \$6,000,000 for the last three years or that have tangible net worth of at least \$5,000,000 (\$2,000,000 if the company has been operating for three or more years). These rules require, among other things, that brokers who trade penny stock to persons other than “established customers” complete certain documentation, make suitability inquiries of investors and provide investors with certain information concerning trading in the security, including a risk disclosure document and quote information under certain circumstances. Many brokers have decided not to trade penny stocks because of the requirements of the penny stock rules and, as a result, the number of broker-dealers willing to act as market makers in such securities is limited. If we remain subject to the penny stock rules for any significant period, it could have an adverse effect on the market, if any, for our securities. If our securities are subject to the penny stock rules, investors will find it more difficult to dispose of our securities.

Table of Contents

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, it could create a circumstance commonly referred to as an “overhang,” 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.

Our stockholders may experience substantial dilution as a result of the conversion of outstanding convertible preferred stock, convertible debentures, convertible notes, or the exercise of options and warrants to purchase shares of our common stock.

As of March 21, 2016, we have outstanding granted options to purchase 629,628 shares of common stock and have reserved 691,600 shares of our common stock for issuance upon the exercise of options pursuant to our 2011 Long-Term Incentive Plan. In addition, as of March 21, 2016, we have reserved 821,061 shares of our common stock for issuance upon exercise of outstanding warrants. As of March 21, 2016, we have also reserved 120,533 shares of our common stock for issuance to certain vendors for services provided.

Because our directors and executive officers are among our largest stockholders, they can exert significant control over our business and affairs and have actual or potential interests that may depart from those of our other stockholders.

Our directors and executive officers own or control a significant percentage of our common stock. Additionally, the holdings of our directors and executive officers may increase in the future upon vesting or other maturation of exercise rights under any of the options or warrants they may hold or in the future be granted or if they otherwise acquire additional shares of our common stock. As of March 21, 2016, our officers and directors beneficially own approximately 16.0% of the outstanding shares of our common stock. The interests of such persons may differ from the interests of our other stockholders. As a result, in addition to their board seats and offices, such persons will have significant influence over and control all corporate actions requiring stockholder approval, irrespective of how our other stockholders may vote, including the following actions:

- to elect or defeat the election of our directors;
- to amend or prevent amendment of our certificate of incorporation or bylaws;
- to effect or prevent a merger, sale of assets or other corporate transaction; and
- to control the outcome of any other matter submitted to our stockholders for vote.

In addition, such persons’ stock ownership may discourage a potential acquirer from making a tender offer or otherwise attempting to obtain control of us, which in turn could reduce our stock price or prevent our stockholders from realizing a premium over our stock price.

ITEM 1B. UNRESOLVED STAFF COMMENTS.

None.

ITEM 2. PROPERTIES

We owned no properties and had three property leases at December 31, 2015. Two property leases relate to our subsidiary Blue Calypso of Latin America, S.A for office space in the same building located in San Jose, Costa Rica.

We also currently have a lease for office space at our current headquarters in Richardson, TX.

Table of Contents

ITEM 3. LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

On July 31, 2012, the Company filed suit against Groupon, Inc. in the Eastern District of Texas in Civil Action No. 6:12-cv-00486. The Company filed additional suits against IZEA, Inc. on October 17, 2012; Yelp, Inc. on October 17, 2012; and Foursquare Labs, Inc. on October 31, 2012 in Civil Action Nos. 6:12-cv-786, 6:12-cv-788, 6:12-cv-837, respectively. Each of these cases alleges that the defendants infringe U.S. Patent Nos. 7,664,516 entitled "Method and System for Peer-to-Peer Advertising Between Mobile Communication Devices" and 8,155,679 entitled "System and Method for Peer-to-Peer Advertising Between Mobile Communication Devices." The Company subsequently added U.S. Patent Nos. 8,438,055, 8,452,646, and 8,457,670 to the cases, alleging each defendant infringed the newly added patents. Each of the defendants have answered, denying infringement and claiming that the asserted patents are invalid. Groupon, Yelp, and Foursquare filed counterclaims for declaratory judgment that the asserted patents are invalid and not infringed. Yelp filed an additional counterclaim for declaratory judgment that the asserted patents are unenforceable. The Court subsequently consolidated the actions for at least pre-trial purposes. Groupon filed a motion to transfer the case against it to the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California, which the Court denied on September 27, 2013.

Between July 19, 2013 and October 3, 2013, Groupon filed petitions with the Patent Trial & Appeals Board ("PTAB") requesting institution of Covered Business Method Review of all asserted claims. On December 19, 2013 and January 17, 2014, the PTAB issued decisions instituting review on all but four of the asserted claims. On January 14, 2014, the Company and all defendants filed a joint motion to stay the district court litigation. The Court granted the motion and stayed the case on January 16, 2014 pending a decision by the PTAB. Trial on the Covered Business Method Reviews at the PTAB occurred during September 2014. On February 3, 2014, Groupon filed a petition to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit for mandamus on the district court's denial of its motion to transfer, which remains pending as of the date of this report.

On December 17, 2014, the Patent Trial and Appeal Board issued final decisions in Covered Business Method Review proceedings CBM2013-00035, CBM2013-00033, CBM2013-00034, CBM2013-00046 and CBM2013-00044. In each case, certain claims of each patent were held to be invalid for various reasons. With respect to the '516, '679, '055 and '646 patents, many of the claims survived and the patents remain enforceable. All of the claims of the '670 patent were held invalid. The Company appealed each of the final decisions to the United States Federal Circuit Court of Appeals. The Company appealed the unpatentability determinations including the decision of invalidity based on anticipation of several claims of the patents by prior art (the Paul reference). The Company also appealed the decision to review its patents under the provisions for CBMR and that the '516 patent lacked sufficient written description under § 112 to support the claims. Groupon appealed the Board's decision that the patents were not valid under § 103 and the determination by the PTAB that a certain reference (the Ratismor reference) was not publically available prior art.

On March 1, 2016, the Federal Circuit overturned the PTAB decision as to insufficient written description but upheld the decision that the Ratismore reference was not publically available prior art. However, the Federal Circuit confirmed the Board's decision to institute the CBMR process on the basis that Blue Calypso's patent portfolio qualified as a business method patent which was financial in nature. The Federal Circuit also upheld the decision of invalidity based on anticipation of several claims of the patents by the prior art Paul reference.

The Company has an option to pursue an en banc review of the holding with respect to anticipation by the Paul reference. An en banc review would occur before a panel of eight judges of the Federal Circuit as compared to the recently completed appeals process which utilized three. We also have the option of requesting that the Supreme Court review the Federal Circuit's decision. These options for appeal must be filed within 30 and 90 days respectively from the date of the March 1, 2016 decision.

The reversal of the written description matter is significant as it re-establishes the '516 parent patent issue date of February 2010 as the date that damages begin to accrue. Prior to this reversal the first date of infringement was relegated to the later issue date of the '679 patent on April 2012.

The court dockets for each case, including the parties' briefs are publicly available on the Public Access to Court Electronic Records website, or PACER, www.pacer.gov, which is operated by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts.

Other than as noted above, the Company is not a party to any pending legal proceeding nor is its property the subject of any pending legal proceeding that is not in the ordinary course of business or otherwise material to the financial condition of its business. Further, to the knowledge of management, no director or executive officer is party to any action in which any has an interest adverse to us.

ITEM 4. MINE SAFETY DISCLOSURES.

None.

Table of Contents

PART II

ITEM 5. MARKET FOR REGISTRANT'S COMMON EQUITY, RELATED STOCKHOLDER MATTERS AND ISSUER PURCHASES OF EQUITY SECURITIES.

Our common stock was originally approved for quotation on the OTC Bulletin Board on July 13, 2011 and since August 8, 2012, has been quoted under the trading symbol BCYP. The following table sets forth the high and low bid prices for our common stock for the periods indicated, as reported by the OTC Bulletin Board. The quotations reflect inter-dealer prices, without retail mark-up, mark-down or commission, and may not represent actual transactions.

| | High | Low |
|------------------|----------|---------|
| Fiscal Year 2014 | | |
| First Quarter | \$ 8.00 | \$ 6.00 |
| Second Quarter | \$ 7.00 | \$ 4.50 |
| Third Quarter | \$ 8.00 | \$ 4.50 |
| Fourth Quarter | \$ 10.00 | \$ 3.50 |
| Fiscal Year 2015 | | |
| First Quarter | \$ 8.50 | \$ 7.09 |
| Second Quarter | \$ 7.55 | \$ 5.50 |
| Third Quarter | \$ 8.99 | \$ 4.01 |
| Fourth Quarter | \$ 5.00 | \$ 1.03 |

The last reported sales price of our common stock on the OTC Bulletin Board on March 21, 2016, was \$2.90 per share. As of March 21, 2016, there were approximately 59 holders of record of our common stock.

Dividends

We have not paid, nor declared, any cash dividends since our inception and do not intend to declare any such dividends in the foreseeable future. Our ability to pay cash dividends is subject to limitations imposed by Delaware law. Under Delaware law, cash dividends may be paid to the extent that a corporation's assets exceed its liabilities and it is able to pay its debts as they become due in the usual course of business.

Securities Authorized for Issuance Under Equity Compensation Plans

On August 31, 2012, the Board adopted, subject to stockholder approval, the Blue Calypso, Inc. 2011 Long-Term Incentive Plan, or the Plan. Our stockholders approved the Plan on September 9, 2011. The Plan is intended to enable us to remain competitive and innovative in our ability to attract, motivate, reward and retain the services of key employees, certain key contractors, and non-employee directors. The Plan provides for the granting of incentive stock options, nonqualified stock options, stock appreciation rights, restricted stock, restricted stock units, performance awards, dividend equivalent rights, and other awards which may be granted singly, in combination, or in tandem, and which may be paid in cash or shares of common stock. The Plan is expected to provide flexibility to our compensation methods in order to adapt the compensation of employees, contractors, and non-employee directors to a changing business environment, after giving due consideration to competitive conditions and the impact of federal tax laws. Subject to certain adjustments, the maximum number of shares of our common stock that may be delivered pursuant to awards under the Plan is 700,000 shares.

Table of Contents

As of December 31, 2015, securities issued and securities available for future issuance under the Blue Calypso 2011 Long-Term Incentive Plan were as follows:

| | Number of securities issued or to be issued upon exercise of outstanding options, warrants and rights (a) | Weighted-average exercise price of outstanding and issued options, warrants and rights | Number of securities remaining available for future issuance under equity compensation plans (excluding securities reflected in column (a)) |
|--|---|--|---|
| Equity compensation plans approved by security holders | 444,092 | \$ 7.48 | 247,508 |
| Equity compensation plans not approved by security holders | 185,536 | \$ 7.84 | — |
| Total | 629,628 | \$ 7.59 | 247,508 |

ITEM 6. SELECTED FINANCIAL DATA.

Since we are a “smaller reporting company,” as defined by SEC regulation, we are not required to provide the information required by this Item.

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

Forward-Looking Statements

The statements made herein for fiscal 2015 and beyond represent “forward looking statements” within the meaning of Section 27A of the Securities Act of 1933 and Section 21E of the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 and are subject to a number of risks and uncertainties. These include, among other risks and uncertainties, whether we will be able to generate sufficient cash flow from our operations or other sources to fund our working capital needs, maintain existing relationships with our lender, successfully introduce and attain market acceptance of any new products, attract and retain qualified personnel both in our existing markets and in new territories in an extremely competitive environment, and potential obsolescence of our technologies.

In some cases, you can identify forward-looking statements by terms such as “may,” “will,” “should,” “could,” “would,” “expect,” “plans,” “anticipates,” “believes,” “estimates,” “projects,” “predicts,” “potential” and similar expressions intended to identify forward-looking statements. These statements are only predictions and involve known and unknown risks, uncertainties, and other factors that may cause our 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 such forward-looking statements. Given these uncertainties, you should not place undue reliance on these forward-looking statements. Also, these forward-looking statements represent our estimates and assumptions only as of the date of this report. Except as otherwise required by law, we expressly disclaim any obligation or undertaking to release publicly any updates or revisions to any forward-looking statement contained in this report to reflect any change in our expectations or any change in events, conditions or circumstances on which any of our forward-looking statements are based. We qualify all of our forward-looking statements by these cautionary statements.

You should read the following discussion and analysis of our financial condition and results of operations in conjunction with our consolidated financial statements and the related notes thereto that are included in this Annual Report. In addition to historical information, the following discussion and analysis includes forward-looking information that involves risks, uncertainties, and assumptions. Actual results and the timing of events could differ materially from those anticipated by these forward looking statements as a result of many factors.

Table of Contents

Recent Events

General

In September and October 2015, pursuant to a securities purchase agreement, the Company sold an aggregate of 482,500 shares of its common stock together with warrants to purchase an aggregate of 482,500 shares of its common stock for net proceeds, after commissions and other costs, of \$1,854,725. The warrants are exercisable at an exercise price of \$4.75 for a term of five years.

On July 20, 2015, the Company issued a senior convertible note (the "July 2015 Note"), in the principal amount of \$550,000 due one year from the date of issuance. The total net proceeds the Company received from this note were \$415,123, net of fees and original interest discount ("OID") of \$50,000.

On December 18, 2015, the Company modified certain terms of the July 2015 Note. Pursuant to the modification, the Company agreed to repay the lender \$300,000 in consideration for the extinguishment of \$250,000 of the principal amount outstanding as of the December 18, 2015. The Company and the lender also agreed to reduce the guaranteed interest on the note from 10% to 5%, to delay the guaranteed interest start date by thirty days until February 20, 2016 and to delay the first installment payment by thirty days until February 20, 2016. The July 2015 Note was subsequently repaid in full during February 2016.

Litigation

On July 31, 2012, the Company filed suit against Groupon, Inc. in the Eastern District of Texas in Civil Action No. 6:12-cv-00486. The Company filed additional suits against IZEA, Inc. on October 17, 2012, Yelp, Inc. on October 17, 2012, and Foursquare Labs, Inc. on October 31, 2012 in Civil Action Nos. 6:12-cv-786, 6:12-cv-788, 6:12-cv-837, respectively. Each of these cases alleges that the defendants infringe U.S. Patent Nos. 7,664,516 entitled "Method and System for Peer-to-Peer Advertising Between Mobile Communication Devices" and 8,155,679 entitled "System and Method for Peer-to-Peer Advertising Between Mobile Communication Devices." The Company subsequently added U.S. Patent Nos. 8,438,055, 8,452,646, and 8,457,670 to the cases, alleging each defendant infringed the newly added patents. Each of the defendants have answered, denying infringement and claiming that the asserted patents are invalid. Groupon, Yelp, and Foursquare filed counterclaims for declaratory judgment that the asserted patents are invalid and not infringed. Yelp filed an additional counterclaim for declaratory judgment that the asserted patents are unenforceable. The Court subsequently consolidated the actions for at least pre-trial purposes. Groupon filed a motion to transfer the case against it to the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, which the Court denied on September 27, 2013. On February 3, 2014, Groupon filed a petition to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit for mandamus on the district court's denial of its motion to transfer. On April 23, 2014, the petition was denied by the Federal Circuit.

Between July 19, 2013 and October 3, 2013, Groupon filed petitions with the Patent Trial & Appeals Board ("PTAB") requesting institution of Covered Business Method Review ("CBMR") of all asserted claims. On December 19, 2013 and January 17, 2014, the PTAB issued decisions instituting review on all but four of the asserted claims. On January 14, 2014, the Company and all defendants filed a joint motion to stay the district court litigation. The Court granted the motion and stayed the case on January 16, 2014 pending a decision by the PTAB. Trial on the CBMR at the PTAB occurred during September 2014.

On December 17, 2014, the Patent Trial and Appeal Board issued final decisions in Covered Business Method Review proceedings CBM2013-00035, CBM2013-00033, CBM2013-00034, CBM2013-00046 and CBM2013-00044. In each case, certain claims of each patent were held to be invalid for various reasons. With respect to the '516, '679, '055 and '646 patents, many of the claims survived and the patents remain enforceable. All of the claims of the '670 patent were

held invalid. The Company appealed each of the final decisions to the United States Federal Circuit Court of Appeals. The Company appealed the unpatentability determinations including the decision of invalidity based on anticipation of several claims of the patents by prior art (the Paul reference). The Company also appealed the decision to review its patents under the provisions for CBMR and that the '516 patent lacked sufficient written description under § 112 to support the claims. Groupon appealed the Board's decision that the patents were not valid under § 103 and the determination by the PTAB that a certain reference (the Ratismor reference) was not publically available prior art.

On April 2, 2015, the District Court lifted the stay and required the parties to file a joint docket control order. On April 6, 2015, the Court set a Markman Hearing for June 29, 2015, and jury selection for December 14, 2015. On April 15, 2015, the parties filed their joint docket control order. The Court entered its docket control order on April 23, 2015. Due to an apparent *scheduling conflict, the Court rescheduled the Markman Hearing to July 8, 2015.

On April 22, 2015, the Company filed its third amended complaint against all defendants. The defendants timely answered on May 11, 2015. Each of the defendant's answers included a counterclaim for invalidity of the patents. The Company responded to these invalidity contentions on June 1, 2015.

On May 13, 2015, the Company filed a motion for entry of an order focusing patent claims and prior art. That motion requested that the Court narrow the number of claims at issue and the number of prior art references that defendants could use in an attempt to invalidate the Company's patents. On May 27, 2015, the Court held a hearing on the motion and ordered defendants to reduce the number of references in support of any invalidity contention against the patents.

Table of Contents

On June 25, 2015, the Company attended mediation with Yelp in an effort to settle the case. That mediation was recessed to explore settlement options.

On July 8, 2015 the Company attended the Markman Hearing in order to construe the claims of the patents. On July 14, 2015, the Court entered its Memorandum Opinion and Order regarding claim construction. In that Order, the Court analyzed eleven claim terms. The Court agreed with Blue Calypso's proffered construction as to seven terms, chose its own construction as to three terms and agreed with defendants' proffered construction as to only one term. The Court also expressly rejected defendants' argument that the term "testimonial tag" was indefinite.

On July 13, 2015 the Court entered an order severing the non-active claims out of the case and consolidating claims regarding those patents into a separate set of cases. These new cases address the claims which were held invalid by the PTAB and which are now on appeal to the Federal Circuit Court of Appeals.

On July 14, 2015, the Company attended court-ordered mediation with Groupon. The result of that mediation was an impasse.

On July 16, 2015, the Company attended court-ordered mediation with IZEA. The parties reached a settlement.

On July 20, 2015, the Company attended court-ordered mediation with Foursquare. The result of that mediation was an impasse.

On August 17, 2015, the Company entered into a settlement agreement with IZEA, pursuant to which it settled all outstanding litigation with IZEA. Under the Agreement, IZEA has agreed to pay the Company a royalty fee of 4.125% of revenue from IZEA's discontinued legacy platforms SocialSpark, Sponsored Tweets and WeReward. The remaining terms of the settlement are confidential. Legal costs due to our attorneys associated with the IZEA settlement are classified as a settlement payable on our consolidated balance sheet.

On September 21, 2015, the Company entered into a settlement agreement with Yelp, pursuant to which all outstanding litigation with Yelp was settled. Under the agreement, Yelp has agreed to purchase 4,000 KIOSentrix beacons.

On March 1, 2016, the Federal Circuit overturned the PTAB decision as to insufficient written description but upheld the decision that the certain reference (the Ratismore reference) was not publically available prior art. However, the Federal Circuit confirmed the Board's decision to institute the CBMR process on the basis that Blue Calypso's patent portfolio qualified as a business method patent which was financial in nature. The Federal Circuit also upheld the decision of invalidity based on anticipation of several claims of the patents by the prior art Paul reference.

The Company has an option to pursue an en banc review of the holding with respect to anticipation by the Paul reference. An en banc review would occur before a panel of eight judges of the Federal Circuit as compared to the recently completed appeals process which utilized three. We also have the option of requesting that the Supreme Court review the Federal Circuit's decision. These options for appeal must be filed within 30 and 90 days respectively from the date of the March 1,, 2016 decision.

The reversal of the written description matter is significant as it re-establishes the '516 parent patent issue date of February 2010 as the date that damages begin to accrue. Prior to this reversal the first date of infringement was relegated to the later issue date of the '679 patent on April 2012.

The court dockets for each case, including the parties' briefs are publicly available on the Public Access to Court Electronic Records website, or PACER, www.pacer.gov, which is operated by the Administrative Office of the U.S.

Courts.

Other than as noted above, the Company is not a party to any pending legal proceeding nor is its property the subject of any pending legal proceeding that is not in the ordinary course of business or otherwise material to the financial condition of its business. Further, to the knowledge of management, no director or executive officer is party to any action in which any has an interest adverse to us.

Critical Accounting Policies

Principles of Consolidation and Basis of Presentation

The consolidated financial statements are stated in U.S. dollars and include the accounts of Blue Calypso, Inc. and its wholly-owned subsidiaries. All intercompany balances and transactions have been eliminated in consolidation. The consolidated financial statements have been prepared in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America ("GAAP").

28

Table of Contents

Use of Estimates

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, 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. Significant estimates include the recoverability and useful lives of long-lived assets, the fair value of the Company's stock, stock-based compensation, fair values relating to warrant and other derivative liabilities, debt discounts and the valuation allowance related to deferred tax assets. Actual results may differ from these estimates.

Revenue Recognition

Revenue is recognized when persuasive evidence of an arrangement exists, delivery of the product or service has occurred, all obligations have been performed pursuant to the terms of the agreement, the sales price is fixed or determinable, and collectability is reasonably assured. Revenue includes fees received from customers for advertising and marketing services. In each case, revenue is recognized when services are performed or licenses are granted to customers.

Revenue from the licensing of the Company's intellectual property and settlements reached from legal enforcement of the Company's patent rights is recognized when the arrangement with the licensee has been signed and the license has been delivered and made effective, provided license fees are fixed or determinable and collectability is reasonably assured. The fair value of licenses achieved by ordinary business negotiations is recognized as revenue.

The amount of consideration received upon any settlement or judgment is allocated to each element of the settlement based on the fair value of each element. Elements related to licensing agreements, royalty revenues, net of contingent legal fees, are recognized as revenue in the consolidated statement of operations. Elements that are not related to license agreements and royalty revenue in nature will be reflected as a separate line item within the other income section of the consolidated statements of operations. Elements provided in either settlement agreements or judgments include: the value of a license, legal release, and interest. When settlements or judgments are achieved at discounts to the fair value of a license, the Company allocates the full settlement or judgment, excluding specifically named elements as mentioned above, to the value of the license agreement or royalty revenue under the residual method. Legal release as part of a settlement agreement is recognized as a separate line item in the consolidated statements of operations when value can be allocated to the legal release. When the Company reaches a settlement with a defendant, no value is allocated to the legal release since the existence of a settlement removes legal standing to bring a claim of infringement and without a legal claim, the legal release has no economic value. The element that is applicable to interest income will be recorded as a separate line item in other income. The Company does not assume future performance obligations in its license arrangements.

The Company also has revenue from information technology consulting services. Revenue is recognized in the periods that satisfactory performance of services is delivered to customers. Revenue is recognized when persuasive evidence of an arrangement exists, delivery of the service has occurred, all obligations have been performed pursuant to the terms of the agreement, the sales price is fixed or determinable, and collectability is reasonably assured.

Cost of Revenue

Cost of revenue includes technical service costs directly associated with initiating and supporting a customer's program, technical service costs directly associated with providing IT consulting and legal fees directly related to the settlement of intellectual property claims that result in licensing and royalty revenue.

Intangible Assets

The Company capitalizes certain software development costs as well as purchased software upon achieving technological feasibility of the related products. Software development costs incurred and software purchased prior to achieving technological feasibility are charged to engineering and product development expense as incurred. Commencing upon initial product release, capitalized costs are amortized to cost of software licenses using the straight-line method over the estimated life of the product (which approximates the ratio that current gross revenues for a product bear to the total of current and anticipated future gross revenues for that product), which is generally up to five years.

Table of Contents

Impairment of Long-Lived Assets

The Company reviews the carrying value of intangibles and other long-lived assets for impairment at least annually or whenever events or changes in circumstances indicate that the carrying amount of an asset may not be recoverable. Recoverability of long-lived assets is measured by comparing the carrying amount of the asset or asset group to the undiscounted cash flows that the asset or asset group is expected to generate. If the undiscounted cash flows of such assets are less than the carrying amount, the impairment to be recognized is measured by the amount by which the carrying amount of the property, if any, exceeds its fair market value. No impairment was deemed to exist as of December 31, 2015 and 2014. The Company re-evaluates the carrying amounts of its amortizable intangibles at least quarterly to identify any triggering events. As described above, if triggering events require us to undertake an impairment review, it is not possible at this time to determine whether it would be necessary to record a charge or if such charge would be material.

Fair Value Measurements

We have adopted ASC Topic 820, "Fair Value Measurements and Disclosures," which defines fair value, establishes a framework for measuring fair value in generally accepted accounting principles, and expands disclosures about fair value measurements. ASC 820 establishes a hierarchy for inputs used in measuring fair value that maximizes the use of observable inputs and minimizes the use of unobservable inputs by requiring that the most observable inputs be used when available. Level 1 inputs are quoted prices (unadjusted) in active markets for identical assets or liabilities that the reporting entity has the ability to access at the measurement date. Level 2 inputs are inputs other than quoted prices included within Level 1 that are observable for the asset or liability, either directly or indirectly. Level 3 inputs are unobservable inputs for the asset or liability.

Stock-Based Compensation

The Company measures the cost of services received in exchange for an award of equity instruments based on the fair value of the award. For employees and directors, the fair value of the award is measured on the grant date and for non-employees, the fair value of the award is generally re-measured on vesting dates and interim financial reporting dates until the service period is complete. The fair value amount is then recognized over the period during which services are required to be provided in exchange for the award, usually the vesting period. Stock-based compensation expense is recorded by the Company in the same expense classifications in the consolidated statements of operations, as if such amounts were paid in cash.

Results of Operations

Comparison of Year Ended December 31, 2015 and 2014

Net Loss. For the year ended December 31, 2015, we had a net loss of \$3,303,150 compared to a net loss of \$7,735,464 for the year ended December 31, 2014. The decrease in loss was primarily due to a decrease in general and administrative expense from \$6,103,628 during 2014 to \$2,318,720 in 2015. General and administrative expense decreased partially as a result of expenses incurred in connection with the departure of our previous Chief Executive Officer at the end of 2014. Pursuant to the agreement, during 2014, the Company incurred \$150,000 in expense associated with future agreed upon cash compensation and \$1,441,534 of costs in accelerated stock compensation expense related to previous restricted stock and option grants. The Company experienced a further reduction of \$1,706,778 in stock based compensation as we did not incur expense associated with restricted stock grants during 2015 as compared to \$1,750,225 during 2014. The 2014 expense was primarily associated with our former Chief Executive Officer. Finally, the Company experienced a reduction in officer compensation during 2015 as our founder and previous Chief Technology Officer, assumed the role of Chief Executive Officer while also performing his duties

as Chief Technology Officer.

In addition to the decrease in general and administrative expense, sales and marketing decreased by \$96,857 as the Company reduced its salesforce to align with performance. Depreciation and amortization increased by \$20,182 in comparison to 2014. Other expense decreased by \$578,377. During 2014, the Company incurred a loss on debt settlement upon conversion of the remaining outstanding debt and significant interest on a warrant modification. Interest expense incurred during 2015 is primarily associated with cost from the convertible note issued during July 2015 with an additional 283,387 in expense incurred associated with a terminated offering.

Revenue. Revenue for the year ended December 31, 2015 increased to \$1,004,495 as compared to \$759,889 for the same period in 2014. 2015 revenue included \$390,506 in settlement fees and associated licensing revenue as compared to \$23,798 in 2014. Revenue from consulting services was \$501,989 and \$736,091 during the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014.

Cost of Revenue. Current year cost of revenue was \$664,447 and includes charges directly related to licensing fee and consulting fee revenue with costs increasing as compared to 2014 primarily as a result of legal fees associated with various settlements. Cost of revenue for the year ended December 31, 2014 was \$412,225 and substantially consisted of costs related to internal technology professional staff members assigned to the BC Labs team.

Table of Contents

Sales and Marketing. For the year ended December 31, 2015, sales and marketing expenses decreased by \$96,857 to \$385,827 from \$482,729 during the same period in 2014 as the Company reduced its salesforce to align with performance.

General and Administrative. For the year ended December 31, 2015, general and administrative expense decreased partially as a result of expenses incurred in connection with the departure of our previous Chief Executive Officer at the end of 2014. Pursuant to the agreement, during 2014, the Company incurred \$150,000 in expense associated with future agreed upon cash compensation and \$1,441,534 of costs in accelerated stock compensation expense related to previous restricted stock and option grants. The Company experienced a further reduction of \$1,706,778 in stock based compensation as we did not incur expense associated with restricted stock grants during 2015 as compared to \$1,750,225 during 2014. The 2014 expense was primarily associated with our former Chief Executive Officer. Finally, the Company experienced a reduction in officer compensation during 2015 as our founder and previous Chief Technology Officer, assumed the role of Chief Executive Officer while also performing his duties as Chief Technology Officer.

Depreciation and Amortization. Depreciation and amortization expenses, increased from \$344,128 for the year ended December 31, 2014 to \$364,310 for the year ended December 31, 2015 as the Company invested \$381,168 in capitalized software as compared to \$149,131 during 2014.

Interest Expense. Interest expense was \$740,756 for the year ended December 31, 2014 as compared to \$379,776 for the year ended 2015. Interest expense incurred during 2014 related to the Company's long-term debt obligations at various interest rates ranging from 8% to 10% and the amortization of debt discount. An additional \$460,949 was incurred as a result of a warrant modification. During 2015, the Company incurred interest expense primarily associated with cost from the convertible note issued during July 2015.

Cash Flows

Cash used in operating activities during the year ended December 31, 2015 was \$2,004,893, as compared to \$2,367,655 for the year ended December 31, 2014. Overall, the Company reduced cash utilized by operations primary through employee compensation reductions.

Cash used in investing activities during the year ended December 31, 2015 was \$387,674, as compared to \$150,312 for the year ended December 31, 2014. The increase in cash used in investing activities resulted from continuing to expand and enhance our software offerings and core platform.

During the year ended December 31, 2015, cash provided by financing was \$2,019,848 as compared to \$2,326,286 for the same period in 2014. In the current year, the Company secured net proceeds of \$1,854,725 from the sale of common stock. In addition, the Company secured \$415,123 from the issuance of \$550,000 in convertible notes. A principal payment on such convertible notes of \$250,000 was made during December 2015. In the prior year, the Company secured \$1,330,000 from the sale of common stock. In addition, \$1,024,558 and \$21,728 in proceeds were generated from the exercise of warrants and options, respectively. These monies were secured to address the cash requirements of the business as the Company continues to enhance its service offerings. These proceeds were offset by a \$50,000 debt repayment.

Going Concern

Our independent registered public accounting firm, in their report accompanying our consolidated financial statements for the year ended December 31, 2015, expressed substantial doubt about our ability to continue as a going concern due to our recurring losses from operations, negative cash flows from operating activities and our accumulated deficit.

Our ability to continue as a going concern is dependent upon our ability to obtain additional equity or debt financing, attain further operating efficiencies, reduce expenditures, dispose of selective assets, and ultimately, generate additional revenue. The going concern opinion may also limit our ability to access certain types of financing, prevent us from obtaining financing on acceptable terms, and limit our ability to obtain new business due to potential customers' concern about our ability to deliver products or services. We will likely need to raise capital to implement our project and stay in business.

Liquidity and Capital Resources

We are an early stage company and have incurred cumulative losses of \$35,470,384 since beginning operations on September 11, 2009. At December 31, 2015, we had a cash balance of \$730,482 and favorable working capital of \$441,014.

In September and October 2015, pursuant to a securities purchase agreement, the Company sold an aggregate of 482,500 shares of its common stock together with warrants to purchase an aggregate of 482,500 shares of its common stock for net proceeds, after commissions and other costs, of \$1,854,725. The warrants are exercisable at an exercise price of \$4.75 for a term of five years.

Table of Contents

On July 20, 2015, the Company issued a senior convertible note (the “July 2015 Note”), in the principal amount of \$550,000 due one year from the date of issuance. The total net proceeds the Company received from this note were \$415,123, net of fees and original interest discount (“OID”) of \$50,000.

On December 18, 2015, the Company modified certain terms of the July 2015 Note. Pursuant to the modification, the Company agreed to repay \$300,000 in consideration for the extinguishment of \$250,000 of the principal amount then outstanding. The Company and the lender also agreed to reduce the guaranteed interest on the note from 10% to 5%, to delay the guaranteed interest start date by thirty days until February 20, 2016 and to delay the first installment payment by thirty days until February 20, 2016. The July 2015 was fully repaid during February 2016.

The Company continually assesses its capital needs based on current and anticipated future operating results and will be required to raise additional capital during 2016.

Off-Balance Sheet Arrangements

We do not maintain any off-balance sheet arrangements, transactions, obligations or other relationships with unconsolidated entities that would be expected to have a material current or future effect upon our financial condition or results of operations.

ITEM 7A. QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE DISCLOSURES ABOUT MARKET RISK

Since we are a “smaller reporting company,” as defined by SEC regulation, we are not required to provide the information required by this Item.

ITEM 8. FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AND SUPPLEMENTARY DATA

The required financial statements are included following the signature page of this Form 10-K.

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

Not applicable.

ITEM 9A. CONTROLS AND PROCEDURES.

Evaluation of Disclosure Controls and Procedures

(a) Evaluation of disclosure controls and procedures. Our management, with the participation of our Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer, evaluated the effectiveness of our disclosure controls and procedures (as defined in Rule 13a-15 under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Exchange Act”)) as of the end of the period covered by this Annual Report on Form 10-K. In designing and evaluating the disclosure controls and procedures, management recognizes that any controls and procedures, no matter how well designed and operated, can provide only reasonable assurance of achieving the desired control objectives. In addition, the design of disclosure controls and procedures must reflect the fact that there are resource constraints and that management is required to apply its judgment in evaluating the benefits of possible controls and procedures relative to their costs.

Our disclosure controls and procedures are designed to provide reasonable, not absolute, assurance that the objectives of our disclosure control system are met. Because of inherent limitations in all control systems, no evaluation of controls can provide absolute assurance that all control issues, if any, within a company have been detected. Our Chief

Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer have concluded, based on their evaluation as of the end of the period covered by this report, that our disclosure controls and procedures were effective.

Table of Contents

Management's Report on Internal Control over Financial Reporting

Our management is responsible for establishing and maintaining adequate internal control over financial reporting, as such term is defined In Exchange Act Rule 13a-15(f). The term "internal control over financial reporting" is defined as a process designed by, or under the supervision of, the registrant's principal executive and principal financial officers, or persons performing similar functions, and effected by the registrant's board of directors, management and other personnel,

to provide reasonable assurance regarding the reliability of financial reporting and the preparation of financial statements for external purposes in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles and includes those policies and procedures that:

pertain to the maintenance of records that in reasonable detail accurately and fairly reflect the transactions and dispositions of the assets of the registrant;

provide reasonable assurance that transactions are recorded as necessary to permit preparation of financial statements in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles, and that receipts and expenditures of the registrant are being made only in accordance with authorizations of management and directors of the registrant; and

provide reasonable assurance regarding prevention or timely detection of unauthorized acquisition, use or disposition of the registrant's assets that could have a material effect on the financial statements.

Our internal control system is designed to provide reasonable assurance to our management and board of directors regarding the preparation and fair presentation of published financial statements. All internal control systems, no matter how well designed, have inherent limitations. Therefore, even those systems determined to be effective can provide only reasonable assurance with respect to financial statement preparation and presentation. Further, the design of a control system must reflect the fact that there are resource constraints and the benefits of controls must be considered relative to their costs. In addition, because of changes in conditions, the effectiveness of internal control may vary over time.

As previously disclosed in Item 9A of our Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2013, management concluded that there were material weaknesses in internal control over financial reporting related to insufficient experience to account for and disclose complex transactions under US GAAP and a limited segregation of duties within our accounting and financial reporting functions due to the small number of employees assigned to positions that involve the processing of financial information.

During the year ended December 31, 2014, remedial actions were implemented to address these weaknesses. We have devoted significant effort and resources to remediation and improvement of our internal control over financial reporting. While we had processes in place to identify and apply developments in accounting standards, we enhanced these processes to better evaluate our research of the nuances of complex accounting standards and engaged a third party financial reporting consultant to assist the Company in its financial reporting compliance in the latter part of 2013. Our third party consultant is a technical accounting professional, who assists us in the interpretation and application of new and complex accounting guidance. In order to address the segregation of duties item, all transactions are recorded by a third party accounting firm and approved by management. In addition to the CFO, the consultant also reviews the quarterly and annual financial statements. Management will continue to review and make necessary changes to the overall design of our internal control environment, if needed.

As of December 31, 2015, management conducted an evaluation of the effectiveness of our internal control over financial reporting based on the criteria in Internal Control-Integrated Framework issued by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission (2013) ("COSO") and have concluded our controls are effective.

The Company is a non-accelerated filer and is not subject to Section 404(b) of the Sarbanes Oxley Act. Accordingly, this Annual Report does not contain an attestation report of our independent registered public accounting firm regarding internal control over financial reporting, since the rules for smaller reporting companies provide for this exemption.

(b) Changes in internal control over financial reporting. There have been no changes in our internal control over financial reporting that occurred during the quarter ended December 31, 2015, that have materially affected or are reasonably likely to materially affect our internal control over financial reporting.

ITEM 9B. OTHER INFORMATION

None.

33

Table of Contents

PART III

ITEM 10. DIRECTORS, EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AND CORPORATE GOVERNANCE.

Executive Officers and Directors

Set forth below is certain information regarding our current executive officers and directors. Each of the directors listed below was appointed to our board of directors to serve until our next annual meeting of stockholders or until his successor is elected and qualified. All directors hold office for one-year terms until the election and qualification of their successors.

| Name | Age | Position with the Company | Director/Officer Since |
|----------------------|-----|---|------------------------|
| Andrew Levi | 49 | Chief Executive Officer, Chairman of the Board | 2011 |
| Melisse Shaban | 55 | Director | 2015 |
| D. Jonathan Merriman | 55 | Director | 2014 |
| Charles Thomas | 49 | Director | 2012 |
| Dennis Schmal | 68 | Director | 2015 |
| Chris Fameree | 34 | Chief Financial Officer | 2014 |

Biographical Information

Andrew Levi, Chief Executive Officer, Director

Mr. Levi founded Blue Calypso Holdings, Inc. in September 2009. In October 2014, Andrew was named Co-Chief Executive Officer and appointed as sole Chief Executive Officer during December 2014. He previously served as our Chief Technology Officer from June 2012 to October 2014 and was the Company's Chairman and Chief Executive Officer prior to that. From November 1991 until June 2012, Mr. Levi served as the founder, president and chief executive officer of Aztec Systems, Inc., a Dallas-based provider of mid-market ERP, managed services and related technology solutions. Mr. Levi has been named to SmartPartner Magazine's list of "50 Smartest People" in the technology industry and to D Magazine's "Top Entrepreneurs under 40." Mr. Levi has been involved in numerous business and association ventures in the technology industry such as Boardroom Software, Inc., Critical Devices, Inc., Aztec Business Solutions, L.L.P., REES Associates, the board of the International Association of Microsoft Certified Partners (IAMCP) and the Information Technology Solution Provider Alliance (ITSPA). Mr. Levi holds a Bachelor of Science degree in finance from Florida State University in addition to numerous technical certifications and ten United States patents. His achievements, experience and knowledge led the board to believe that he is qualified to serve on the board of directors.

Melisse Shaban, Director

Ms. Shaban is a strategist and marketer of innovative retail concepts in the health and beauty industry. With more than 25 years of experience in consumer applications, she has demonstrated expertise in skin care, hair care, retail operations, and molding medical service concepts into viable consumer brands. In January 2005 Ms. Shaban established Chrysallis, a full-service management team dedicated to the nurturing and development of niche retail brands to position them for future growth and success. As Founding Partner and head of Chrysallis, Melisse is charged with identifying unique concepts for investment, development, and growth, as well as leading growth strategies for her clients' brand portfolios. In this role to date, she has overseen investments in companies including StriVectin, the

largest independent prestige anti-aging skin care brand in America; Frederic Fekkai, a leading prestige hair care and salon brand; and Niadyne, Inc., a company dedicated to the discovery and development of topical products for the treatment and prevention of sun damage to the skin. Under her leadership, the Fekkai Company achieved year-on-year double-digit growth, which led to the acquisition of Fekkai by the Procter & Gamble Company in May 2008. Prior to founding Chrysallis, Melisse served as Head of Consumer Genomics for Genaissance Pharmaceuticals, with primary responsibility for identifying consumer applications for genetic discoveries, leading to a successful joint venture with Sciona, Inc., a genetic science firm based in the U.K. Her achievements, experience and knowledge led the board to believe that she is qualified to serve on the board of directors.

Table of Contents

D. Jonathan Merriman, Director

Mr. Merriman was appointed to our board in December 2014. As co-chairman and CEO of Merriman Holdings, Inc., Jon Merriman is responsible for the overall strategic direction of the firm as well as working closely with the firm's clients. He actively advises fast-growing public and private companies on complex capital market and financing issues and works directly with growth-oriented investors. With more than 25 years of experience in the investment banking and brokerage business, he brings deep experience in relationship management, corporate turnarounds and building growth companies. His extensive institutional and personal network and his trading experience give him a unique perspective when working with investment banking clients, as well as institutional investors. Prior to forming Merriman Capital, Merriman was Managing Director and the head of the Wells Fargo Securities equity group, formerly First Security Van Kasper, and served on FSVK's Board of Directors. Merriman was subsequently appointed Chairman and CEO of publicly traded telecom company Ralexchange, which he restructured into Merriman Curhan Ford, now known as Merriman Capital. He has served on several private and public company boards over the course of his career and has been a frequent guest on Bloomberg TV, as well as CNBC's show "Fast Money," and has been a regular contributor to financial publications such as The Wall Street Journal, Barron's and The Daily Deal. His achievements, experience and knowledge led the board to believe that he is qualified to serve on the board of directors.

Charles Thomas, Director

Mr. Thomas was appointed to our board in June 2012. He is the senior vice president of sales for Centro, a media logistics company based in Chicago, Illinois. At Centro, Mr. Thomas leads the company's sales efforts and oversees the strategic direction of the sales force. Mr. Thomas was associated with Time Inc. from 1996 through 1998. Mr. Thomas became the company's first online ad sales person and was promoted to advertising sales director and VP of online sales and marketing. During his tenure at Time Inc., he also contributed to the industry as a founding member of the Internet Advertising Bureau (IAB). Mr. Thomas then joined Broadcast.com as the VP of advertising sales, which was later purchased by Yahoo. He remained Yahoo's central region sales VP until 2007 and was later promoted to the VP of display sales strategy. When Mr. Thomas left Yahoo, he founded Step Ahead Strategies (SAS), a sales and marketing consulting firm. Mr. Thomas graduated from Ohio Wesleyan University in 1980. His achievements, experience and knowledge led the board to believe that he is qualified to serve on the board of directors.

Dennis Schmal, Director

Mr. Schmal was appointed to our board in May 2015. Mr. Schmal is a senior business advisor who spent nearly three decades with a global accounting firm consulting with hundreds of corporate clients. During his public accounting career, Mr. Schmal specialized in working with companies in the financial services sector, including the commercial banking, securities/investment banking and asset management industries. His consulting projects covered many facets of business, including operations, systems, capital planning, strategic planning, mergers & acquisitions executive recruitment and initial and secondary public offerings. Over the last sixteen years, he has served as a board director for fourteen corporate entities, both large and small, most of whom were public entities, and who were concentrated primarily in the technology and financial services industry sectors. Dennis's corporate board experience is extensive. He has served as the Audit Committee Chairperson and "Audit Committee Finance Expert" for seven public companies and has similar experience serving on compensation, technology, merger & acquisition, nominating and corporate governance board committees. Mr. Schmal is a member of the National Association of Corporate Directors and has attended many educational local chapter presentations as well as the annual corporate governance conventions. Dennis has earned the NACD certificate of director education. He has also attended several times the Directors College at Stanford Law School. Dennis is an associate member of the Committee on Mergers & Acquisitions of the Business Law Section of the American Bar Association. Dennis has been inducted in the Manchester's Who's Who Executive and Professional registry. His achievements, experience and knowledge led the board to believe that he is qualified to

serve on the board of directors.

Chris Fameree, Chief Financial Officer

Mr. Fameree was appointed our Chief Financial Officer during August 2014. Chris is a founding member of Assure Professional (Assure) with 10+ years of combined public accounting and industry experience. In his time in public accounting, Chris has lead and participated in numerous engagements including due diligence engagements, financial statement audits, SSAE 16 (formerly known as SAS 70) engagements and other advisory projects. In addition, Chris has actively lead and participated in numerous outsourced accounting and fractional CFO and Controller engagements which involve preparing accounting and financial reporting while providing insight into Companies' operational and financial results. Prior to founding Assure, Chris was a Senior Manager in Cherry Bekaert's Transaction Advisory Services Group and Audit Group. During this time, Chris participated in numerous business combinations and due diligence assignments. These transactions ranged from \$10 million to over \$100 million in value. Prior to joining CB&H, Chris worked at PricewaterhouseCoopers, where he served lead roles on audit engagements from international Fortune 500 companies to closely held private companies.

35

Table of Contents

Independent Directors

Our board of directors has determined that each of Messrs. Melisse Shaban, Charles Thomas and Dennis Schmal is independent within the meaning of applicable listing rules of the Nasdaq Stock Market and the rules and regulations promulgated by the Securities and Exchange Commission. We anticipate that we will add additional independent directors in the future.

Committees of the Board of Directors

Audit Committee. We established an audit committee of the board of directors on October 25, 2011. The audit committee consists of Messrs. Schmal and Thomas, each of whom our board has determined to be financially literate and qualify as an independent director under Section 5605(a)(2) of the rules of the Nasdaq Stock Market. In addition, Mr. Schmal qualifies as a financial expert, as defined in Item 407(d)(5)(ii) of Regulation S-K. The function of the audit committee is to oversee our accounting and financial reporting and the audits of our financial statements. The audit committee assists the board in monitoring the integrity of the financial statements, the qualifications, independence and appointment of the independent registered public accounting firm, the performance of our internal audit function and independent auditors, our systems of internal control and our compliance with legal and regulatory requirements. Copies of our audit committee charter can be obtained free of charge from our web site, www.bluecalypso.com.

Compensation Committee. We established a compensation committee of the board of directors October 25, 2011. The compensation committee consists of Messrs. Thomas and Merriman, each of whom our board has determined qualifies as an independent director under Section 5605(a)(2) of the rules of the Nasdaq Stock Market, as an “outside director” for purposes of Section 162(m) of the Internal Revenue Code and as a “non-employee director” for purposes of Section 16b-3 under the Exchange Act. The function of the compensation committee is to assist the board in overseeing our management compensation policies and practices, including (i) determining and approving the compensation of the our chief executive officer and other executive officers, (ii) reviewing and approving management incentive compensation policies and programs, and exercising discretion in the administration of such programs, (iii) reviewing and approving the form and amount of director compensation and (iv) reviewing and approving equity compensation programs for employees and exercising discretion in the administration of such programs. Copies of our compensation committee charter can be obtained free of charge from our web site, www.bluecalypso.com.

Section 16(a) Beneficial Ownership Reporting Compliance

Section 16(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “Act”) requires the Company’s directors, executive officers, and persons who beneficially own more than 10 percent of our Common Stock, to file reports of ownership and changes in ownership with the SEC. Directors, executive officers, and greater than 10 percent stockholders are required by SEC regulations to furnish the Company with copies of all Section 16(a) forms they file.

Based solely on our review of the copies of such forms received by us or filed with the SEC, we believe that during the year ended December 31, 2015, all persons subject to the reporting requirements of Section 16(a) with respect to the Company filed the required reports on a timely basis, except Mr. Ogle, Mr. Levi, and Ms. Shaban failed to timely file Form 4s and Mr. Schmal failed to timely file a Form 3 and Form 4.

Code of Ethics

We have adopted a Code of Business Conduct and Ethics that applies to directors, officers and other employees of the Company and its subsidiaries, including our principal executive officer, principal financial officer and principal

accounting officer. Copies of the code can be obtained free of charge from our web site, www.bluecalypso.com. We intend to post any amendments to; or waivers from, our code of ethics on our web site.

Table of Contents

ITEM 11. EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION

2015 and 2014 Summary Compensation Table

The following table sets forth the compensation earned by the Company's principal executive officer, and each of the Company's highly compensated executive officers other than the principal executive officer whose compensation exceeded \$100,000 (collectively, the "Named Executive Officers"), during the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014.

| Name and Position | Year | Salary(\$) | Bonus(\$) | Options | Other Compensation | Total (\$) |
|---|------|------------|-----------|-----------|--------------------|------------|
| Andrew Levi | 2015 | 165,625 | | 260,944 | | 426,569 |
| Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, | 2014 | 240,625 | | | | 240,625 |
| Former Chief Technology Officer (1) | | | | | | |
| Chris Fameree | 2015 | 84,000 | | 32,314 | | 116,314 |
| Chief Financial Officer | 2014 | 38,500 | | | | 38,500 |
| William Ogle | 2014 | 350,000 | 85,000 | 1,046,039 | 2,621,770 | 4,102,809 |
| Former Chairman and Chief Executive Officer (2) | | | | | | |
| David Polster | 2014 | 59,770 | | 18,539 | | 78,309 |
| Former Chief Financial Officer (3) | | | | | | |

(1) Mr. Levi served as our Chairman and Chief Executive Officer from September 1, 2011 through June 10, 2012 and was appointed to Co-Chief Executive Officer during October 2014 and sole Chief Executive Officer during December 2014. He served as our Chief Technology Officer from June 2012 until this appointment.

(2) Mr. Ogle was appointed as our Chairman and Chief Executive Officer effective June 11, 2012 and resigned as Co -Executive Officer effective December 31, 2014. Other compensation includes expense associated with Mr. Ogle's termination and restricted stock grant.

(3) Mr. Polster was appointed as our Chief Financial Officer in March 2012 and resigned during August 2014. Mr. Fameree replaced Mr. Polster during 2014.

Employment Agreements

On October 17, 2015, the Compensation Committee set the annual base salary of our Chief Executive Officer, Andrew Levi, at \$250,000 effective October 1, 2015. Mr. Levi's base salary had been temporarily reduced to \$137,500 for a period of 12 months pursuant to a settlement and standstill agreement entered into between the Company and one of its stockholders dated September 26, 2014. In addition, the Compensation Committee awarded Mr. Levi options to purchase 32,864 shares of the Company's Common Stock. The options are exercisable at an exercise price of \$5.00 per share for a term of 10 years. The options were fully vested at the time of issuance. In addition, Mr. Levi shall be eligible to receive a bonus at year-end with a target level of 100 % of his base salary, which will also be paid in options to purchase shares of the Company's Common Stock.

On June 1, 2012, we entered into an employment letter agreement with our former Chief Executive Officer, William Ogle, which was effective on June 11, 2012. The agreement did not have a specified term and Mr. Ogle's employment

was on an at-will basis. The agreement provided that Mr. Ogle was entitled to an annual base salary of \$400,000. He was also entitled to annual incentive-based compensation with a target value of 100% of his base salary with an upper limit of 200%, to be determined and administered by our board of directors. Such incentive-based compensation may be paid in the form of shares of our common stock or cash. Mr. Ogle was awarded a restricted stock award equal to 7% of our total issued and outstanding shares calculated as of June 11, 2012. The restricted stock award will vest: (i) one-third on the one year anniversary of the grant date, and (ii) the remaining two-thirds will vest pro rata in eight equal quarterly installments. Mr. Ogle was also eligible to receive additional annual equity awards of up to 200% of his base salary subject to mutually agreeable and reasonable targets beginning in 2013. On June 11, 2012, pursuant to his employment letter agreement, we also granted to Mr. Ogle options to purchase 3% of the issued and outstanding shares of common stock of the Company on a fully-diluted basis. The options are exercisable at an exercise price equal to \$0.10 per share for a term of 10 years. Mr. Ogle also was eligible to participate in the Company's comprehensive medical and dental program. In the event that we terminate Mr. Ogle's employment without cause or Mr. Ogle terminates his employment for good reason, we will pay him his base salary for a period of 12 months from the date of separation and he will be eligible to receive any incentive compensation subject to the applicable targets being achieved. During such severance period, we will pay the premiums for health insurance coverage substantially similar to the benefits provided to Mr. Ogle and his dependents as of the date of termination.

Table of Contents

Effective December 31, 2014, Mr. Ogle resigned from his position as Co-Chief Executive Officer for “good reason” as defined in his employment letter agreement. Pursuant to the agreement, Mr. Ogle was entitled to receive continued payment of his current base salary through September 30, 2014. In addition, Mr. Ogle’s restricted stock grant and outstanding stock options shall continue to vest through April 30, 2016. He shall also be permitted to exercise such options through December 31, 2017.

Director Compensation

We do not currently compensate our directors, except as described below. We expect that the future compensation arrangements may be comprised of a combination of cash and/or equity awards.

During the year ending December 31, 2015, we granted stock options under the Blue Calypso, Inc. 2011 Long-Term Incentive Plan to the directors as follows:

| Name | Shares Subject to Option | Exercise Price | Vesting Provisions | Expiration Date |
|----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---|-------------------|
| Andrew Levi | 20,000 | \$ 7.00 | Pro-rata vesting quarterly over three years | April 10, 2025 |
| Charles Thomas | 20,000 | \$ 7.00 | Pro-rata vesting quarterly over three years | April 10, 2025 |
| D. Jonathan Merriman | 20,000 | \$ 7.00 | Pro-rata vesting quarterly over three years | April 10, 2025 |
| D. Jonathan Merriman | 7,500 | \$ 5.00 | Pro-rata vesting quarterly over three years | December 18, 2024 |
| Melisse Shaban | 20,000 | \$ 7.00 | Pro-rata vesting quarterly over two years | December 3, 2025 |
| Dennis Schmal | 20,000 | \$ 7.00 | Pro-rata vesting quarterly over three years | May 19, 2025 |
| Andrew Malloy | 20,000 | \$ 7.00 | Vested upon departure | December 3, 2016 |

Compensation Committee Interlocks and Insider Participation

No member of our compensation committee is an employee of the Company. None of our executive officers serve on the board of directors or compensation committee of a company that has an executive officer that serves on our board of directors or compensation committee. No member of our board of directors serves as an executive officer of a company in which one of our executive officers serves as a member of the board of directors or compensation committee of that company.

To the extent any members of our compensation committee and affiliates of theirs have participated in transactions with us meeting the requirements of Item 404 of Regulation S-K, a description of those transactions is described in “Certain Relationships and Related Party Transactions.” See “Item 10. Directors, Executive Officers and Corporate Governance – Committees of the Board of Directors” for further information regarding our compensation committee.

Termination of Employment and Change of Control Arrangement

Mr. Ogle’s employment letter agreement provides that in the event that he is terminated without cause (as such term is defined in the letter agreement) or if Mr. Ogle terminates his employment with the Company for good reason (as such

term is defined in the letter agreement), the Company will pay him his base salary for a period of twelve months from the date of his separation and that he will be eligible to receive an incentive compensation subject to the applicable targets being achieved. During the severance period, the Company will also pay the premiums for Mr. Ogle's health insurance coverage substantially similar to that provided to Mr. Ogle and his family as of the date of his termination under the Company's group health and medical policies for so long as he elects to continue such coverage.

Effective December 31, 2014, Mr. Ogle terminated his employment as Co-Chief Executive Officer for "good reason" as defined in his employment letter. Mr. Ogle was entitled to receive continued payment of his current base salary through September 30, 2015. In addition, Mr. Ogle's restricted stock grant and outstanding stock options shall continue to vest through April 30, 2016. He shall also be permitted to exercise such options through December 31, 2017.

Table of Contents

Outstanding Equity Awards at Fiscal Year End

The following table provides information about the number of outstanding equity awards held by our named executive officers as of December 31, 2015.

| Name | Option Awards | | | | | Stock Awards | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|----------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--|--|------------------------|--|
| | Number of Securities Underlying Unexercised Options (#) | Number of Securities Underlying Unexercised Options (#) | Equity Incentive Plan Awards: Number of Securities Underlying Unexercised Options (#) | Option Exercise Price (\$) | Option Expiration Date | Market Value of Awards | Number of Shares or Units of Unearned Shares, or Other Rights That Have Not Vested | or Payout Value of Unearned Shares, or Other Rights That Have Not Vested | Market Value of Awards | Number of Shares or Units of Unearned Shares, or Other Rights That Have Not Vested |
| Andrew Levi Chief Executive Officer and Chairman | 5,000 | 15,000 | 20,000 | 7.00 | 4/10/2025 | | | | | |
| Chris Fameree Current CFO | 32,864 | - | 32,864 | 5.00 | 10/1/2025 | | | | | |
| David Polster Former CFO | 3,333 | 6,834 | 10,000 | 7.00 | 5/6/2025 | | | | | |
| | 5,000 | - | 5,000 | 27.00 | 8/15/2017 | | | | | |
| | 667 | - | 667 | 12.00 | 8/15/2017 | | | | | |
| | 1,750 | - | 1,750 | 6.00 | 8/15/2017 | | | | | |
| William Ogle Former CEO and Chairman | 110,164 (1)(3) | - | 110,164 | 5.00 | 12/31/2017 | - | - | - | - | - |
| | 50,248 (3) | 25,124 | 75,372 | 12.00 | 12/31/2017 | - | - | - | - | - |
| | 61,551 | 61,551 | 123,102 | 7.00 | 12/31/2017 | - | - | - | - | - |

- (1) All of these options were immediately exercisable on June 11, 2012.
- (2) Mr. Ogle's options were assigned an expiration date of December 31, 2017 upon his resignation from the Company. Likewise, Mr. Polster's were assigned an expiration date of August 15, 2017 upon his resignation.
- (3) These options vest equally over three anniversary dates after their issuance.

Table of Contents

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

The following table sets forth the number and percentage of outstanding shares of common stock and other classes of our equity securities entitled to vote on all matters submitted to a vote by holders of common stock beneficially owned as of March 18, 2016, by (i) each of our directors and named executive officers; (ii) all persons who are known by us to be beneficial owners of 5% or more of our outstanding common stock; and (iii) all of our officers and directors as a group. The percentages of common stock beneficially owned are reported on the basis of regulations of the Securities and Exchange Commission governing the determination of beneficial ownership of securities. Under the rules of the Securities and Exchange Commission, a person is deemed to be a beneficial owner of a security if that person has or shares voting power, which includes the power to vote or to direct the voting of the security, or investment power, which includes the power to dispose of or to direct the disposition of the security. Unless otherwise noted, to our knowledge and subject to community property laws where applicable, each of the persons listed below has sole voting and investment power with respect to the shares indicated as beneficially owned by such person. Unless otherwise noted, each person's address is c/o Blue Calypso, 101 W. Renner Rd. Suite 200 Richardson, TX 75082.

| Name and Address of Beneficial Owner | Amount and Nature of Beneficial Ownership (1) | Percentage of Class (1)(2) |
|---|---|----------------------------|
| Andrew Levi | 777,674(3) | 12.8% |
| Chris Fameree | 6,668(4) | * |
| Dennis Schmal | 80,197(5) | 1.3% |
| Charles Thomas | 21,217(6) | * |
| Melisse Shaban | 5,000(7) | * |
| D. Jonathan Merriman | 86,815(8) | 1.4% |
| William Ogle | 481,638(9) | 7.6% |
| Ronald L. Chez c/o Barry L. Fischer Thompson Coburn LLP 55 East Monroe Street Suite 3700 Chicago, IL 60603 | 301,605(10) | 5.0% |
| Scarsdale Equities LLC 10 Rockefeller Plaza, Suite 720 New York, NY 10020 | 1,351,824(11) | 21.4% |
| All directors and executive officers as a group (6 persons) | 977,571 | 16.0% |
| *Less than 1% | | |

- (1) Shares of common stock beneficially owned and the respective percentages of beneficial ownership of common stock assumes the exercise of all options, warrants and other securities convertible into common stock beneficially owned by such person or entity currently exercisable or exercisable within 60 days of March 18, 2016, except as otherwise noted. Shares issuable pursuant to the exercise of stock options and warrants exercisable within 60 days are deemed outstanding and held by the holder of such options or warrants for computing the percentage of outstanding common stock beneficially owned by such person, but are not deemed outstanding for computing the percentage of outstanding common stock beneficially owned by any other person.

Edgar Filing: BLUE CALYPSO, INC. - Form 10-K

- (2) These percentages have been calculated based on 6,007,443 shares of common stock outstanding as of March 21, 2016.
- (3) Includes 39,531 shares issuable upon exercise of vested stock options, 14,118 warrants and 667,554 shares of common stock.
- (4) Includes 6,668 shares issuable upon exercise of vested stock options.
- (5) Includes 6,667 shares issuable upon exercise of vested stock options, 14,706 shares issuable upon exercise of warrants and 58,824 shares of common stock.
- (6) Includes 19,171 shares issuable upon exercise of vested stock options and 2,046 shares of common stock.
- (7) Includes 5,000 shares issuable upon exercise of vested stock options.
- (8) Includes 11,357 shares issuable upon exercise of vested stock options and 75,458 shares of common stock held by Mr. Merriman and Merriman Capital, Inc. Mr. Merriman is Chief Executive Officer and Co-Chairman of Merriman Holdings, Inc., the parent company of Merriman Capital, Inc. and may be deemed to have beneficial ownership of such shares.
- (9) Includes (i) 308,638 shares issuable upon exercise of vested stock options and (ii) 173,000 shares of common stock.
- (10) Based upon a Schedule 13D filed by Ronald L. Chez on July 21, 2015.
- (11) Based upon a Schedule 13G/A filed by Scarsdale Equities LLC on October 21, 2015 and additional shares and warrants purchased during March 2016. Includes shares held by investor accounts over which Scarsdale Equities acts as investors' discretionary account manager.

Table of Contents

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

Procedures for the Approval of Related Person Transactions

Our Audit Committee on a timely basis reviews and, if appropriate, approves all related person transactions. At any time in which an executive officer, director or nominee for director becomes aware of any contemplated or existing transaction that, in that person's judgment may be a related person transaction, the executive officer, director or nominee for director is expected to notify the chairman of the Audit Committee of the transaction. Generally, the chairman of the Audit Committee reviews any reported transaction and may consult with outside legal counsel regarding whether the transaction is, in fact, a related person transaction requiring approval by the Audit Committee. If the transaction is considered to be a related person transaction, then the Audit Committee will review the transaction at its next scheduled meeting or at a special meeting of the committee.

Independent Directors

Our board of directors has determined that each of Messrs. Shaban, Thomas and Schmal is independent within the meaning of applicable listing rules of the Nasdaq Stock Market and the rules and regulations promulgated by the Securities and Exchange Commission. We anticipate that we will add additional independent directors in the future.

ITEM 14. PRINCIPAL ACCOUNTING FEES AND SERVICES

We engaged Liggett & Webb P.A. ("Liggett") as our independent registered public accounting firm for the audit of our financial statements for the year ended December 31, 2015 commencing December 2015. Prior to the engagement of Liggett, Marcum LLP ("Marcum") served as our independent registered public accounting firm.

During the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014, we were billed or expect to be billed by our independent registered public accounting firms the following fees:

Audit Fee

The aggregate fees billed or expected to be billed for each of the last two fiscal years for professional services rendered by the principal accountant for the audit of our financial statements were approximately \$100,095 by Marcum for 2014 and \$131,028 by Marcum for 2015. We anticipate fees of \$39,000 for the 2015 audit by Liggett.

Audit-Related Fees

The aggregate fees billed in each of the last two fiscal years for assurance and related services by the principal accountant that are reasonably related to the performance of the audit or review of our financial statements that are not reported above were \$-0- for fiscal year ended 2014 and \$-0- for fiscal year ended 2015.

Tax Fees

The aggregate fees billed or expected to be billed in each of the last two fiscal years for professional services rendered by the principal accountant for tax compliance, and tax planning were \$6,500 for fiscal year ended 2014 from Marcum. We anticipate fees of \$0 for the 2015 tax compliance from Liggett.

All Other Fees

The aggregate fees billed in each of the last two fiscal years for products and services provided by the principal accountant, other than the services reported above were \$0 paid to Marcum for fiscal years ended 2014 and 2015, respectively.

Our Audit Committee will evaluate and approve in advance, the scope and cost of the engagement of an auditor before the auditor renders audit and non-audit services.

Table of Contents

PART IV

ITEM 15. EXHIBITS, FINANCIAL STATEMENT SCHEDULES

(a) Exhibits

| Exhibit Number | Description |
|-------------------|--|
| 2.1 | Agreement and Plan of Merger and Reorganization, dated as of September 1, 2011, by and among Blue Calypso, Inc., Blue Calypso Acquisition Corp., and Blue Calypso Holdings, Inc. (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 2.1 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on September 8, 2011) |
| 2.2 | Agreement and Plan of Merger, dated September 9, 2011, by and between Blue Calypso, Inc., a Nevada corporation, and Blue Calypso, Inc., a Delaware corporation (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.1 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on September 15, 2011) |
| 3.1 | Certificate of Incorporation (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 3.1 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on October 19, 2011) |
| 3.2 | Certificate of Designation of Series A Convertible Preferred Stock (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 3.2 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on October 19, 2011) |
| 3.3 | Bylaws of Blue Calypso, Inc., a Delaware corporation, adopted September 9, 2011 (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 3.3 to Current Report on Form 8- K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on October 19, 2011) |
| 10.1 | 2011 Long-Term Incentive Plan (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.1 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on September 8, 2011) |
| 10.2 | Form of Incentive Stock Option Agreement (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.2 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on September 8, 2011) |
| 10.3 | Form of Non-Qualified Stock Option Agreement (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.3 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on September 8, 2011) |
| 10.4 | Form Restricted Stock Award Agreement (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.4 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on September 8, 2011) |
| 10.5 | Agreement of Conveyance, Transfer and Assignment of Assets and Assumption of Obligations, dated as of September 1, 2011 (incorporated by reference to Exhibit |

Edgar Filing: BLUE CALYPSO, INC. - Form 10-K

10.5 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on September 8, 2011)

- 10.6 Stock Purchase Agreement, by and between Blue Calypso, Inc. and Deborah Flores, dated as of September 1, 2011 (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.6 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on September 8, 2011)
- 10.7 Securities Purchase Agreement, dated as of September 1, 2011, by and among Blue Calypso, Inc. and certain purchasers set forth therein (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.7 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on September 8, 2011)
- 10.8 Registration Rights Agreement, dated as of September 1, 2011, by and among Blue Calypso, Inc. and certain purchasers set forth therein (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.9 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on September 8, 2011)

Table of Contents

- 10.9 Form of Warrant (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.10 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on September 8, 2011)
- 10.10 Letter Agreement, dated January 16, 2012, by and between Blue Calypso, Inc. and Aztec Systems, Inc. (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.1 to our Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on January 20, 2012)
- 10.11 Promissory Note, dated January 17, 2012, issued by Blue Calypso, Inc. to Aztec Systems, Inc. (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.2 to our Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on January 20, 2012)
- 10.12 Securities Purchase Agreement, dated April 19, 2012, by and between Blue Calypso, Inc. and the Buyer thereto (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.1 to our Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on April 24, 2012)
- 10.13 Senior Secured Convertible Note issued April 19, 2012 (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.2 to our Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on April 24, 2012)
- 10.14 Common Stock Purchase Warrant issued April 19, 2012 (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.3 to our Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on April 24, 2012)
- 10.15 Security Agreement, dated April 19, 2012, by and between the Company, Blue Calypso, LLC and the Buyer (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.4 to our Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on April 24, 2012)
- 10.16 Intellectual Property Security Agreement, dated April 19, 2012, by and between the Company, Blue Calypso, LLC, and the Buyer (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.5 to our Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on April 24, 2012)
- 10.17 Subsidiary Guarantee, dated April 19, 2012, by Blue Calypso, LLC, in favor of the Buyer (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.6 to our Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on April 24, 2012)
- 10.18 Form of Lock-Up Agreement (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.7 to our Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on April 24, 2012)
- 10.19 Amendment No. 1 to Common Stock Purchase Warrant (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.8 to our Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on April 24, 2012)
- 10.20

Edgar Filing: BLUE CALYPSO, INC. - Form 10-K

Stockholder's Agreement, dated April 19, 2012, by and between Andrew Levi and the Company (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.9 to our Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on April 24, 2012)

10.21

Letter Agreement dated June 1, 2012, between Blue Calypso, Inc. and Bill Ogle effective as of June 1, 2012 (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.1 to our Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on June 4, 2012)

43

Table of Contents

- 10.22 Form of Subscription Agreement – June 2012 Private Placement (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.1 to our Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on July 30, 2012)
- 10.23 Form of Warrant – June 2012 Private Placement (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.1 to our Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on July 30, 2012)
- 10.24 Exchange Agreement dated November 9, 2012 between Blue Calypso, Inc. and Aztec Systems, Inc. (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.24 to our Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q for the period ended September 30, 2012 filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on November 19, 2012)
- 10.25 8% Convertible Note dated November 9, 2012 (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.24 to our Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q for the period ended September 30, 2012 filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on November 19, 2012)
- 10.26 Amendment No. 1 to 8% Senior Secured Convertible Debentures between Blue Calypso, Inc. and the Holder dated April 29, 2013 (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.1 to our Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on May 3, 2013)
- 10.27 Amendment No. 2 to Common Stock Purchase Warrants between the Company and the Holder dated April 29, 2013 (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.2 to our Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on May 3, 2013)
- 10.28 Amendment No. 2 to Common Stock Purchase Warrants between the Company and the Holder dated April 29, 2013 (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.3 to our Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on May 3, 2013)
- 10.29 Securities Purchase Agreement dated May 6, 2013 (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.1 to our Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on May 6, 2013)
- 10.30 10% Convertible Debenture dated May 6, 2013 (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.2 to our Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on May 6, 2013)
- 10.31 Amendment No. 1 to 10% Convertible Debenture between Blue Calypso, Inc. and the Holder dated September 13, 2013 (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.1 to our Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on September 16, 2013)
- 10.32 Amendment No. 3 to Common Stock Purchase Warrants between the Company and the Holder dated September 13, 2013 (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.2 to our Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on September 16, 2013)

- 10.33 Amendment No. 2 to Common Stock Purchase Warrant between the Company and the Holder dated September 13, 2013 (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.3 to our Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on September 16, 2013)
- 10.34 Securities Purchase Agreement dated October 7, 2013 (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.3 to our Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on October 11, 2013)
- 10.35 Amendment No. 4 to Common Stock Purchase Warrants between the Company and the Holder dated January 9, 2014 (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.1 to our Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on January 10, 2014)
- 10.36 Amendment No. 3 to Common Stock Purchase Warrant between the Company and the Holder dated January 9, 2014 (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.2 to our Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on January 10, 2014)
- 10.37 Settlement and Standstill Agreement dated September 26, 2014 by and between Blue Calypso, Inc., Ronald L. Chez and Individual Retirement Accounts for the benefit of Ronald L. Chez (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.1 to our Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on October 2, 2014)

Edgar Filing: BLUE CALYPSO, INC. - Form 10-K

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------|--|
| 10.38 | Form of Note Purchase Agreement dates as of July 20, 2015 by and between the Lender, Blue Calypso Inc., Blue Calypso Holdings, Inc., Blue Calypso, LLC and Blue Calypso Latin America, S.A. (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.1 to Current Report on Form 8-K files with the Securities and Exchange Commission on July 24, 2015) |
| 10.39 | Form of Senior Convertible Note issued July 20, 2015 (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.2 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on July 24, 2015) |
| 10.40 | Form of Securities Purchase Agreement (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.1 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on September 29, 2015) |
| 10.41 | Form of Warrant (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.2 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on September 29, 2015) |
| 10.42 | Form of Securities Purchase Agreement - February 2016 (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.1 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on March 2, 2016) |
| 10.43 | Form of Warrant – February 2016 (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 10.2 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on March 2, 2016) |
| 16.1 | Letter dated December 30, 2015 addressed to the Securities and Exchange Commission from Marcum LLP (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 16.1 to Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on December 30, 2015) |
| 21.1 | List of subsidiaries (incorporated by reference to Exhibit 21.1 to our Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2012 filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on April 16, 2012) |
| 31.1 | <u>Certification of Principal Executive Officer pursuant to Section 302 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002</u> |
| 31.2 | <u>Certification of Principal Financial Officer pursuant to Section 302 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002</u> |
| 32.1 | <u>Certification of Principal Executive Officer pursuant to Section 906 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002</u> |
| 32.2 | <u>Certification of Chief Financial Officer pursuant to Section 906 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002</u> |
| 101.INS | XBRL Instance Document |

Edgar Filing: BLUE CALYPSO, INC. - Form 10-K

| | |
|---------|--|
| 101.SCH | XBRL Taxonomy Extension Schema Document |
| 101.CAL | XBRL Taxonomy Extension Calculation Linkbase Document |
| 101.DEF | XBRL Taxonomy Extension Definition Linkbase Document |
| 101.LAB | XBRL Taxonomy Extension Label Linkbase Document |
| 101.PRE | XBRL Taxonomy Extension Presentation Linkbase Document |

45

Table of Contents

SIGNATURES

In accordance with Section 13 or 15(d) of the Exchange Act, the registrant caused this report to be signed on its behalf by the undersigned, thereunto duly authorized.

Blue Calypso, Inc.

Date March 22, 2016

By: /s/ Andrew Levi
Andrew Levi
Chief Executive Officer

In accordance with the Exchange Act, 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 |
|--|--|----------------|
| /s/ Andrew Levi Andrew Levi | Chief Executive Officer and Director (Principal Executive Officer) | March 22, 2016 |
| /s/ Chris Fameree Chris Fameree | Chief Financial Officer (Principal Financial and Accounting Officer) | March 22, 2016 |
| /s/ Melisse Shaban Melisse Shaban | Director | March 22, 2016 |
| /s/ Charles Thomas Charles Thomas | Director | March 22, 2016 |
| /s/ Dennis Schmal Ian Wolfman | Director | March 22, 2016 |
| /s/ D. Jonathan Merriman D. Jonathan Merriman | Director | March 22, 2016 |

Table of Contents

BLUE CALYPSO, INC. AND SUBSIDIARIES
CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

| | Page |
|---|------------|
| <u>Reports of Independent Registered Public Accounting Firms</u> | F-2 ~ F-3 |
| <u>Consolidated Balance Sheets as of December 31, 2015 and 2014</u> | F-4 |
| <u>Consolidated Statements of Operations for the Years Ended December 31, 2015 and 2014</u> | F-5 |
| <u>Consolidated Statement of Stockholders' Equity for the Two Years Ended December 31, 2015</u> | F-6 ~ F-7 |
| <u>Consolidated Statements of Cash Flows for the Years Ended December 31, 2015 and 2014</u> | F-8 |
| <u>Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements</u> | F-9 ~ F-27 |

F-1

Table of Contents

REPORT OF INDEPENDENT REGISTERED PUBLIC ACCOUNTING FIRM

To the Audit Committee of the
Board of Directors and Stockholders
of Blue Calypso, Inc.

We have audited the accompanying consolidated balance sheet of Blue Calypso, Inc. and Subsidiaries (the “Company”) as of December 31, 2015 and the related consolidated statements of operations, stockholders’ equity and cash flows for the year then ended. These financial statements are the responsibility of the Company’s management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audit.

We conducted our audit in accordance with the standards of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (United States). Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement. The Company is not required to have, nor were we engaged to perform, an audit of its internal control over financial reporting. Our audit included consideration of internal control over financial reporting as a basis for designing audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, 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. An audit also includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements, assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. We believe that our audit provide a reasonable basis for our opinion.

In our opinion, the consolidated financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of Blue Calypso, Inc. and Subsidiaries, as of December 31, 2015, and the results of its operations and its cash flows for the year then ended in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

The accompanying consolidated financial statements have been prepared assuming that the Company will continue as a going concern. As more fully discussed in Note 2, the Company has incurred net losses since inception and needs to raise additional funds to meet its obligations and sustain its operations. These conditions raise substantial doubt about the Company’s ability to continue as a going concern. Management’s plans in regard to these matters are described in Note 2. The consolidated financial statements do not include any adjustments that might result from the outcome of this uncertainty.

/s/ Liggett & Webb, P.A.

New York, NY
March 22, 2016

Table of Contents

REPORT OF INDEPENDENT REGISTERED PUBLIC ACCOUNTING FIRM

To the Audit Committee of the
Board of Directors and Stockholders
of Blue Calypso, Inc.

We have audited the accompanying consolidated balance sheet of Blue Calypso, Inc. and Subsidiaries (the “Company”) as of December 31, 2014 and the related consolidated statements of operations, stockholders’ equity and cash flows for the year then ended. These financial statements are the responsibility of the Company’s management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audit.

We conducted our audit in accordance with the standards of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (United States). Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement. The Company is not required to have, nor were we engaged to perform, an audit of its internal control over financial reporting. Our audit included consideration of internal control over financial reporting as a basis for designing audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, 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. An audit also includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements, assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. We believe that our audit provide a reasonable basis for our opinion.

In our opinion, the consolidated financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of Blue Calypso, Inc. and Subsidiaries, as of December 31, 2014, and the results of its operations and its cash flows for the year then ended in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

The accompanying consolidated financial statements have been prepared assuming that the Company will continue as a going concern. As more fully discussed in Note 2, the Company has incurred net losses since inception and needs to raise additional funds to meet its obligations and sustain its operations. These conditions raise substantial doubt about the Company’s ability to continue as a going concern. Management’s plans in regard to these matters are described in Note 2. The consolidated financial statements do not include any adjustments that might result from the outcome of this uncertainty.

/s/ Marcum llp

Marcum llp
New York, NY

March 17, 2015, except for Note 8A, as to which the date is August 3, 2015

Table of Contents

BLUE CALYPSO, INC. AND SUBSIDIARIES

CONSOLIDATED BALANCE SHEETS

DECEMBER 31, 2015 AND 2014

| | 2015 | 2014 |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| ASSETS | | |
| Current assets: | | |
| Cash | \$730,482 | \$1,103,201 |
| Accounts receivable, net | 247,131 | 167,396 |
| Inventory | 41,653 | - |
| Prepaid expenses and other current assets | 42,370 | 50,356 |
| Total current assets | 1,061,636 | 1,320,953 |
| Property and equipment, net | 6,682 | 6,315 |
| Other assets: | | |
| Accounts receivable, long term portion | 71,440 | - |
| Capitalized software development costs, net of accumulated amortization of \$1,344,672 and \$986,502 as of December 31, 2015 and 2014, respectively | 817,548 | 794,551 |
| Total assets | \$1,957,306 | \$2,121,819 |
| LIABILITIES AND STOCKHOLDERS' EQUITY | | |
| Current liabilities: | | |
| Accounts payable | \$103,936 | \$24,600 |
| Accrued expenses | 44,190 | 236,526 |
| Settlement payable, short term portion | 119,066 | - |
| Deferred revenue | - | 1,100 |
| Convertible note payable, net of debt discounts of \$119,115 and \$-0-, respectively | 180,885 | - |
| Deferred rent, short term portion | 2,048 | - |
| Derivative liabilities | 170,497 | - |
| Total current liabilities | 620,622 | 262,226 |
| Long term debt: | | |
| Settlement payable, long term | 71,440 | - |
| Deferred rent, long term portion | 1,211 | - |
| Total liabilities | 693,273 | 262,226 |
| Stockholders' equity: | | |
| Preferred stock, \$0.0001 par value; 5,000,000 shares authorized: Series A convertible preferred stock, \$0.0001 par value; 1,700,000 shares designated; -0- and 161,827 shares issued and outstanding as of December 31, 2015 and 2014, respectively | - | 16 |
| Common stock, \$0.0001 par value; 680,000,000 shares authorized, 5,522,146 and 4,902,639 shares issued and outstanding as of December 31, 2015 and 2014, respectively | 552 | 490 |
| Additional paid in capital | 36,733,865 | 34,026,321 |
| Accumulated deficit | (35,470,384) | (32,167,234) |
| Total stockholders' equity | 1,264,033 | 1,859,593 |

| | | |
|--|-------------|-------------|
| Total liabilities and stockholders' equity | \$1,957,306 | \$2,121,819 |
|--|-------------|-------------|

See the accompanying notes to these consolidated financial statements.

F-4

Table of Contents

BLUE CALYPSO, INC. AND SUBSIDIARIES
CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF OPERATIONS

| | Year ended December 31, | |
|---|-------------------------|----------------|
| | 2015 | 2014 |
| REVENUE | \$1,004,495 | \$759,889 |
| OPERATING EXPENSES: | | |
| Cost of revenue | 664,477 | 412,225 |
| Sales and marketing | 385,872 | 482,729 |
| General and administrative | 2,318,720 | 6,103,628 |
| Depreciation and amortization | 364,310 | 344,128 |
| Total operating expenses | 3,733,379 | 7,342,710 |
| Loss from operations | (2,728,884) | (6,582,821) |
| Other income (expense): | | |
| Change in fair value of derivative liabilities | 130,331 | 2,030 |
| Loss on settlement or conversion inducement of debt | - | (413,917) |
| Loss on debt modification | (41,434) | - |
| Terminated offering costs | (283,387) | - |
| Interest expense | (379,776) | (740,756) |
| Total other income (expense) | (574,266) | (1,152,643) |
| NET LOSS | \$(3,303,150) | \$(7,735,464) |
| Net loss per common share, basic and diluted | \$(0.65) | \$(1.80) |
| Weighted average common shares outstanding, basic and diluted | 5,112,911 | 4,288,826 |

See the accompanying notes to these consolidated financial statements.

Table of Contents

BLUE CALYPSO, INC. AND SUBSIDIARIES

CONSOLIDATED STATEMENT OF STOCKHOLDERS' EQUITY
TWO YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2015

| | Preferred Stock | | Common Stock | | Additional | Accumulated | Total |
|---|-----------------|--------|--------------|--------|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|
| | Shares | Amount | Shares | Amount | Paid in Capital | Deficit | Stockholders' Equity |
| Balance, January 1, 2014 | 750,068 | \$ 75 | 3,764,778 | \$ 376 | \$ 26,297,841 | \$ (24,431,770) | \$ 1,866,522 |
| Shares issued in connection with exercise of warrants | - | - | 409,823 | 41 | 1,024,517 | - | 1,024,558 |
| Shares issued for services rendered | - | - | 31,200 | 3 | 195,465 | - | 195,468 |
| Shares issued in connection with exercise of options | - | - | 6,400 | 1 | 21,727 | - | 21,728 |
| Sale of common stock associated with private transaction | - | - | 285,000 | 29 | 1,329,971 | - | 1,330,000 |
| Conversion of preferred shares to common shares at \$0.0679 per share | (588,241) | (59) | 173,267 | 17 | 42 | - | - |
| Net shares cancelled in exchange for option exercise | - | - | (222) | - | - | - | - |
| Shares issued in settlement of convertible notes | - | - | 139,150 | 14 | 549,986 | - | 550,000 |
| Shares issued as inducement to settle convertible notes | - | - | 4,400 | - | 37,345 | - | 37,345 |
| Loss on warrant modification | - | - | - | - | 460,949 | - | 460,949 |
| Loss on debt modification | - | - | - | - | 376,572 | - | 376,572 |
| Stock based compensation | - | - | 88,843 | 9 | 3,731,906 | - | 3,731,915 |
| Net loss | - | - | - | - | - | (7,735,464) | (7,735,464) |
| Balance, December 31, 2014 | 161,827 | \$ 16 | 4,902,639 | \$ 490 | \$ 34,026,321 | \$ (32,167,234) | \$ 1,859,593 |

Table of Contents

BLUE CALYPSO, INC. AND SUBSIDIARIES
CONSOLIDATED STATEMENT OF STOCKHOLDERS' EQUITY
TWO YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2015

| | Preferred Stock | | Common Stock | | Additional | Accumulated | Total |
|---|-----------------|--------|--------------|--------|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|
| | Shares | Amount | Shares | Amount | Paid in Capital | Deficit | Stockholders' Equity |
| Balance, January 1, 2015 | 161,827 | \$ 16 | 4,902,639 | \$ 490 | \$ 34,026,321 | \$ (32,167,234) | \$ 1,859,593 |
| Conversion of preferred shares to common shares | (161,827) | (16) | 47,646 | 5 | 11 | - | - |
| Sale of common stock and warrants at \$4.25 per share, net of issuance costs of \$195,900 | - | - | 482,500 | 48 | 1,854,677 | - | 1,854,725 |
| Shares issued for services rendered | - | - | 45,741 | 5 | 226,363 | - | 226,368 |
| Stock based compensation | - | - | 43,620 | 4 | 583,599 | - | 583,603 |
| Loss on debt modification | - | - | - | - | 41,435 | - | 41,435 |
| Reclass derivative liability to equity upon note payment | - | - | - | - | 1,459 | - | 1,459 |
| Net loss | - | - | - | - | - | (3,303,150) | (3,303,150) |
| Balance, December 31, 2015 | - | \$ - | 5,522,146 | \$ 552 | \$ 36,733,865 | \$ (35,470,384) | \$ 1,264,033 |

See the accompanying notes to these consolidated financial statements.

Table of Contents

BLUE CALYPSO, INC. AND SUBSIDIARIES
CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF CASH FLOWS

| | Year ended December 31, | |
|---|-------------------------|----------------|
| | 2015 | 2014 |
| CASH FLOWS FROM OPERATING ACTIVITIES | | |
| Net loss | \$(3,303,150) | \$(7,735,464) |
| Adjustments to reconcile net loss to net cash used in operating activities: | | |
| Depreciation and amortization | 364,310 | 344,128 |
| Bad debt expense | 19,141 | 23,762 |
| Amortization of debt discounts | 318,050 | 223,419 |
| Interest from warrant modification | - | 460,949 |
| Loss on debt conversion inducement | - | 413,917 |
| Loss on debt modification | 41,435 | - |
| Change in fair value of derivative liabilities | (130,331) | (2,030) |
| Stock based compensation | 583,603 | 3,731,915 |
| Common stock issued for services rendered | 226,368 | 195,468 |
| Changes in operating assets and liabilities: | | |
| Accounts receivable | (98,876) | (126,857) |
| Inventory | (41,653) | - |
| Prepaid expenses and other current assets | 7,986 | 7,015 |
| Accounts payable | 79,335 | (136,625) |
| Accrued expenses | (73,270) | 231,648 |
| Deferred revenue | (1,100) | 1,100 |
| Deferred rent | 3,259 | - |
| Net cash used in operating activities | (2,004,893) | (2,367,655) |
| CASH FLOWS FROM INVESTING ACTIVITIES | | |
| Purchase of fixed assets | (6,506) | (1,180) |
| Software development costs | (381,168) | (149,132) |
| Net cash used in investing activities | (387,674) | (150,312) |
| CASH FLOWS FROM FINANCING ACTIVITIES | | |
| Proceeds from sale of common stock and warrants | 1,854,725 | 1,330,000 |
| Proceeds from issuance of convertible note | 415,123 | - |
| Proceeds from exercise of options | - | 21,728 |
| Proceeds from exercise of warrants | - | 1,024,558 |
| Repayments of convertible notes payable | (250,000) | (50,000) |
| Net cash provided by financing activities | 2,019,848 | 2,326,286 |
| Net decrease in cash | (372,719) | (191,681) |
| Cash at beginning of period | 1,103,201 | 1,294,882 |
| Cash at end of period | \$730,482 | \$1,103,201 |
| SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION | | |
| Cash paid for interest | \$81,716 | \$29,127 |
| Cash paid for income taxes | \$- | \$- |

Edgar Filing: BLUE CALYPSO, INC. - Form 10-K

Non-cash investing and financing activities:

| | | |
|---|---------|-----------|
| Reclass derivative liability to equity | \$1,459 | \$- |
| Conversion of notes payable to common and preferred stock | \$- | \$550,000 |

See the accompanying notes to these consolidated financial statements.

F-8

Table of Contents

BLUE CALYPSO, INC. AND SUBSIDIARIES
NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
DECEMBER 31, 2015

NOTE 1 – NATURE OF OPERATIONS AND BASIS OF PRESENTATION

Blue Calypso, Inc. (the “Company”) is engaged in the development, licensing and enforcement of technology and intellectual property focused on digital word-of-mouth marketing and advertising. The Company’s primary activities since inception, have been the design and development of its products, negotiating strategic alliances and other agreements, and raising capital.

NOTE 2 – GOING CONCERN AND MANAGEMENT’S LIQUIDITY PLANS

As of December 31, 2015, the Company had cash of \$730,482 and working capital of \$441,014. During the year ended December 31, 2015, the Company used net cash in operating activities of \$2,004,893. While the Company continues to increase its revenues, we have incurred net losses since inception. These conditions raise substantial doubt about the Company’s ability to continue as a going concern.

During the year ended December 31, 2015, the Company raised \$1,854,725 in cash proceeds from the sale of common stock and warrants and \$415,123 through the issuance of a convertible note. The Company believes that its current cash on hand will be sufficient to fund its projected operating requirements through May 2016.

The Company's primary source of operating funds since inception has been cash proceeds from the private placements of common stock and preferred stock, and proceeds from private placements of convertible debt. The Company intends to raise additional capital through private placements of debt and equity securities, but there can be no assurance that these funds will be available on terms acceptable to the Company, or will be sufficient to enable the Company to fully complete its development activities or sustain operations. If the Company is unable to raise sufficient additional funds, it will have to develop and implement a plan to further extend payables, reduce overhead, or scale back its current business plan until sufficient additional capital is raised to support further operations. There can be no assurance that such a plan will be successful.

Accordingly, the accompanying consolidated financial statements have been prepared in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America (“GAAP”), which contemplate continuation of the Company as a going concern and the realization of assets and satisfaction of liabilities in the normal course of business. The carrying amounts of assets and liabilities presented in the financial statements do not necessarily purport to represent realizable or settlement values. The consolidated financial statements do not include any adjustment that might result from the outcome of this uncertainty.

NOTE 3 – SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES

Principles of Consolidation

The accompanying consolidated financial statements include the accounts of the Company and its wholly-owned subsidiaries. All significant intercompany accounts and transactions have been eliminated in consolidation.

Revenue Recognition

Revenue is recognized when persuasive evidence of an arrangement exists, delivery of the product or service has occurred, all obligations have been performed pursuant to the terms of the agreement, the sales price is fixed or

determinable, and collectability is reasonably assured. Revenue includes fees received from customers for advertising and marketing service. Revenue is recognized when services are performed or licenses are granted to customers.

Revenue from the licensing of the Company's intellectual property and settlements reached from legal enforcement of the Company's patent rights is recognized when the arrangement with the licensee has been signed and the license has been delivered and made effective, provided license fees are fixed or determinable and collectability is reasonably assured. The fair value of licenses achieved by ordinary business negotiations is recognized as revenue.

F-9

Table of Contents

BLUE CALYPSO, INC. AND SUBSIDIARIES
NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
DECEMBER 31, 2015

The amount of consideration received upon any settlement or judgment is allocated to each element of the settlement based on the fair value of each element. Elements related to licensing agreements, royalty revenues, net of contingent legal fees, are recognized as revenue in the consolidated statement of operations. Elements that are not related to license agreements and royalty revenue in nature will be reflected as a separate line item within the other income section of the consolidated statements of operations. Elements provided in either settlement agreements or judgments include: the value of a license, legal release, and interest. When settlements or judgments are achieved at discounts to the fair value of a license, the Company allocates the full settlement or judgment, excluding specifically named elements as mentioned above, to the value of the license agreement or royalty revenue under the residual method. Legal release as part of a settlement agreement is recognized as a separate line item in the consolidated statements of operations when value can be allocated to the legal release. When the Company reaches a settlement with a defendant, no value is allocated to the legal release since the existence of a settlement removes legal standing to bring a claim of infringement and without a legal claim, the legal release has no economic value. The element that is applicable to interest income will be recorded as a separate line item in other income. The Company does not assume future performance obligations in its license arrangements. Revenue from licensing and related service fees aggregated \$390,506 and \$23,798 during the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014.

The Company also has revenue from information technology design and programming consulting services and minor product sales. Revenue is recognized in the periods that satisfactory performance of services is delivered to customers. Revenue is recognized when persuasive evidence of an arrangement exists, delivery of the service has occurred, all obligations have been performed pursuant to the terms of the agreement, the sales price is fixed or determinable, and collectability is reasonably assured. Revenue from consulting services was \$501,989 and \$736,091 during the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014. Product sales for the year ended December 31, 2015 was \$112,000.

Cost of Revenue

Legal costs directly related to the settlement of intellectual property and patent enforcement litigation are recognized as cost of revenue. Other legal expenses incurred in the normal course of the Company's business are expensed when incurred as selling, general and administrative expenses.

Use of Estimates

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, 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. Significant estimates include the recoverability and useful lives of long-lived assets, the fair value of the Company's stock, stock-based compensation, fair values relating to warrant and other derivative liabilities, debt discounts and the valuation allowance related to deferred tax assets. Actual results may differ from these estimates.

Concentrations of Credit Risk

The Company's financial instruments that are exposed to a concentration of credit risk are cash and accounts receivable.

As of December 31, 2015, excluding the impact of the allowance for doubtful accounts, three customers represented 10% , 30% and 39% of the Company's accounts receivable. As of December 31, 2014, two customers represented 62%

and 20% of the Company's accounts receivable.

During the year ended December 31, 2015, three customers represented approximately 10%, 25% and 39% of total revenue, respectively.

During the year ended December 31, 2014, three customers represented approximately 59%, 18% and 10% of total revenue, respectively.

F-10

Table of Contents

BLUE CALYPSO, INC. AND SUBSIDIARIES
NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
DECEMBER 31, 2015

Cash

Cash consist of cash held in bank demand deposits. The Company considers all highly liquid instruments with original maturities of three months or less to be cash equivalents.

The Company maintains cash in bank accounts located in the United States, which, at times, may exceed federally insured limits or be uninsured. The Company has not experienced any losses in such accounts.

Accounts Receivable

Accounts receivable primarily consists of trade receivables, net of allowances. On a periodic basis, the Company evaluates its trade receivables and establishes an allowance for doubtful accounts based on its history of past bad debt expense, collections and current credit conditions. The Company performs on-going credit evaluations of its customers and the customer's current credit worthiness. Collections and payments from customers are continuously monitored. The Company maintains an allowance for doubtful accounts, which is based upon historical experience as well as specific customer collection issues that have been identified. As of December 31, 2015 and 2014, the Company's allowance for doubtful accounts was \$42,650 and \$23,511, respectively. If the financial condition of customers were to deteriorate, resulting in an impairment of their ability to make payments, additional allowances may be required in future periods.

Property and Equipment

Property and equipment consists of office equipment and is recorded at cost, less accumulated depreciation. Depreciation is computed using the straight-line method over the estimated useful lives of the related assets, which for office equipment is three to five years. Expenditures for major renewals and betterments that extend the useful lives of the property and equipment are capitalized. Expenditures for maintenance and repairs are charged to expense as incurred.

Intangible Assets

The Company capitalizes certain software development costs as well as purchased software upon achieving technological feasibility of the related products. Software development costs incurred and software purchased prior to achieving technological feasibility are charged to engineering and product development expense as incurred. Commencing upon initial product release, capitalized costs are amortized to cost of software licenses using the straight-line method over the estimated life of the product (which approximates the ratio that current gross revenues for a product bear to the total of current and anticipated future gross revenues for that product), which is generally up to five years.

Impairment of Long-lived Assets

The Company reviews the carrying value of intangibles and other long-lived assets for impairment at least annually or whenever events or changes in circumstances indicate that the carrying amount of an asset may not be recoverable. Recoverability of long-lived assets is measured by comparing the carrying amount of the asset or asset group to the undiscounted cash flows that the asset or asset group is expected to generate. If the undiscounted cash flows of such assets are less than the carrying amount, the impairment to be recognized is measured by the amount by which the

carrying amount of the property, if any, exceeds its fair market value. No impairment was deemed to exist as of December 31, 2015 and 2014. The Company re-evaluates the carrying amounts of its amortizable intangibles at least quarterly to identify any triggering events. As described above, if triggering events require us to undertake an impairment review, it is not possible at this time to determine whether it would be necessary to record a charge or if such charge would be material.

Income Taxes

The Company recognizes deferred tax assets and liabilities for the expected future tax consequences of items that have been included or excluded in the financial statements or tax returns. Deferred tax assets and liabilities are determined on the basis of the difference between the tax basis of assets and liabilities and their respective financial reporting amounts (“temporary differences”) at enacted tax rates in effect for the years in which the temporary differences are expected to reverse.

F-11

Table of Contents

BLUE CALYPSO, INC. AND SUBSIDIARIES
NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
DECEMBER 31, 2015

The Company adopted the provisions of Accounting Standards Codification (“ASC”) Topic 740-10, which prescribes a recognition threshold and measurement process for financial statement recognition and measurement of a tax position taken or expected to be taken in a tax return.

Management has evaluated and concluded that there were no material uncertain tax positions requiring recognition in the Company’s consolidated financial statements as of December 31, 2015 and 2014. The Company does not expect any significant changes in its unrecognized tax benefits within twelve months of the reporting date.

The Company’s policy is to classify assessments, if any, for tax related interest as interest expense and penalties as general and administrative expenses in the consolidated statements of operations.

Net Loss per Share

The Company computes basic net loss per share by dividing net loss per share available to common stockholders by the weighted average number of common shares outstanding for the period, adjusted to give effect to the 50-for-1 reverse stock split, which was effective in the market on July 2, 2015 (see Note 8), and excludes the effects of any potentially dilutive securities. Diluted earnings per share, if presented, would include the dilution that would occur upon the exercise or conversion of all potentially dilutive securities into common stock using the “treasury stock” and/or “if converted” methods as applicable. The computation of basic and diluted loss per share for the year ended December 31, 2015 and 2014 excludes potentially dilutive securities when their inclusion would be anti-dilutive, or if their exercise prices were greater than the average market price of the common stock during the period.

Potentially dilutive securities excluded from the computation of basic and diluted net income (loss) per share are as follows:

| | December 31, 2015 | December 31, 2014 |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Convertible notes payable | 263,118 | - |
| Series A convertible preferred stock | - | 47,666 |
| Options to purchase common stock | 629,628 | 441,064 |
| Warrants to purchase common stock | 703,413 | 220,913 |
| Restricted stock units | - | 43,619 |
| Totals | 1,596,159 | 753,262 |

Preferred Stock

Preferred shares subject to mandatory redemption (if any) are classified as liability instruments and are measured at fair value. The Company classifies conditionally redeemable preferred shares, which includes preferred shares that feature redemption rights that are either within the control of the holder or subject to redemption upon the occurrence of uncertain events not solely within the Company’s control, as temporary equity. At all other times, the Company classifies its preferred shares in stockholders’ equity. As of December 31, 2015 and 2014, the Company does not have any preferred shares subject to mandatory or conditional redemption outstanding.

Convertible Instruments

U.S. GAAP requires companies to bifurcate conversion options from their host instruments and account for them as free standing derivative financial instruments according to certain criteria. The criteria include circumstances in which (a) the economic characteristics and risks of the embedded derivative instrument are not clearly and closely related to the economic characteristics and risks of the host contract, (b) the hybrid instrument that embodies both the embedded derivative instrument and the host contract is not re-measured at fair value under otherwise applicable generally accepted accounting principles with changes in fair value reported in earnings as they occur and (c) a separate instrument with the same terms as the embedded derivative instrument would be considered a derivative instrument. An exception to this rule is when the host instrument is deemed to be conventional, as that term is described under applicable ASC 480-10.

When the Company has determined that the embedded conversion options should not be bifurcated from their host instruments, the Company records, when necessary, discounts to convertible notes for the intrinsic value of conversion options embedded in debt instruments based upon the differences between the fair value of the underlying common stock at the commitment date of the note transaction and the effective conversion price embedded in the note. Debt discounts under these arrangements are amortized over the term of the related debt to their stated date of redemption.

Table of Contents

BLUE CALYPSO, INC. AND SUBSIDIARIES
 NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
 DECEMBER 31, 2015

Common Stock Purchase Warrants and Other Derivative Financial Instruments

The Company classifies as equity any contracts that (i) require physical settlement or net-share settlement or (ii) provide the Company with a choice of net-cash settlement or settlement in its own shares (physical settlement or net-share settlement) providing that such contracts are indexed to the Company's own stock. The Company classifies as assets or liabilities any contracts that (i) require net-cash settlement (including a requirement to net cash settle the contract if an event occurs and if that event is outside the Company's control) or (ii) gives the counterparty a choice of net-cash settlement or settlement in shares (physical settlement or net-share settlement). The Company assesses classification of its common stock purchase warrants and other free standing derivatives at each reporting date to determine whether a change in classification between assets and liabilities is required.

The Company's free standing derivatives consisted of warrants to purchase common stock that were issued in connection with its private placement transactions (expired 2014) and of embedded conversion options with a convertible note. The Company evaluated these derivatives to assess their proper classification in the consolidated balance sheets as of December 31, 2015 using the applicable classification criteria enumerated under ASC 815-Derivatives and Hedging. The Company determined that certain embedded conversion features do not contain fixed settlement provisions. The convertible note contains a conversion feature such that the Company could not ensure it would have adequate authorized shares to meet all possible conversion demands.

As such, the Company was required to record the debt derivatives which do not have fixed settlement provisions as liabilities and mark to market all such derivatives to fair value at the end of each reporting period.

Stock-Based Compensation

The Company measures the cost of services received in exchange for an award of equity instruments based on the fair value of the award. For employees and directors, the fair value of the award is measured on the grant date and for non-employees, the fair value of the award is generally re-measured on vesting dates and interim financial reporting dates until the service period is complete. The fair value amount is then recognized over the period during which services are required to be provided in exchange for the award, usually the vesting period. Stock-based compensation expense is recorded by the Company in the same expense classifications in the consolidated statements of operations, as if such amounts were paid in cash.

Advertising

The Company's advertising costs are expensed as incurred. Advertising expense was \$3,627 and \$2,280 for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014.

Accrued expenses:

Accrued expenses were comprised of the following:

| | December 31, 2015 | December 31, 2014 |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Payroll | \$ 13,455 | \$ 169,965 |
| Legal and accounting services | 23,466 | 39,103 |

| | | |
|--------------------|-----------|------------|
| Interest and other | 7,269 | 27,458 |
| Totals | \$ 44,190 | \$ 236,526 |

Reclassification

The Company has reclassified the presentation of cost of revenue to conform to current period presentation. The reclassification has no effect on the Company's consolidated financial position or the consolidated results of operations as previously reported.

F-13

Table of Contents

BLUE CALYPSO, INC. AND SUBSIDIARIES
 NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
 DECEMBER 31, 2015

Subsequent Events

The Company evaluates events that have occurred after the balance sheet date but before the financial statements are issued. Based upon the evaluation, the Company did not identify any recognized or non-recognized subsequent events that would have required adjustment or disclosure in the consolidated financial statements, except as disclosed below.

Recent Accounting Pronouncements

There are various updates recently issued, most of which represented technical corrections to the accounting literature or application to specific industries and are not expected to have a material impact on the Company's financial position, results of operations or cash flows.

NOTE 4 - FAIR VALUE OF FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS

The Company measures the fair value of financial assets and liabilities based on the guidance of ASC 820 "Fair Value Measurements and Disclosures" which defines fair value, establishes a framework for measuring fair value, and expands disclosures about fair value measurements. ASC 820 defines fair value as the exchange price that would be received for an asset or paid to transfer a liability (an exit price) in the principal or most advantageous market for the asset or liability in an orderly transaction between market participants on the measurement date. ASC 820 also establishes a fair value hierarchy, which requires an entity to maximize the use of observable inputs and minimize the use of unobservable inputs when measuring fair value.

ASC 820 describes three levels of inputs that may be used to measure fair value:

- Level 1 — quoted prices in active markets for identical assets or liabilities
- Level 2 — quoted prices for similar assets and liabilities in active markets or inputs that are observable
- Level 3 — inputs that are unobservable based on an entity's own assumptions, as there is little, if any, related market activity (for example, cash flow modeling inputs based on assumptions)

Financial liabilities as of December 31, 2015 measured at fair value on a recurring basis are summarized below (none at December 31, 2014):

| | December 31, 2015 | Quoted Prices in Active Markets for Identical Assets (Level 1) | Significant Other Observable Inputs (Level 2) | Significant Unobservable Inputs (Level 3) |
|----------------------|----------------------|---|---|--|
| Derivative liability | \$ 170,497 | \$ -- | \$ -- | \$ 170,497 |

The Company determined that certain conversion option related to a convertible note did not have fixed settlement provisions and are deemed to be derivative financial instruments, since the exercise price was subject to adjustment

Edgar Filing: BLUE CALYPSO, INC. - Form 10-K

based on certain changes in market price of the Company's common stock. Accordingly, the Company was required to record such conversion option as a liability and mark such derivative to fair value each reporting period. Such instrument was classified within Level 3 of the valuation hierarchy.

The fair value of the conversion option was calculated using a binomial lattice formula with the following weighted average assumptions during the year ended December 31, 2015:

| | July 20, 2015 | December 31, 2015 |
|----------------------------|------------------|----------------------|
| Common Stock Closing Price | \$ 8.50 | \$ 1.45 |
| Conversion Price per Share | \$ 7.6334 | \$ 1.1402 |
| Conversion Shares | 71,864 | 263,118 |
| Call Option Value | 4.21 | 0.65 |
| Dividend Yield | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Volatility | 124.15% | 129.48% |
| Risk-free Interest Rate | 0.31% | 0.49% |
| Term | 1.0 years | 0.55 years |

Table of Contents

BLUE CALYPSO, INC. AND SUBSIDIARIES
NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
DECEMBER 31, 2015

The risk-free interest rate is the United States Treasury rate on the measurement date having a term equal to the remaining contractual life of the instrument. The volatility is a measure of the amount by which the Company's share price has fluctuated or is expected to fluctuate. The dividend yield is 0% as the Company has not made any dividend payment and has no plans to pay dividends in the foreseeable future.

Level 3 liabilities are valued using unobservable inputs to the valuation methodology that are significant to the measurement of the fair value of the derivative liabilities. For fair value measurements categorized within Level 3 of the fair value hierarchy, the Company's Chief Financial Officer, who reports to the Chief Executive Officer, determine its valuation policies and procedures.

The development and determination of the unobservable inputs for Level 3 fair value measurements and fair value calculations are the responsibility of the Company's Chief Financial Officer and are approved by the Chief Executive Officer.

Level 3 financial liabilities consist of the derivative liabilities for which there is no current market for these securities such that the determination of fair value requires significant judgment or estimation. Changes in fair value measurements categorized within Level 3 of the fair value hierarchy are analyzed each period based on changes in estimates or assumptions and recorded as appropriate.

Significant observable and unobservable inputs include stock price, exercise price, annual risk free rate, term, and expected volatility, and are classified within Level 3 of the valuation hierarchy. An increase or decrease in volatility or interest free rate, in isolation, can significantly increase or decrease the derivative liabilities. Changes in the values of the derivative liabilities are recorded as a component of other income (expense) on the Company's consolidated statements of operations.

The following table sets forth a summary of the changes in the fair value of the Company's Level 3 financial liabilities that are measured at fair value on a recurring basis using significant unobservable input for the two years ended December 31, 2015:

| | |
|---|------------|
| Balance-January 1, 2014 | \$2,030 |
| Change in fair value of derivative liabilities | (2,030) |
| Balance, December 31, 2014 | -0- |
| Aggregate amount of derivative instruments issued | 302,287 |
| Transfer to equity at payoff of convertible note | (1,459) |
| Change in fair value of derivative liabilities | (130,331) |
| Balance, December 31, 2015 | \$170,497 |

NOTE 5 – PROPERTY AND EQUIPMENT

Property and equipment include the following:

| | December 31, 2015 | December 31, 2014 |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Office Equipment | \$ 31,468 | \$ 24,961 |
| Less: Accumulated depreciation | (24,786) | (18,646) |

| | | |
|-----------------------------|----------|----------|
| Property and equipment, net | \$ 6,682 | \$ 6,315 |
|-----------------------------|----------|----------|

Depreciation expense was \$6,139 and \$4,874 for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014, respectively.

F-15

Table of Contents

BLUE CALYPSO, INC. AND SUBSIDIARIES

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

DECEMBER 31, 2015

NOTE 6 – INTANGIBLE ASSETS

Intangible assets consist of the following:

| | December 31, 2015 | December 31, 2014 |
|--|----------------------|----------------------|
| Capitalized Software Development Costs | \$ 2,162,220 | \$ 1,781,053 |
| Less: Accumulated amortization | (1,344,672) | (986,502) |
| Net capitalized development costs | \$ 817,548 | \$ 794,551 |

At December 31, 2015, the Company had capitalized software development costs of \$2,162,220. Amortization expense relating to the capitalized development costs was \$358,171 and \$339,255 for the year ended December 31, 2015 and 2014, respectively.

The estimated future amortization of intangible assets over the remaining weighted average useful life of approximately 4 years is as follows:

| | |
|------------|-----------|
| 2016 | \$318,556 |
| 2017 | 206,889 |
| 2018 | 145,927 |
| 2019 | 94,138 |
| Thereafter | 52,038 |
| | \$817,548 |

NOTE 7 – NOTES PAYABLE

November 15, 2012 Unit Offering

On November 15, 2012, the Company commenced a private offering of up to \$3,000,000 of units (the "Units") at a purchase price of \$50,000 per unit pursuant to the securities purchase agreement dated November 15, 2012 (the "Purchase Agreement"). Each Unit consisted of a 10% Convertible Debenture in the principal amount of \$50,000 (the "10% Debenture") and 250 shares of the Company's common stock. The 10% Debenture bears interest at a rate of 10% per annum, is due two years from the issuance date and is convertible into shares of the Company's common stock at a conversion price of \$10.00 per share. Through December 31, 2012, we issued and sold an aggregate of 9 units totaling \$450,000. The 10% Debentures were determined to have an embedded beneficial conversion feature ("BCF") under the provisions of ASC 470-20, "Debt with Conversion and Other Options" ("ASC 470-20") based on the issue date market value and the exercise price of \$10.00 per share. In accordance with ASC 470-20, a discount of \$225,000 was recorded at issuance in 2012 based on the relative fair value of the instruments. During the year ended December 31, 2013 an additional \$150,000 of 10% Debentures were issued. An additional discount of \$268,210 was recorded in 2013. Amortization expense of \$223,419 was recorded during the year ended December 31, 2014. The note balance was \$376,581 net of discount of \$223,419 at December 31, 2013.

On November 10, 2014, the Company modified certain terms of the November 2012 Debentures maturing prior to December 31, 2014 in order to induce the holder to extend the November 2012 Debentures to December 31, 2014. In exchange, the Company provided for a reduction in the conversion price of the November 2012 Debenture to \$4.00

per share. In December 2014, the Company entered into exchange agreements with the holders of such debentures pursuant to which the Company exchanged the debentures maturing on December 31, 2014 for new debentures maturing on December 31, 2015. Each debenture holder also received an additional 550 shares of common stock for each \$50,000 in principal amount of debentures converted. In December 2014, the Company modified certain terms of the November 2012 Debentures maturing subsequent to December 31, 2014 in order to reduce the conversion price to \$3.8314 per share. The holders elected to convert the convertible debentures of \$550,000 for an aggregate of 143,500 shares of the Company's common stock. In accordance with ASC 470-20, the fair value of the consideration was measured and recognized as an expense on the dates the inducement offer was accepted by the holder. In connection with the inducement, the Company recorded a loss of \$413,917 representing the difference between the fair value of the aggregate shares issuable under the new conversion price and issuance of additional shares as compared to the original conversion feature of the November 2012 Debentures. In December 2014, the Company repaid the remaining \$50,000 of principal outstanding under the November 2012 Convertible Debentures and related accrued interest.

Table of Contents

BLUE CALYPSO, INC. AND SUBSIDIARIES
NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
DECEMBER 31, 2015

July 2015 Senior Convertible Note

On July 20, 2015, the Company issued a senior convertible note (the "July 2015 Note"), in the principal amount of \$550,000 due one year from the date of issuance. The total net proceeds the Company received from this note were \$415,123, net of fees and original interest discount ("OID") of \$50,000. At any time commencing one hundred and eighty one days from issuance, the note is convertible into shares of the Company's common stock at the option of the holder at a conversion price of \$7.6335 with certain reset provisions should certain default conditions occur. These certain default conditions were deemed to be outside the Company's control.

If the \$550,000 principal amount of the July 2015 Note and all accrued but unpaid interest thereof is not paid in full on or before January 16, 2016, the July 2015 Note shall amortize in four equal payments payable on January 20, 2016, February 20, 2016, March 20, 2016 and April 20, 2016. These payments shall be paid (i) in cash at a 120% premium, and/or (ii) in shares of the Company's common stock at a 20% discount to the average of the three daily volume weighted average prices of the Company's common stock for the prior three trading days, provided the Company is in compliance with certain equity conditions as defined in the July 2015 Note.

The Company identified an embedded derivative related to a conversion option in the July 2015 Note. The accounting treatment of derivative financial instruments requires that the Company record the fair value of the derivative as of the inception date of the Secured Convertible Debentures and to fair value the derivative as of each subsequent reporting date.

At the inception of the July 2015 Note, the Company determined the aggregate fair value of the embedded derivatives to be \$302,287.

The Company has issued debt for which total proceeds were allocated to individual instruments based on the fair value of the each instrument at the time of issuance. Such value of the debt was recorded as discount on debt and is being amortized over the term of the respective debt.

On December 18, 2015, the Company modified certain terms of the July 2015 Note. Pursuant to the modification, the Company agreed to repay the lender \$300,000 in consideration for the extinguishment of \$250,000 of the principal amount outstanding as of the December 18, 2015. The Company and the lender also agreed to reduce the guaranteed interest on the note from 10% to 5%, to delay the guaranteed interest start date by thirty days until February 20, 2016 and to delay the first installment payment by thirty days until February 20, 2016.

In addition, the Company and the lender also agreed reduce the conversion price from \$7.6335 to \$4.25 per share, modify certain equity conditions (as defined in the July 2015 Note) and events of default (as defined in the July 2015 Note).

In accordance with ASC 470-20, the change in fair value of the debt modification was recognized as an expense on the date was accepted by the holder. In connection with the modification, the Company recorded a loss of \$41,434 representing the difference between the fair value of the conversion feature under the new conversion price and under the original conversion feature.

For the year ended December 31, 2015 and 2014 amortization of debt discount was \$318,051 and \$-0-, respectively. The July 2015 Note balance was \$180,885 net of discount of \$119,115 at December 31, 2015.

NOTE 8A – REVERSE STOCK SPLIT

On June 26, 2015, the Company filed an amendment to its Articles of Incorporation and effected a 50-for-1 reverse stock split of its issued and outstanding shares of common stock, whereby 250,666,631 outstanding shares of the Company's common stock were converted into 5,013,366 shares of the Company's common stock. The reverse stock split was effective in the market commencing on July 2, 2015. All per share amounts and number of shares in the consolidated financial statements, related notes and other items throughout these consolidated financial statements have been retroactively restated to reflect the reverse stock split.

F-17

Table of Contents

BLUE CALYPSO, INC. AND SUBSIDIARIES
NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
DECEMBER 31, 2015

NOTE 8 – STOCKHOLDERS' EQUITY

Common Stock

On January 9, 2014, the Company entered into agreements with the holder of certain of its outstanding warrants originally issued in private placement transactions in September 2011 and April 2012. Pursuant to such agreements, which are more fully described below, the Company agreed to extend the period during which the warrants were exercisable at a reduced exercise price.

On January 9, 2014, the Company entered into Amendment No. 4 to the warrants that were originally issued in September 2011. Pursuant to Amendment No. 4, the exercise price of the warrants was reduced to \$2.50 per share until March 10, 2014.

On January 9, 2014, the Company entered into Amendment No. 3 to the warrant that was originally issued in April 19, 2012. Pursuant to Amendment No. 3, the exercise price of the warrants was reduced to \$2.50 per share until March 10, 2014.

On January 10, 2014, holders of such warrants exercised an aggregate of 224,000 warrants to purchase common stock at the reduced exercise price per share of \$2.50 resulting in \$560,000 in cash proceeds. In connection with the warrant exercise, the Company incurred a non-cash interest expense due to warrant modification of \$241,176 when the inducement offer was accepted during the year ended December 31, 2014.

On March 10, 2014, aggregate of 185,823 of such warrants were exercised resulting in \$464,558 in cash proceeds. The Company issued such shares to the holder in April 2014. In connection with the warrant exercise, the Company incurred a non-cash interest expense due to warrant modification of \$219,773 when the inducement offer was accepted during the year ended December 31, 2014.

During the year ended December 31, 2014, the Company issued an aggregate of 22,154 shares of its common stock as consideration for investor relations services valued at \$130,000.

During the year ended December 31, 2014, the Company issued an aggregate of 9,046 shares of its common stock as consideration for legal services valued at \$65,468.

On August 18, 2014, pursuant to a securities purchase agreement, the Company sold an aggregate of 285,000 shares of its common stock for net proceeds, after commissions and other costs, of \$1,330,000. Commissions and other costs totaled \$95,000.

On December 12, 2014, 588,241 shares of the Company's Series A Convertible Preferred Stock were converted into an aggregate of 173,267 shares of common stock at the stated conversion price of \$3.395 per share.

On December 31, 2014, Bill Ogle, our former Chief Executive Officer, returned to treasury, and subsequently canceled, 2,222 shares of the Company's common stock valued at \$10,000 as payment for the exercise price of 2,000 previously granted options. Documents associated with the transaction were executed during December 2014 with actual shares issued during January 2015. The related impact on outstanding shares has been recognized as of December 31, 2014.

On March 3, 2015, 161,827 shares of the Company's Series A Convertible Preferred Stock were converted into an aggregate of 47,646 shares of common stock at the stated conversion price of \$3.395 per share.

During the year ended December 31, 2015, the Company issued 19,448 shares of its common stock as consideration for investor relations services valued at \$104,026.

During the year ended December 31, 2015, the Company issued 26,293 shares of its common stock as consideration for legal services valued at \$122,342.

In September and October 2015, pursuant to a securities purchase agreement, the Company sold an aggregate of 482,500 shares of its common stock together with warrants to purchase an aggregate of 482,500 shares of its common stock for net proceeds, after commissions and other costs, of \$1,854,725. The warrants are exercisable at an exercise price of \$4.75 for a term of five years. The Company was required to file a registration statement covering the shares and the shares issuable upon exercise of the warrants no later than thirty days following the closing. The registration statement was filed on November 2, 2015 and effective November 6, 2015. In addition, the purchase agreement prohibits the Company from effecting any public offering of common stock within ninety days of the closing unless the closing price of the Company's common stock is above \$15.00 per share for ten consecutive trading days.

Table of Contents

BLUE CALYPSO, INC. AND SUBSIDIARIES
 NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
 DECEMBER 31, 2015

The Company paid the placement agent cash commissions equal to 8% of the gross proceeds of the offering of \$164,050 and also reimbursed the placement agent for its out of pocket expenses and paid other placement costs in aggregate of \$31,850.

Long-Term Incentive Plan

The stockholders approved the Blue Calypso, Inc. 2011 Long-Term Incentive Plan (the “Plan”) on September 9, 2011. The Plan provides for the granting of incentive stock options, nonqualified stock options, stock appreciation rights, restricted stock, restricted stock units, performance awards, dividend equivalent rights, and other awards which may be granted singly, in combination, or in tandem, and which may be paid in cash or shares of common stock. Subject to certain adjustments, the maximum number of shares of common stock that may be delivered pursuant to awards under the Plan is 700,000 shares.

Options

Option valuation models require the input of highly subjective assumptions. The fair value of stock-based payment awards was estimated using the Black-Scholes option model with a volatility figure derived from an index of historical stock prices of comparable entities until sufficient data exists to estimate the volatility using the Company’s own historical stock prices. Management determined this assumption to be a more accurate indicator of value. The Company accounts for the expected life of options based on the contractual life of options for non-employees.

For employees, the Company accounts for the expected life of options in accordance with the “simplified” method, which is used for “plain-vanilla” options, as defined in the accounting standards codification.

The risk-free interest rate was determined from the implied yields of U.S. Treasury zero-coupon bonds with a remaining life consistent with the expected term of the options. The fair value of stock-based payment awards during the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014 was estimated using the Black-Scholes pricing model.

In addition, the Company is required to estimate the expected forfeiture rate and only recognize expense for those shares expected to vest. In estimating the Company’s forfeiture rate, the Company analyzed its historical forfeiture rate, the remaining lives of unvested options, and the number of vested options as a percentage of total options outstanding. If the Company’s actual forfeiture rate is materially different from its estimate, or if the Company reevaluates the forfeiture rate in the future, the stock-based compensation expense could be significantly different from what the Company has recorded in the current period.

The Company estimated forfeitures related to option grants at a weighted average annual rate of 0% per year, as the Company does not yet have adequate historical data, for options granted during the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014.

The following assumptions were used in determining the fair value of employee and vesting non-employee options:

| | December 31, 2015 | December 31, 2014 |
|-------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Risk-free interest rate | 1.37% - 2.27 % | 1.97% - 2.73 % |

Edgar Filing: BLUE CALYPSO, INC. - Form 10-K

| | | | | |
|--|------------|---|------------|--------|
| Dividend yield | 0 | % | 0 | % |
| | 123.05% | | | |
| Stock price volatility | - 140.67 | % | 76% | - 79 % |
| Expected life | 5-10 years | | 6-10 years | |
| Weighted average grant date fair value | \$ 5.90 | | \$ 5.50 | |

F-19

Table of Contents

BLUE CALYPSO, INC. AND SUBSIDIARIES
NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
DECEMBER 31, 2015

On March 14, 2014, the Compensation Committee of the Board of Directors approved an equity bonus for the Company's former Chief Executive Officer, Bill Ogle, consisting of stock options with a fair value of \$800,000. The total bonus awarded was \$1,140,000 of which \$85,000 was paid in cash and \$1,055,000 was granted in stock options valued using the Black Scholes model. Accordingly, the Company granted options to purchase 184,655 shares of common stock to Mr. Ogle effective March 14, 2014 exercisable at \$7.00 per share for ten years, vesting over a term of three years. Subsequent to issuance and pursuant to a standstill agreement entered into on September 26, 2014 with a significant stockholder, Mr. Ogle agreed to return and cancel 15,000 of the previously granted March 2014 options and purchase \$85,000 in the Company's common stock within 12 months following the date of the agreement, with \$15,000 being purchased by December 15, 2014. In conjunction with the standstill agreement, Mr. Ogle and the Co-Chief Executive Officer and Chief Technology Officer Andrew Levi agreed to a fifty percent reduction in their annual base salary for a period of twelve months following the date of the agreement.

In April 2014, the Company awarded an aggregate of 34,600 of stock options to certain employees and one contractor. The stock options have exercise prices from \$6.00 to 6.50 per share, will vest over a three year period, and have an approximate fair value of \$170,000 using the Black Scholes model.

On April 9, 2014, 6,400 options were exercised at \$3.395 per share for cash proceeds of \$21,728.

In May 2014, the Company awarded an aggregate of 25,000 of stock options to members of the Company's Board of Directors. The stock options have exercise price of \$5.00 per share, will vest over a three year period, and have an approximate fair value of \$101,000 using the Black Scholes model.

In June 2014, the Company awarded an aggregate of 2,000 of stock options to certain employees. The stock options have exercise price of \$5.50 per share, will vest over a three-year period, and have an approximate fair value of \$9,000 using the Black Scholes model.

On August 15, 2014, the Company's Board of Directors approved accelerating to fully vested previously granted options of the Company's past Chief Financial Officer and to set an expiry date of August 15, 2017. Accordingly, the remaining unrecognized expense was charged to operations during the year ended December 31, 2014.

On October 23, 2014, the Company's Board of Directors approved accelerating to fully vested previously granted options of the Company's past Chief Operating Officer and to set an expiry date of December 31, 2017. Accordingly, the remaining unrecognized expense was charged to operations during the year ended December 31, 2014.

Effective December 31, 2014, the Company's Board of Directors approved the continued vesting of previously granted options through April 30, 2016 of the Company's former Chief Executive Officer and to set an expiry date of December 31, 2017. Options that would not have vested through April 30, 2016 were considered forfeited as of December 31, 2014. Accordingly, the remaining unrecognized expense related to the non-forfeited options was charged to operations during the year ended December 31, 2014.

During December 2014, the Board of Directors appointed Jonathan Merriman to the Board of Directors. In conjunction with his appointment, the Board of Directors also granted Mr. Merriman options to purchase 7,500 shares of the Company's Common Stock and subsequently in January 2015, the associated option agreement was finalized. The stock options have exercise price of \$5.00 per share, will vest over a three-year period, term of 10 years and have an approximate fair value of \$34,945 using the Black Scholes model.

In April 2015, the Company awarded options to purchase an aggregate of 80,000 shares of common stock to board members. These options vest beginning June 30, 2015 through March 31, 2018 on a quarterly basis, have a term of 10 years and contain an exercise price of \$7.00 per share. The options had an aggregate grant date fair value of \$493,774.

In May 2015, the Company awarded an option to purchase 10,000 shares of common stock to a consultant. These options vest beginning June 30, 2015 through March 31, 2017 on a quarterly basis, have a term of 10 years and contain an exercise price of \$7.00 per share. The options had an aggregate grant date fair value of \$52,049.

F-20

Table of Contents

BLUE CALYPSO, INC. AND SUBSIDIARIES
NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
DECEMBER 31, 2015

In May 2015, the Company awarded an option to purchase 1,000 shares of common stock to an employee. These options vest over three years on the grant date anniversary, have a term of 10 years and contain an exercise price of \$6.50 per share. The options had an aggregate grant date fair value of \$5,570.

In May 2015, the Company awarded an option to purchase 20,000 shares of common stock to a new board member. These options vest beginning June 30, 2015 through March 31, 2018 on a quarterly basis, have a term of 10 years and contain an exercise price of \$7.00 per share. The options had an aggregate grant date fair value of \$128,115.

In June 2015, the Company awarded options to purchase an aggregate of 8,000 shares of common stock to four consultants. These options vest beginning June 30, 2015 through March 31, 2018 on a quarterly basis, have a term of 10 years and contain an exercise price of \$7.00 per share. The options had an aggregate grant date fair value of \$41,688.

In September 2015, the Company awarded an option to purchase 10,000 shares of common stock to an employee. These options vest over three years on the grant date anniversary, have a term of 10 years and contain an exercise price of \$5.14 per share. The options had an aggregate grant date fair value of \$44,978.

In October 2015, the Company awarded an option to purchase 32,864 shares of common stock to the Company's Chief Executive Officer, Andrew Levi. These options vest immediately, have a term of 10 years and contain an exercise price of \$5.00 per share. The options had an aggregate grant date fair value of \$137,501.

In October 2015, the Company awarded an option to purchase an aggregate of 5,000 shares of common stock to two employees. These options vest over three years on grant date anniversary, have a term of 10 years and contain an exercise prices from \$2.86 to \$3.90 per share. The options had an aggregate grant date fair value of \$15,254.

On December 2, 2015, the Company's Board of Directors approved accelerating to fully vested previously granted options of a departing director and to set an expiry date of December 31, 2016. Accordingly, the remaining unrecognized expense was charged to operations during the year ended December 31, 2015.

In December 2015, the Company awarded an option to purchase 20,000 shares of common stock to an employee. These options vest quarterly beginning December 31, 2015 through September 30, 2017, have a term of 10 years and contain an exercise price of \$1.95 per share. The options had an aggregate grant date fair value of \$40,658.

The following table summarizes the stock option activity for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014:

| | Shares | Weighted-Average Exercise Price | Weighted Average Remaining Contractual Term | Aggregate Intrinsic Value |
|----------------------------------|----------|------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|
| Outstanding at January 1, 2014 | 277,561 | \$ 9.57 | 8.7 | \$ 259,558 |
| Granted | 246,255 | \$ 6.50 | 10.0 | \$ - |
| Exercised | (8,400) | | | |
| Forfeitures or expirations | (74,352) | \$ 8.11 | | |
| Outstanding at December 31, 2014 | 441,064 | \$ 8.44 | 4.2 | \$ 858,766 |
| Granted | 194,364 | \$ 5.87 | 10.0 | \$ - |

Edgar Filing: BLUE CALYPSO, INC. - Form 10-K

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---------|----|-------|-----|------|
| Forfeitures or expirations | (5,800) | \$ | 14.53 | | |
| Outstanding at December 31, 2015 | 629,628 | \$ | 7.59 | 4.5 | \$ - |
| Exercisable at December 31, 2015 | 429,544 | \$ | 7.89 | 3.7 | \$ - |

F-21

Table of Contents

BLUE CALYPSO, INC. AND SUBSIDIARIES
NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
DECEMBER 31, 2015

The following table presents information related to stock options at December 31, 2015:

| Options Outstanding | Options Exercisable | Options Exercisable | Options Exercisable |
|---------------------|---------------------|--|---------------------|
| Exercise Price | Number of Options | Weighted Average Remaining Life In Years | Number of Options |
| \$ 0.00-5.00 | 222,945 | 4.8 | 193,568 |
| 5.01-12.50 | 382,675 | 4.4 | 211,968 |
| 12.51-25.00 | 15,008 | 4.2 | 15,008 |
| 25.01-45.00 | 9,000 | 3.8 | 9,000 |
| | 629,628 | 4.5 | 429,544 |

As of December 31, 2015, stock-based compensation of \$523,037 remains unamortized and is expected to be amortized over the weighted average remaining period of 2 years.

The stock-based compensation expense related to option grants was \$583,603 and \$1,250,113 during the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014, respectively.

Restricted Stock

The following table summarizes the restricted stock activity for the two years ended December 31, 2015:

| | |
|---|------------|
| Restricted shares issued as of January 1, 2014 | 269,134 |
| Granted | - |
| Total Restricted Shares Issued at December 31, 2014 | 269,134 |
| Granted | - |
| Total Restricted Shares Issued at December 31, 2015 | 269,134 |
| Vested at December 31, 2015 | (269,134) |
| Unvested restricted shares as of December 31, 2015 | - |

Stock based compensation expense related to restricted stock grants was \$-0- and \$2,478,124 for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014, respectively. For the year ended December 31, 2015, there was no stock-based compensation relating to restricted stock unamortized, since the remaining unamortized expense was charged to operations upon the departure of the Company's former Chief Executive Officer in December 2014.

Warrants

The following table summarizes information with respect to outstanding warrants to purchase common stock of the Company, all of which were exercisable, at December 31, 2015:

| Exercise Price | Number Outstanding | Expiration Date |
|----------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| \$ 4.75 | 482,500 | September/October 2020 |

Edgar Filing: BLUE CALYPSO, INC. - Form 10-K

| | | |
|---------|------------|-------------|
| \$ 5.00 | 220,913 | August 2016 |
| | \$ 703,413 | |

F-22

Table of Contents

BLUE CALYPSO, INC. AND SUBSIDIARIES
NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
DECEMBER 31, 2015

The following table summarizes the warrant activity for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014:

| | Shares | Weighted-Average Exercise Price | Weighted-Average Remaining Contractual Term | Aggregate Intrinsic Value |
|----------------------------------|-----------|------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| Outstanding at January 1, 2014 | 649,915 | \$ 3.85 | 3.4 | \$ - |
| Grants | - | - | | |
| Exercised | (409,823) | \$ 10.00 | | |
| Forfeitures or expirations | (19,179) | \$ 31.00 | | |
| Outstanding at January 1, 2015 | 220,913 | \$ 5.00 | 1.7 | \$ - |
| Grants | 482,500 | \$ 4.75 | 5.0 | \$ - |
| Exercised | - | | | |
| Forfeitures or expirations | - | | | |
| Outstanding at December 31, 2015 | 703,413 | \$ 4.83 | 3.5 | \$ - |
| Exercisable at December 31, 2015 | 703,413 | \$ 4.83 | 3.5 | \$ - |

In connection with the sale of common stock, the Company issued an aggregate of 482,500 warrants to purchase the Company's common stock at \$4.75 per share expiring five years from the date of issuance.

NOTE 9 – RELATED PARTY TRANSACTIONS

The Company appointed a new Chief Financial Officer during August 2014. The Company utilizes Assure Professional, LLC ("Assure") to provide certain outsourced accounting services. The Company's current Chief Financial Officer is a partial owner of Assure. The Company incurred expense of \$40,687 and \$29,940 in exchange for these services during the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014, respectively. Included in accounts payable at December 31, 2015 and 2014 was \$2,250 due to Assure.

Jonathan Merriman was appointed to the Company's Board of Directors during December 2014. Mr. Merriman is the CEO of Merriman Capital, Inc. ("Merriman"). Merriman provides capital market advisory services to the Company for which we incurred expense of \$125,000 and \$120,000 during the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014, respectively. The Company primarily issues common stock in exchange for monthly services and no amount was due to Merriman at December 31, 2015. In addition, Merriman Capital advised the Company in connection with its August 2014 private placement and received an advisory fee of \$95,000 and acted as the Company's placement agent during its most recent offering. During September and October 2015, the Company paid Merriman cash commissions equal to 8% of the gross proceeds of the offering of \$164,050 (see note 7) and also reimbursed the placement agent for its out of pocket expenses of \$14,167.

NOTE 10 – COMMITMENTS AND CONTINGENCIES

Operating leases

On April 6, 2015, as amended on October 16, 2015, the Company entered into a lease agreement for office space for corporate offices expiring June 30, 2019. Lease payments are \$5,696 per month, increasing to \$6,347 in July 2018. In connection therewith, the Company paid a security deposit of \$2,188.

On October 1, 2012, the Company entered into a lease agreement for office space for its wholly owned subsidiary in Costa Rica and expiring on September 30, 2018. Lease payments are \$1,491 per month, increasing 3.5% at each anniversary. In connection therewith, the Company paid a security deposit of \$1,345.

On December 15, 2014, the Company entered into a lease agreement for additional office space for its wholly owned subsidiary in Costa Rica which expires on December 15, 2017 and will automatically extend for an additional 3 year term unless notification is given three months in advance. Lease payments are \$1,278 per month, increasing 3.5% at each anniversary. In connection therewith, the Company paid a security deposit of \$1,235.

F-23

Table of Contents

BLUE CALYPSO, INC. AND SUBSIDIARIES
 NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
 DECEMBER 31, 2015

Future minimum lease payments under these agreements are as follows:

| Year Ending December 31, | |
|-----------------------------|------------|
| 2016 | \$ 102,719 |
| 2017 | 106,817 |
| 2018 | 89,565 |
| 2019 | 38,084 |
| | \$ 337,185 |

Rental expense under the operating leases totaled \$58,846 and \$51,114 for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014, respectively.

Litigation

On July 31, 2012, the Company filed suit against Groupon, Inc. in the Eastern District of Texas in Civil Action No. 6:12-cv-00486. The Company filed additional suits against IZEA, Inc. on October 17, 2012, Yelp, Inc. on October 17, 2012, and Foursquare Labs, Inc. on October 31, 2012 in Civil Action Nos. 6:12-cv-786, 6:12-cv-788, 6:12-cv-837, respectively. Each of these cases alleges that the defendants infringe U.S. Patent Nos. 7,664,516 entitled "Method and System for Peer-to-Peer Advertising Between Mobile Communication Devices" and 8,155,679 entitled "System and Method for Peer-to-Peer Advertising Between Mobile Communication Devices." The Company subsequently added U.S. Patent Nos. 8,438,055, 8,452,646, and 8,457,670 to the cases, alleging each defendant infringed the newly added patents. Each of the defendants have answered, denying infringement and claiming that the asserted patents are invalid. Groupon, Yelp, and Foursquare filed counterclaims for declaratory judgment that the asserted patents are invalid and not infringed. Yelp filed an additional counterclaim for declaratory judgment that the asserted patents are unenforceable. The Court subsequently consolidated the actions for at least pre-trial purposes. Groupon filed a motion to transfer the case against it to the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, which the Court denied on September 27, 2013. On February 3, 2014, Groupon filed a petition to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit for mandamus on the district court's denial of its motion to transfer. On April 23, 2014, the petition was denied by the Federal Circuit.

Between July 19, 2013 and October 3, 2013, Groupon filed petitions with the Patent Trial & Appeals Board ("PTAB") requesting institution of Covered Business Method Review ("CBMR") of all asserted claims. On December 19, 2013 and January 17, 2014, the PTAB issued decisions instituting review on all but four of the asserted claims. On January 14, 2014, the Company and all defendants filed a joint motion to stay the district court litigation. The Court granted the motion and stayed the case on January 16, 2014 pending a decision by the PTAB. Trial on the CBMR at the PTAB occurred during September 2014.

On December 17, 2014, the Patent Trial and Appeal Board issued final decisions in Covered Business Method Review proceedings CBM2013-00035, CBM2013-00033, CBM2013-00034, CBM2013-00046 and CBM2013-00044. In each case, certain claims of each patent were held to be invalid for various reasons. With respect to the '516, '679, '055 and '646 patents, many of the claims survived and the patents remain enforceable. All of the claims of the '670 patent were held invalid. The Company appealed each of the final decisions to the United States Federal Circuit Court of Appeals. The Company appealed the unpatentability determinations including the decision of invalidity based on anticipation of several claims of the patents by prior art (the Paul reference"). The Company also appealed the decision

to review its patents under the provisions for CBMR and that the '516 patent lacked sufficient written description under § 112 to support the claims. Groupon appealed the Board's decision that the patents were not valid under § 103 and the determination by the PTAB that the Ratismor reference was not publically available prior art.

On April 2, 2015, the District Court lifted the stay and required the parties to file a joint docket control order. On April 6, 2015, the Court set a Markman Hearing for June 29, 2015, and jury selection for December 14, 2015. On April 15, 2015, the parties filed their joint docket control order. The Court entered its docket control order on April 23, 2015. Due to an apparent scheduling conflict, the Court rescheduled the Markman Hearing to July 8, 2015.

Table of Contents

BLUE CALYPSO, INC. AND SUBSIDIARIES
NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
DECEMBER 31, 2015

On April 22, 2015, the Company filed its third amended complaint against all defendants. The defendants timely answered on May 11, 2015. Each of the defendant's answers included a counterclaim for invalidity of the patents. The Company responded to these invalidity contentions on June 1, 2015.

On May 13, 2015, the Company filed a motion for entry of an order focusing patent claims and prior art. That motion requested that the Court narrow the number of claims at issue and the number of prior art references that defendants could use in an attempt to invalidate the Company's patents. On May 27, 2015, the Court held a hearing on the motion and ordered defendants to reduce the number of references in support of any invalidity contention against the patents.

On June 25, 2015, the Company attended mediation with Yelp in an effort to settle the case. That mediation was recessed to explore settlement options.

On July 8, 2015 the Company attended the Markman Hearing in order to construe the claims of the patents. On July 14, 2015, the Court entered its Memorandum Opinion and Order regarding claim construction. In that Order, the Court analyzed eleven claim terms. The Court agreed with Blue Calypso's proffered construction as to seven terms, chose its own construction as to three terms and agreed with defendants' proffered construction as to only one term. The Court also expressly rejected defendants' argument that the term "testimonial tag" was indefinite.

On July 13, 2015 the Court entered an order severing the non-active claims out of the case and consolidating claims regarding those patents into a separate set of cases. These new cases address the claims which were held invalid by the PTAB and which are now on appeal to the Federal Circuit Court of Appeals.

On July 14, 2015, the Company attended court-ordered mediation with Groupon. The result of that mediation was an impasse.

On July 16, 2015, the Company attended court-ordered mediation with IZEA. The parties reached a settlement.

On July 20, 2015, the Company attended court-ordered mediation with Foursquare. The result of that mediation was an impasse.

As part of the Company's settlement with Living Social, the Company's attorney is entitled to additional compensation for the value of certain non-monetary arrangements.

On August 17, 2015, the Company entered into a settlement agreement with IZEA, pursuant to which it settled all outstanding litigation with IZEA. Under the Agreement, IZEA has agreed to pay the Company a royalty fee of 4.125% of revenue from IZEA's discontinued legacy platforms SocialSpark, Sponsored Tweets and WeReward. The remaining terms of the settlement are confidential. Legal costs due to our attorneys associated with the IZEA settlement are classified as a settlement payable on our consolidated balance sheet.

On September 21, 2015, the Company entered into a settlement agreement with Yelp, pursuant to which all outstanding litigation with Yelp was settled. Under the agreement, Yelp has agreed to purchase 4,000 KIOSentrix beacons.

On March 1, 2016, the Federal Circuit overturned the PTAB decision as to insufficient written description but upheld the decision that the Ratismore reference was not publically available prior art. However, the Federal Circuit

confirmed the Board's decision to institute the CBMR process on the basis that Blue Calypso's patent portfolio qualified as a business method patent which was financial in nature. The Federal Circuit also upheld the decision of invalidity based on anticipation of several claims of the patents by the prior art Paul reference.

The Company has an option to pursue an en banc review of the holding with respect to anticipation by the Paul reference. An en banc review would occur before a panel of eight judges of the Federal Circuit as compared to the recently completed appeals process which utilized three. We also have the option of requesting that the Supreme Court review the Federal Circuit's decision. These options for appeal must be filed within 30 and 90 days respectively from the date of the March 1, 2016 decision.

The reversal of the written description matter is significant as it re-establishes the '516 parent patent issue date of February 2010 as the date that damages begin to accrue. Prior to this reversal the first date of infringement was relegated to the later issue date of the '679 patent on April 2012.

In the normal course of business, the Company may be involved in legal proceedings, claims and assessments arising in the ordinary course of business. Such matters are subject to many uncertainties, and outcomes are not predictable with assurance. Legal fees for such matters are expensed as incurred and we accrue for adverse outcomes as they become probable and estimable.

Table of Contents

BLUE CALYPSO, INC. AND SUBSIDIARIES
NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
DECEMBER 31, 2015

NOTE 11 – INCOME TAXES

The tax effects of temporary differences that give rise to deferred tax assets are presented below:

| | For The Years Ended | |
|---|---------------------|--------------------|
| | December 31, | |
| | 2015 | 2014 |
| Deferred Tax Assets: | | |
| Net operating loss carryforward | \$4,853,854 | \$4,447,768 |
| Stock-based compensation | 2,403,765 | 2,205,340 |
| Accounts receivable | 14,501 | - |
| Subsidiary investment | 360,423 | - |
| Total deferred tax assets | 7,632,543 | 6,653,108 |
| Deferred Tax Liabilities: | | |
| Fixed assets | 303 | - |
| Software development costs | 60,584 | - |
| Total deferred tax liabilities | 60,887 | - |
| Deferred tax asset, net | 7,571,656 | 6,653,108 |
| Valuation allowance | (7,571,656) | (6,653,108) |
| Deferred tax asset, net of valuation allowance | \$- | \$- |
| Changes in valuation allowance | \$918,548 | \$1,463,191 |

The income tax provision (benefit) consists of the following:

| | For The Years Ended | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| | December 31, | |
| | 2015 | 2014 |
| Federal: | | |
| Current | \$ - | \$ - |
| Deferred | (918,548) | (1,463,191) |
| State and local: | | |
| Current | - | - |
| Deferred | - | - |
| | (918,548) | (1,463,191) |
| Change in valuation allowance | 918,548 | 1,463,191 |
| Income tax provision (benefit) | \$ - | \$ - |

Table of Contents

BLUE CALYPSO, INC. AND SUBSIDIARIES
NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
DECEMBER 31, 2015

A reconciliation of the statutory federal income tax rate to the Company's effective tax rate is as follows:

| | For The Years Ended December 31, | | | |
|--|----------------------------------|----|-------|----|
| | 2015 | | 2014 | |
| Tax benefit at federal statutory rate | (34.0 |)% | (34.0 |)% |
| Other non-deductible compensation subject to SEC 162(M) | 0.0 | % | 10.1 | % |
| Permanent differences | 6.2 | % | 5.0 | % |
| Change in valuation allowance | 27.8 | % | 18.9 | % |
| Effective income tax rate | 0 | % | 0 | % |

The Company assesses the likelihood that deferred tax assets will be realized. To the extent that realization is not likely, a valuation allowance is established. Based upon the Company's history of losses since inception, management believes that it is more likely than not that future benefits of deferred tax assets will not be realized.

At December 31, 2015 and 2014, the Company had \$14,276,041 and \$13,081,670, respectively, of federal net operating losses that may be available to offset future taxable income. The net operating loss carry forwards, if not utilized, will expire from 2031 to 2035 for federal purposes. In accordance with Section 382 of the Internal Revenue Code, the usage of the Company's net operating loss carry forwards are subject to annual limitations in the event of a greater than 50% ownership change.

The Company files income tax returns in the U.S. federal and Texas jurisdictions and is subject to examination by taxing authorities beginning with the year ended December 31, 2012.

NOTE 12 – SUBSEQUENT EVENTS

Subsequent to December 31, 2015, in exchange for \$300,000 in cash, the Company extinguished all of its outstanding convertible notes payable and associated accrued interest.

During March 2016, the Company pursuant to a Securities Purchase Agreement issued to certain accredited investors 470,591 shares of the Company's common stock and warrants to purchase an additional 117,648 shares of the Company's common stock for aggregate gross proceeds of \$400,000. The warrants are exercisable at an exercise price of \$1.25 per share for a term of five years. The exercise price and the number of shares issuable upon exercise of the warrants are subject to adjustment upon the occurrence of certain events, including stock dividends, stock splits, combinations and reclassifications of the Company's common stock. The Company paid the placement agent cash commissions equal to \$10,000.

