

NETWORK 1 TECHNOLOGIES INC

Form 424B3

October 02, 2014

Filed Pursuant to Rule 424(b)(3)

Registration No. 333-190719

PROSPECTUS

NETWORK-1 TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

4,329,186 shares of Common Stock

This Prospectus covers the resale by the selling stockholders listed on pages 33 to 34 of this Prospectus of up to 4,329,186 shares of our common stock, \$.01 par value, which include:

750,000 shares of common stock issuable upon exercise of warrants and 500,000 shares of common stock (issued as a result of exercise of a warrant) issued to three holders in connection with our acquisition of a portfolio and certain other assets of Looking Glass LLC (formerly Mirror Worlds, LLC) on May 21, 2013; and

3,079,186 shares of common stock owned by our Chairman and Chief Executive Officer and related parties.

We will not receive any proceeds from the sale of these shares of common stock. We will, however, receive proceeds if warrants to purchase common stock are exercised and those proceeds will be used for our general corporate purposes. This offering is not being underwritten. The selling stockholders may sell the shares of common stock on the Over-the-Counter (OTC) Bulletin Board with the methods and on the terms described in the section of this Prospectus entitled "Plan of Distribution" on pages 36 to 38.

Our common stock is traded on the OTC Bulletin Board under the symbol "NTIP". Our common stock is not traded on any national securities exchange. On September 26, 2014, the closing price of our common stock, as reported on the OTC Bulletin Board, was \$2.15 per share.

The securities offered in this Prospectus involve a high degree of risk. You should carefully consider the factors described under the heading "Risk Factors" beginning on page 8 of this Prospectus.

The information in this Prospectus is not complete and may be changed. The selling stockholders named in this Prospectus may not sell these securities until the registration statement filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission is effective. This Prospectus is not an offer to sell these securities and neither we nor the selling stockholders named in this Prospectus are soliciting offers to buy these securities in any state where the offer or sale is not permitted.

Neither the Securities and Exchange Commission nor any state securities commission has approved or disapproved of these securities or determined if this Prospectus is truthful or complete. Any representation to the contrary is a criminal offense.

The date of this Prospectus is October 1, 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE	
	PROSPECTUS SUMMARY 2
	RISK FACTORS 8
	SPECIAL NOTE REGARDING FORWARD-LOOKING STATEMENTS 20
	PRICE RANGE OF OUR COMMON STOCK 21
	DIVIDEND POLICY 21
	EQUITY COMPENSATION PLAN INFORMATION 22
	BUSINESS 23
	LEGAL PROCEEDINGS 33
	USE OF PROCEEDS 35
	SELLING STOCKHOLDERS 35
	PLAN OF DISTRIBUTION 38
	MANAGEMENT'S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL CONDITION AND RESULTS OF OPERATION 40
	MANAGEMENT 49
	EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION 52
	SECURITY OWNERSHIP OF CERTAIN BENEFICIAL OWNERS AND MANAGEMENT 57
	CERTAIN RELATIONSHIPS AND RELATED TRANSACTIONS AND DIRECTOR INDEPENDENCE 59
	DESCRIPTION OF SECURITIES 60
	LEGAL MATTERS 62
	EXPERTS 63
	DISCLOSURE OF COMMISSION POSITION ON INDEMNIFICATION FOR SECURITIES ACT LIABILITIES 63
	WHERE YOU CAN FIND MORE INFORMATION 63
	FINANCIAL INFORMATION F-1

You should rely only on the information contained in this Prospectus. We have not authorized anyone to provide you with information different from that contained or incorporated by reference in this Prospectus. The selling stockholders are offering to sell, and seeking offers to buy, shares of our common stock only in jurisdictions where offers and sales are permitted. The information contained in this Prospectus is accurate only as of the date of this

Prospectus, regardless of the time of delivery of this Prospectus or of any sale of common stock.

PROSPECTUS SUMMARY

This summary highlights information contained elsewhere in this Prospectus. It does not contain all of the information that you should consider before investing in our common stock. You should read the entire Prospectus carefully, including the section entitled “Risk Factors” and our consolidated financial statements and the related notes.

Unless the context otherwise requires, all references to “we,” “us,” “our,” or the “Company” in this Prospectus refer to Network-1 Technologies, Inc. (formerly Network-1 Security Solutions, Inc.), a Delaware corporation. On October 9, 2013, we filed an amendment to our Certificate of Incorporation to change our name to Network-1 Technologies, Inc.

The Company

Our principal business is the development, licensing and protection of our intellectual property assets. We presently own twenty-two (22) patents that relate to various technologies including patents covering (i) the delivery of power over Ethernet cables for the purpose of remotely powering network devices, such as wireless access ports, IP phones and network based cameras; (ii) foundational technologies that enable unified search and indexing, displaying and archiving of documents in a computer system; (iii) enabling technology for identifying media content on the Internet and taking further action to be performed based on such identification including, among others, the insertion of advertising and the facilitation of the purchase of goods and services related to such content; and (iv) systems and methods for the transmission of audio, video and data in order to achieve high quality of service (QoS) over computer and telephony networks. In addition, we continually review opportunities to acquire or license additional intellectual property.

We have been actively engaged in the licensing of our patent (U.S. Patent No. 6,218,930) covering the delivery of power over Ethernet cables (the “Remote Power Patent”). As of the date of this Prospectus, we had entered into sixteen (16) license agreements with respect to our Remote Power Patent which, among others, include license agreements with Cisco Systems, Inc. and Cisco Linksys, LLC, Extreme Networks, Inc., Netgear, Inc., Microsemi Corporation, Motorola Solutions, Inc. and NEC Corporation (see Notes D[2], D[3] and D[4] to our financial statements for quarterly period ended June 30, 2014 included in this Prospectus).

Our current strategy includes continuing our licensing efforts with respect to our Remote Power Patent and efforts to monetize the two patent portfolios (the Cox and Mirror Worlds patent portfolios) we acquired in 2013 (see “Business-Patents Related to Identification of Media on the Internet” and “Business - Patents Covering Document Stream Operating Systems” on pages 26-28 of this Prospectus).

Our acquisition strategy is to focus on acquiring high quality patents which management believes have the potential to generate significant licensing opportunities as we have achieved with respect to our Remote Power Patent. Our Remote Power Patent has generated licensing revenue in excess of \$65,000,000 from May 2000 through June 30, 2014. In 2013, we acquired, through our wholly-owned subsidiary Mirror Worlds Technologies, Inc., nine (9) issued United States patents and five (5) pending applications previously owned by Mirror Worlds, LLC, covering foundational technologies that enable unified search and indexing, displaying and archiving of documents in a computer system (the “Mirror Worlds Patent Portfolio”). During 2013 we also acquired, from Dr. Ingemar Cox, four (4) patents (as well as a pending patent application) pertaining to enabling technology for identifying media content on the Internet (the “Cox Patent Portfolio”).

In addition, we continue to seek to acquire additional intellectual property assets to develop, commercialize, license or otherwise monetize such intellectual property. Our strategy includes working with inventors and patent owners to assist in the development and monetization of their patented technologies. We may also enter into strategic relationships with third parties to develop, commercialize, license or otherwise monetize their intellectual property. The form of such relationships may differ depending upon the opportunity and may include, among other things, a strategic investment in such third party, the provision of financing to such third party or the formation of a joint venture with such third party or others for the purpose of monetizing their intellectual property assets.

We have three pending patent infringement litigations, one involving each of our primary patents or portfolios – our Remote Power Patent, the Mirror Worlds Patent Portfolio and the Cox Patent Portfolio (see “Legal Proceedings” on pages 33-34 of this Prospectus).

Our future success is largely dependent upon our proprietary technologies, our ability to protect our intellectual property assets, to consummate license agreements with respect to our intellectual property assets as well as our ability to acquire additional intellectual property assets or enter into strategic relationships with third parties to license or otherwise monetize their intellectual property. The complexity of patent and common law and the inherent uncertainty of litigation creates risks that our efforts to protect our intellectual property assets, or those of our strategic partners, may not be successful. We cannot be assured that our intellectual property assets will be upheld, or that third parties will not invalidate such intellectual property assets. In addition, we may not be able to (i) acquire additional intellectual property assets or successfully license such assets or (ii) successfully enter into strategic relationships with third parties to license or otherwise monetize their intellectual property.

We were incorporated under the laws of the State of Delaware in July 1990. Our principal offices are located at 445 Park Avenue, Suite 912, New York, New York 10022 and our telephone number is (212) 829-5770. Our web site can be found at <http://www.network-1.com>.

Cisco License Agreement and Cisco Audit

Cisco Systems, Inc. and Cisco Linksys, LLC (collectively, “Cisco”) accounted for approximately 77% of our revenue for the years ended December 31, 2013 and December 31, 2012 and approximately 92% and 84% of our revenue, respectively, for the six months ended June 30, 2014 and June 30, 2013. In accordance with our Settlement and License Agreement, dated May 25, 2011, with Cisco (the “Agreement”), which expanded upon the short form settlement agreement entered into in July 2010, Cisco is obligated to pay us royalties on a quarterly basis (which began in the first quarter of 2011) based on its sale of PoE products in the United States, up to the maximum royalties per year of \$8 million through 2015 and \$9 million per year thereafter for the remaining term of the patent (March 2020). The royalty payments are subject to certain conditions including the continued validity of our Remote Power Patent and the actual royalty payments may be less than the caps stated above, as was the case for 2013 and prior years. Due to our annual royalty rate structure with Cisco which includes declining rates as the volume of PoE product sales increase during the year, annual royalties from Cisco are anticipated to be highest in the first quarter and decline for each of the remaining quarters of the year. However, in 2014 we had greater revenue from Cisco in the second quarter as compared to the first quarter because we recorded additional royalty revenue from Cisco in the second quarter as a result of our recently completed audit of Cisco for the years ended December 31, 2013 and December 31,

2012 (see below and Note F to our financial statements for the quarterly period ended June 30, 2014 included in this Prospectus). Under the terms of the Agreement, if we grant other licenses with lower royalty rates to third parties (as defined in the Agreement), Cisco shall be entitled to the benefit of the lower royalty rates provided it agrees to the material terms of such other license. Under the terms of the Agreement, we have certain obligations to Cisco and if we materially breach such terms, Cisco will be entitled to stop paying royalties to us. In addition, if our Remote Power Patent is declared invalid in the pending litigation (see “Legal Proceedings” at page 34 hereof), Cisco would have no further obligation to pay us royalties. The aforementioned event would have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

In late December 2013, we exercised our right to audit the royalties paid to us by Cisco for the years 2012 and 2013 (the “Audit Period”) in accordance with our May 2011 license agreement with Cisco. As a result of the audit, Cisco agreed to pay us additional royalty payments pursuant to the May 2011 license agreement of \$3,281,000 for the Audit Period and other periods covered by license agreement. These additional aggregate royalty payments of \$3,281,000 were all recorded as revenue in the three month period ended June 30, 2014, at the time we completed our audit.

Acquisition of the Mirror Worlds Patent Portfolio and Commencement of Litigation

Following our acquisition of the Mirror Worlds patent portfolio on May 21, 2013, on May 23, 2013, through our wholly-owned subsidiary Mirror Worlds Technologies, LLC, we initiated patent litigation in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Tyler Division, against Apple, Inc., Microsoft, Inc., Hewlett-Packard Company, Lenovo Group Ltd., Lenovo (United States), Inc., Dell, Inc., Best Buy Co., Inc., Samsung Electronics America, Inc. and Samsung Telecommunications America L.L.C., for infringement of the U.S. Patent No. 6,006,227 (the “’227 Patent”) (one of the patents we acquired as part of the acquisition of the Mirror Worlds Patent Portfolio – see Note D[2] to our financial statements for the quarterly period ended June 30, 2014 included in this Prospectus). We seek, among other things, monetary damages based upon reasonable royalties. The lawsuit alleges that the defendants have infringed and continue to infringe the claims of the ‘227 Patent by making, selling, offering to sell and using infringing products including Mac OS and Windows operating systems and personal computers and tablets that include versions of those operating systems, and by encouraging others to make, sell, and use these products (see “Legal Proceedings at pages 33-34 hereof).

Acquisition of Cox Patent Portfolio and Commencement of Litigation

Since our acquisition of the Cox Patent Portfolio in February 2013 consisting of four patents and one patent application, we have been issued three additional patents by the United States Patent and Trademark Office related to the Cox Patent Portfolio. On April 4, 2014, we initiated litigation against Google and YouTube in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York for infringement of several of our patents within the Cox Patent Portfolio, relating to the identification of media content on the Internet. The lawsuit alleges that Google and YouTube have infringed and continue to infringe certain of our patents by making, using, selling and offering to sell unlicensed systems and related products and services, which include YouTube’s Content ID system (see “Legal Proceedings” at page 33 hereof).

Pending Litigation Against Major Data Networking Equipment Manufacturers

In September 2011, we initiated patent litigation against 16 data networking equipment manufacturers in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Tyler Division, for infringement of our Remote Power Patent. Named as defendants in the lawsuit, excluding related parties, were Alcatel-Lucent USA, Inc., Allied Telesis, Inc., Avaya Inc., AXIS Communications Inc., Dell, Inc., GarrettCom, Inc., Hewlett-Packard Company, Huawei Technologies USA, Juniper Networks, Inc., Motorola Solutions, Inc., NEC Corporation, Polycom Inc., Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., ShoreTel, Inc., Sony Electronics, Inc., and Transition Networks, Inc. (see “Legal Proceedings” at page 34 hereof). We seek monetary damages based upon reasonable royalties. In March 2012, we reached settlement agreements with defendants Motorola Solutions, Inc. (“Motorola”) and Transition Networks, Inc. (“Transition Networks”). In October 2012, we reached a settlement with defendant GarretCom, Inc. (“GarretCom”). In February 2013, we reached settlement agreements with Allied Telesis, Inc. (“Allied Telesis”) and NEC Corporation (“NEC”). As part of the settlements, Motorola, Transition Networks, GarretCom, Allied Telesis and NEC each entered into a non-exclusive license agreement for our Remote Power Patent pursuant to which each such defendant agreed to license our Remote Power Patent for its full term (which expires in March 2020) and pay a license initiation fee and quarterly royalties based on their sales of PoE products. In March 2013, the court stayed this litigation until application by a party following disposition of the Inter Partes review proceeding described below at the United States Patent and Trademark Office. On September 11, 2014, we filed a motion to lift the stay and a decision by the court is pending.

Proceedings at the United States Patent and Trademark Office

On July 20, 2012, an unknown third party filed with the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”) a request for ex parte reexamination of certain claims of our Remote Power Patent. On September 5, 2012, the USPTO issued an order granting the reexamination. The reexamination was stayed by the USPTO beginning in December 2012 until May 2014 (the completion of the Inter Partes review proceeding at the USPTO described below). On August 13, 2014, the USPTO issued a Notice of Intent to Issue a Reexamination Certificate, rejecting a challenge to the patentability of our Remote Power Patent (see “Legal Proceedings” at pages 34-35 of this Prospectus).

Avaya Inc., Dell Inc., Sony Corporation of America and Hewlett Packard Co. were petitioners in Inter Partes Review proceedings (which were joined together) (the “IPR Proceeding”) at the USPTO before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (the “Patent Board”) involving our Remote Power Patent. Petitioners in the IPR Proceeding sought to cancel certain claims of our Remote Power as unpatentable. A hearing on the merits of the IPR Proceeding was held on January 9, 2014. On May 22, 2014, the Patent Board issued its written decision in our favor, rejecting a challenge to the patentability of our Remote Power Patent. On July 24, 2014, the Petitioners in the IPR Proceeding each filed a Notice of Appeal of the Patent Board’s decision to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (see “Legal Proceedings” at pages 34-35 of this Prospectus).

Shares Being Offered

This Prospectus relates to the resale by the selling stockholders of up to 4,329,186 shares of our common stock, consisting of (i) 750,000 shares of common stock issuable upon exercise of warrants and 500,000 shares of our common stock (issued as a result of exercise of a warrant) issued to three holders in connection with our acquisition of the patent portfolio and certain other assets of Looking Glass LLC (formerly Mirror Worlds, LLC) on May 21, 2013 and (ii) 3,079,186 shares of common stock owned by our Chairman and Chief Executive Officer and related parties.

Summary Financial Data

The following tables summarize the consolidated statements of operations and balance sheet data for our business and should be read together with the section of this Prospectus captioned “Management’s Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations” and our financial statements and related notes included elsewhere in this Prospectus.

	Year Ended December 31, (audited)			Six Months Ended June 30, (unaudited)
CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF OPERATIONS DATA:				
	2013	2012	2014	2013
Royalty Revenue	\$ 8,017,000	\$ 8,698,000	\$ 9,657,000	\$ 5,971,000
Operating expenses(1)	\$ 4,133,000	\$ 2,763,000	\$ 2,193,000	\$ 1,701,000
Net income	\$ 1,016,000	\$ 2,626,000	\$ 2,997,000	\$ 2,174,000
Net income (loss) per share				
Basic	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.10	\$ 0.12	\$ 0.09
Diluted	\$ 0.04	\$ 0.09	\$ 0.11	\$ 0.08
Weighted-average common shares outstanding				
Basic	25,589,238	25,744,330	25,629,473	25,098,074
Diluted	27,954,685	28,472,753	27,689,150	27,396,414
C O N S O L I D A T E D BALANCE SHEET DATA:				
Cash and cash equivalents	\$ 18,938,000	\$ 21,983,000	\$ 16,579,000	\$ 18,103,000
Working capital	\$ 19,794,000	\$ 22,702,000	\$ 20,651,000	\$ 19,924,000
Total assets	\$ 31,568,000	\$ 29,805,000	\$ 31,298,000	\$ 32,307,000
Total shareholders’ equity	\$ 30,804,000	\$ 28,980,000	\$ 29,507,000	\$ 31,496,000

(1) Includes (i) patent amortization expense of \$1,008,000 for the year ended December 31, 2013 (“2013”) relating to our acquisition of 13 patents in 2013 and (ii) non-cash compensation expense of \$162,000, \$256,000, \$390,000 and \$316,000 for the six months ended June 30, 2014 and June 30, 2013, and for the years ended December 31, 2013 and December 31, 2012, respectively.

We had royalty revenue of \$8,017,000 for 2013 as compared to royalty revenue of \$8,698,000 for 2012 and royalty revenue of \$9,657,000 for the six months ended June 30, 2014 as compared to royalty revenue of \$5,917,000 for the six months ended June 30, 2013. The increase in revenue of \$3,686,500 or 62% for the six months ended June 30, 2014 included \$3,281,000 of additional royalty payments from Cisco as a result of our audit of Cisco (See Note F to our financial statements for quarterly period ended June 30, 2014 included in this Prospectus). We had net income of \$1,016,000 for 2013 as compared to net income of \$2,626,000 for 2012 primarily due to increased patent amortization expense, decreased revenue and increased legal costs and non-compensation expense. We had net income of \$2,997,000 or \$0.12 per share (basic) and \$0.11 per share (diluted) for the six months ended June 30, 2014 compared with net income of \$2,174,000 or \$0.09 per share (basic) and \$0.08 per share (diluted) for the six months

ended June 30, 2013. Our ability to achieve revenue and income is currently dependent upon receipt of royalty revenue from licensing agreements with respect to our Remote Power Patent. We have financed our operations primarily by royalty revenue from licensing our Remote Power Patent. At June 30, 2014 our principal sources of liquidity consisted of working capital of approximately \$20,651,000 which includes cash and cash equivalents of \$16,579,000. We believe, based on current cash position and projected licensing revenue, that we will have sufficient cash to satisfy our operational and capital requirements for the foreseeable future.

RISK FACTORS

An investment in our common stock involves a high degree of risk. The risk factors listed below are those that we consider to be material to an investment in our common stock and those which, if realized, could have material adverse effects on our business, financial condition or results of operations as specifically discussed below. In such an event, the trading price of our common stock could decline, and you could lose all or part of your investment. Before you invest in our common stock, you should be aware of various risks, including those described below. You should carefully consider these risk factors, together with all of the other information included or incorporated by reference in this Prospectus, before you decide whether to purchase our common stock. This section includes or refers to certain forward-looking statements. You should refer to the explanation of the qualifications and limitations on such forward-looking statements discussed on page 20.

We operate in a changing environment that involves numerous known and unknown risks and uncertainties that could materially adversely affect our operations. The following highlights some of the factors that have affected, and in the future could affect, our operations.

Our limited operating history makes it difficult to evaluate our current business and future prospects as well as the effectiveness of our business model.

We acquired our first patent assets (which included our Remote Power Patent) in November 2003 and first generated revenue from our Remote Power Patent in May 2007. We next acquired patent assets in 2013. Our strategy is to acquire high quality patents that management believes have the potential to generate significant licensing opportunities as has been the case with our Remote Power Patent. Our Remote Power Patent has generated revenue in excess of \$65,000,000 from May 2007 through June 30, 2014, and \$9,657,000 for the six months ended June 30, 2014 (which included \$3,281,000 of additional royalty payments from Cisco as a result of our audit). We have not yet generated any revenue from our patent assets besides our Remote Power Patent. Accordingly, we have a limited operating history and track record in executing our business model and strategy. Our future success depends upon our ability to protect our Remote Power Patent, successfully monetize our other patent assets and acquire and successfully monetize additional patent assets. In light of our limited track record to date, the uncertainty of patent litigation, the significant time and resources needed to successfully monetize patent assets and the competition faced by us to acquire patent assets, there is a significant risk that we may not be able to grow our revenue and profit and successfully implement our business model.

Our success is dependent upon our ability to protect our patents.

Our success is substantially dependent upon our proprietary technologies and our ability to protect our intellectual property rights. We currently own twenty-two (22) patents that relate to various technologies including (i) our Remote Power Patent covering the delivery of power to certain devices over PoE networks, (ii) patents relating to foundational technologies that enable unified search and indexing, displaying and archiving of documents in a computer system, (iii) patents relating to identification of media content and (iv) patents covering the transmission of audio, voice and data in order to achieve high quality of service (QoS) over computer and telephony networks. On May 22, 2014 the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (PTAB) of the USPTO issued its written decision in the IPR Proceeding in our favor, rejecting the challenge of Avaya Inc., Dell Inc., Sony Corporation of America and Hewlett Packard Co. (collectively the "Petitioners") that sought to cancel certain claims of the Remote Power Patent as unpatentable. On July 24, 2014, the Petitioners in the IPR proceeding filed a Notice of Appeal of the Patent Board's decision to the United States Court

of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. In the event the decision of the Patent Board is reversed by the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit and the Remote Power Patent is determined to be invalid, such a decision would have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations as our entire revenue stream is dependent upon the continued validity of our Remote Power Patent. On August 13, 2014, the USPTO issued a Notice of Intent to Issue a Reexamination Certificate (“NIRC”), rejecting a challenge to the patentability of our Remote Power Patent. The NIRC states that the USPTO intends to confirm the validity of the challenged claims of the Remote Power (claims 6, 8 and 9) without any amendment or modification. The USPTO also intends to allow fourteen new claims, bringing the total claims in the Remote Power Patent to twenty-three claims. No claims were rejected. However, the validity of our Remote Power Patent and other patents acquired by us as part of the acquisition of the Mirror Worlds Patent Portfolio and the Cox Patent Portfolio are currently being challenged in patent infringement litigation pending in the courts (see “Legal Proceedings” on pages 33-34 of this Prospectus). We rely upon our patents and trade secret laws, non-disclosure agreements with our employees, consultants and third parties to protect our intellectual property assets. The complexity of patent and common law and the uncertainty of the outcome of litigation create risk that our efforts to protect our intellectual property assets may not be successful. We cannot assure you that our patents will be upheld or that third parties will not invalidate our patent assets. If our intellectual property assets are not upheld, particularly our Remote Power Patent, such an event would have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

If we are unsuccessful in litigation involving our intellectual property, including if any of the claims of defendants to invalidate our patents are successful, such a result would have a material adverse effect on our business.

We currently have several litigations pending in the courts against parties whom we believe require a license to our patents including (i) litigation against eleven (11) data networking equipment manufacturers commenced in September 2011 relating to our Remote Power Patent, (ii) litigation against Apple, Inc., Microsoft, Inc. and several other major computer systems manufacturers commenced in May 2013 with respect to the Mirror Worlds Patent Portfolio and (iii) litigation against Google and YouTube with respect to our Cox Patent Portfolio. In addition, in the future we may commence patent litigation against third parties alleging infringement of our patents. Patent litigation is inherently risky and the outcome is uncertain. The defendants in our pending litigations are all large, well-financed companies with substantially greater resources than us. We may not be successful in such litigation and the outcome of such litigation could be harmful to us. In addition, it is customary for defendants in patent litigation to assert claims seeking to invalidate our patents, as is the case with respect to our pending patent litigations. If we are unsuccessful in enforcing and validating our patents and/or if third parties making claims against us seeking to invalidate our patents are successful, they may be able to obtain injunctive or other equitable relief, which effectively could block our ability to license or otherwise capitalize on our proprietary technologies. Furthermore, then existing licensees of our patents may no longer be obligated to pay royalties to us. Successful litigation against us resulting in a determination that our patents are not valid or enforceable, and/or that third parties do not infringe, would have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Our revenue and profit is currently dependent upon the continued validity of our Remote Power Patent.

All of our revenue to date has been generated by our Remote Power Patent. We currently have twelve (12) license agreements pursuant to which licensees have an obligation to pay us royalties on an ongoing basis. Such royalty bearing licenses include, among others, agreements with Cisco Systems, Inc. and Cisco-Linksys, LLC, Microsemi Corporation, Netgear, Inc., and Motorola Solutions, Inc. and NEC Corporation. The obligation of licensees of our Remote Power Patent to continue to make royalty payments to us is contingent upon the continued validity of our Remote Power Patent. The validity and infringement of our Remote Power Patent is currently at issue in our pending litigation against eleven (11) data equipment manufacturers in Tyler, Texas (see “Legal Proceedings” beginning at page 31 hereof). In the event our Remote Power Patent is determined to be invalid, licensees of our Remote Power Patent would have no further obligation to make royalty payments to us which would have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

We may not be able to capitalize on our strategy to acquire high quality patents with significant licensing opportunities or enter into strategic relationships with third parties to license or otherwise monetize their intellectual property.

Based upon the success we have achieved to date from licensing our Remote Power Patent and the acquisition of an aggregate of thirteen (13) additional patents in 2013, we believe we have the expertise and sufficient capital to compete in the intellectual property monetization market and to enter strategic relationships with third parties to develop, commercialize, license or otherwise monetize their intellectual property. However, we may not be able to acquire additional intellectual property or, if acquired, we may not achieve material revenue or profit from such intellectual property. Acquisitions of patent assets are competitive, time consuming, complex and costly to consummate. Our strategy is to focus on acquiring high quality patent assets which management believes have the potential for significant licensing opportunities. These high quality patent opportunities are difficult to find and are often very competitive to acquire. In addition, such acquisitions present material risks. Even if we successfully acquire additional patent assets, such as the patent portfolios acquired from Dr. Cox in February 2013 and from Mirror Worlds, LLC in May 2013, we may not be able to achieve significant licensing revenue or even generate sufficient revenue related to such patent assets to offset the acquisition costs and the legal fees and expenses which may be incurred to enforce, license or otherwise monetize such patents. In addition, we may not be able to enter into strategic relationships with third parties to license or otherwise monetize their intellectual property and, even if we consummate such strategic relationships, we may not achieve material revenue or profit from such relationships.

We are currently largely dependent upon our license agreement with Cisco for a significant portion of our royalty revenue. The loss of Cisco as a licensee would have a material adverse effect on our business.

Cisco Systems, Inc. and Cisco Linksys, LLC (collectively, “Cisco”) accounted for 92% and 84% of our revenue for the three month periods ended June 30, 2014 and 2013, respectively, and 77% of our revenue for the years ended December 31, 2013 and December 31, 2012. In accordance with our Settlement and License Agreement, dated May 25, 2011, with Cisco (the “Agreement”), which expanded upon the short form settlement agreement entered into in July 2010, Cisco is obligated to pay us royalties on a quarterly basis (which began in the first quarter of 2011) based on its sale of PoE products in the United States, up to the maximum royalties per year of \$8 million through 2015 and \$9

million per year thereafter for the remaining term of the patent (March 2020). The royalty payments are subject to certain conditions including the continued validity of our Remote Power Patent and the actual royalty payments may be less than the caps stated above, as was the case for 2013 and prior years. Due to our annual royalty rate structure with Cisco which includes declining rates as the volume of PoE product sales increase during the year, annual royalties from Cisco are anticipated to be highest in the first quarter and decline for each of the remaining quarters of the year. However, in 2014 we had greater royalty revenue from Cisco in the second quarter compared to the first quarter because we recorded additional royalty revenue from Cisco in the second quarter as a result of our recently completed audit of Cisco for the years ended December 31, 2013 and December 31, 2012 (see Note F to our financial statements for the quarterly period ended June 30, 2014 included in this Prospectus). Under the terms of the Agreement, if we grant other licenses with lower royalty rates to third parties (as defined in the Agreement), Cisco shall be entitled to the benefit of the lower royalty rates provided it agrees to the material terms of such other license. Under the terms of the Agreement, we have certain obligations to Cisco and if we materially breach such terms, Cisco will be entitled to stop paying royalties to us. In addition, if our Remote Power Patent is declared invalid in legal proceedings pending at the United States Patent and Trademark Office or in court (see "Legal Proceedings" at pages 32-34 hereof), Cisco would have no further obligation to pay us royalties. The aforementioned event would have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

It may be difficult for us to verify royalty amounts owed to us under our license agreement with Cisco and our other licensees, and this may cause us to lose potential revenue.

The standard terms of our royalty bearing license agreements require our licensees to report the sale of licensed products and report this data to us in most cases on a quarterly basis. Although our standard license terms give us the right to audit books and records of our licensees to verify this information, audits can be expensive, time consuming, incomplete and subject to dispute. From time to time, we may audit certain of our licensees (as we recently did with Cisco as referenced below) to verify independently the accuracy of the information contained in their royalty reports in an effort to decrease the likelihood that we will not receive the royalty revenues to which we are entitled under the terms of our license agreements. However, we cannot give assurances that these audits will be frequent enough and/or effective to that end. There is no certainty that we will receive additional royalty revenue from an audit and in some cases there may be an over-payment which will be credited against future royalties under our license agreements.

In late December 2013, we exercised our right to audit the royalties paid to us by Cisco for the years 2012 and 2013 (the "Audit Period") in accordance with our May 2011 license agreement with Cisco. As a result of the audit, Cisco agreed to pay us additional royalty payments pursuant to the May 2011 license agreement of \$3,281,000 for the Audit Period and other periods covered by the license agreement. These additional aggregate royalty payments of \$3,281,000 were all recorded as royalty revenue in the three month period ended June 30, 2014, at the time we completed our audit.

Our current licenses for our Remote Power Patent may not continue to result in significant royalties and do not necessarily mean we will achieve additional license agreements.

For the six months ended June 30, 2014 and June 30, 2013, we achieved royalty revenue of \$9,657,000 (which included \$3,281,000 of additional royalty payments from Cisco as a result of our audit (See Note F to our financial statements for the quarterly period ended June 30, 2014 included in this Prospectus) and \$5,971,000, respectively. For the years ended December 31, 2013 and December 31, 2012, we achieved royalty revenue of \$8,017,000 and \$8,698,000, respectively, with respect to our license agreements for our Remote Power Patent. We currently have license agreements for our Remote Power Patent with twelve (12) licensees including, among others, Cisco Systems, Inc. and Cisco Linksys, LLC, (collectively, "Cisco"), Netgear, Inc., Microsemi Corporation, Extreme Networks, Inc., Motorola Solutions, Inc. and NEC Corporation, pursuant to which such parties are obligated to pay us on-going royalties on a monthly or quarterly basis. Notwithstanding such royalty bearing license agreements, we may not continue to achieve significant royalty revenue from such license agreements. Our failure to continue to achieve significant royalty revenue from our existing license agreements would have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations. In addition, we may not be able to consummate additional licensing agreements resulting in material revenue with respect to our Remote Power Patent.

Our current licensing revenue depends upon the continued viability of the PoE market.

Ethernet is the leading local area networking technology in use today. PoE technology allows for the delivery of power over Ethernet ("PoE") cables rather than by separate power cords. As a result a wide variety of network devices, including IP telephones, wireless LAN access points, web-based network security cameras, data collection terminals and other network devices are able to receive power over existing data cables. The failure of the PoE market to remain viable would have a material adverse effect on licensing revenue for our Remote Power Patent which is currently our sole patent generating licensing revenue.

A limited number of our licensees account for a significant portion of our total revenues.

One of our licensees, Cisco Systems, Inc. and Cisco-Linksys, LLC (collectively, "Cisco"), accounted for 92% and 84% of our revenue for the three month periods ended June 30, 2014 and June 30, 2013, respectively, and 77% of our revenue for the years ended December 31, 2013 and December 31, 2012. It is anticipated that a few licensees will continue to constitute a significant portion of our revenue for the foreseeable future. To the extent such sales of PoE products by our significant licensees are adversely affected our revenues will be significantly impacted.

Our pending patent infringement litigations in the courts involving our Remote Power Patent, the Mirror Worlds Patent Portfolio and the Cox Patent Portfolio may be time consuming and costly and we can provide no assurance that we will be successful.

We have a pending litigation in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Tyler Division against eleven (11) data networking equipment manufacturers for infringement of our Remote Power Patent. A stay with respect to this litigation has been in effect since March 2013 while the Inter Partes proceeding was pending at the USPTO. On September 11, 2014, we made a motion to lift the stay and a decision by the court is pending. In May 2013, we initiated patent litigation in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Tyler Division, against Apple, Inc., Microsoft, Inc., Hewlett-Packard Company, Lenovo Group Ltd., Lenovo (United States), Inc., Dell, Inc., Best Buy Co., Inc., Samsung Electronics America, Inc. and Samsung Telecommunications America L.L.C., for infringement of the '227 Patent, which was one of the nine (9) patents acquired from Mirror Worlds LLC. In April 2014, we initiated patent litigation in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York against Google and YouTube for infringement of several of our patents within our Cox Patent Portfolio.

We anticipate that the above referenced litigations in federal court could continue for a number of years and while we have a contingent legal fee arrangement with our patent litigation counsel in each litigation, we are responsible for a portion of the expenses which are anticipated to be material. In addition, the time and effort required of our management to effectively pursue this litigation is likely to be significant and it may adversely affect other business opportunities.

We face intense competition to acquire intellectual property and enter into strategic relationships.

With respect to our ability to acquire additional intellectual property or enter into strategic relationships with third parties to monetize their intellectual property, we face considerable competition from other companies, many of which have significantly greater financial and other resources than we have. The patent licensing and enforcement industry has grown significantly over the past several years and there has been an increase in the number of companies seeking to acquire intellectual property rights from third parties. Entities including, among others, Acacia Research Corporation (NASDAQ:ACTG), Vringo, Inc. (NYSE MKT:VRNG), Intellectual Ventures, VirnetX Holdings Corp. (NYSE MKT:VHC), Marathon Group, Inc. (NASDAQ:MARA) and RPX Corporation (NASDAQ:RPXC) seek to acquire or partner with third parties to license or enforce intellectual property rights. It is expected that others will enter this market as well. Many of these competitors have significantly more financial and human resources than us.

We may also compete with strategic corporate buyers, litigation funding firms such as Burford Capital Limited, Fortress Investment Group, Gerchen Keller Capital, LLC, Parabellum Capital LLC and Bentham Capital LLC, venture capital firms and hedge funds for intellectual property acquisitions and licensing opportunities. Many of these competitors have greater financial resources and human resources than us.

New legislation, regulations, court rulings or actions by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office related to enforcing patents could adversely affect our business and operating results.

If new legislation, regulations or rules are implemented either by Congress, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office or the courts that impact the patent application process, the patent enforcement process or the rights of patent holders, these changes could negatively affect our business, financial condition and results of operations. Recently, United States patent laws were amended by the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act, or the America Invents Act, which became effective on March 16, 2013. The America Invents Act includes a number of significant changes to U.S. patent law. In general, it 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 and new administrative post-grant review procedures to challenge the patentability of issued patents outside of litigation, including Inter Partes Review proceedings which provide third parties a timely, cost effective alternative to district court litigation to challenge the validity of an issued patent. 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. It also includes changes that transition the United States from a “first-to-invent” system to a “first to file” system and alter the processes for challenging issued patents. At this time, it is not clear what, if any, impact the America Invents Act will have on the operation of our 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, financial condition and results of operations.

Our quarterly and annual operating and financial results and our revenue are likely to fluctuate significantly in future periods.

Our quarterly and annual operating and financial results are difficult to predict and may fluctuate significantly from period to period. Our revenue and net income was \$9,657,000 and \$2,997,000, respectively, for the six months ended June 30, 2014 as compared to \$5,971,000 and \$2,174,000, respectively, for the six months ended June 30, 2013. Our revenue and net income was \$8,017,000 and \$1,016,000 for the year ended December 31, 2013 as compared to revenue of \$8,698,000 and net income of \$2,626,000 for the year ended December 31, 2012. Our revenue was \$7,398,000 with net income of \$8,493,000 (including net income of \$6,903,000 related to the recording of a deferred tax benefit) for the year ended December 31, 2011 as compared to revenue of \$33,037,000 and net income of \$19,236,000 for the year ended December 31, 2010 (which 2010 revenue and net income were primarily due to achieving a large settlement of a patent litigation in July 2010). Accordingly, our revenue, net income and results of operations may fluctuate as a result of a variety of factors that are outside our control including, but not limited to, our ability and timing in consummating future license agreements for our intellectual property assets, the timing and extent of royalty payments received by us from licensees, the timing and our ability to achieve successful outcomes from current and future patent litigation, and the timing and our ability to achieve revenue from future strategic relationships.

We may need additional financing to implement our strategy and expand our business.

We may need additional equity or debt financing beyond our existing cash to pursue our strategy including the acquisition of additional intellectual property assets or to enter into strategic relationships with third parties to license or monetize their intellectual property. Any additional financing that we need may not be available and, if available, may not be available on terms that are acceptable to us. Our failure to obtain financing on a timely basis, or on economically favorable terms, could prevent us from pursuing our intellectual property acquisition strategy or from responding to changing business or economic conditions and could cause us to experience difficulty in withstanding adverse operating results.

We do not intend to pay future dividends on our common stock and thus stockholders must look to appreciation of our common stock to realize a gain on their investments.

We have not paid any dividends to our stockholders since 2010. In December 2010, the only time in our history, we paid a special cash dividend of \$0.10 per share to holders of our common stock. We do not have any plans to pay dividends in the foreseeable future. Our future dividend policy is within the discretion of our board of directors and will depend upon various factors, including future earnings, if any, operations, capital requirements, our general financial condition, the preferences of any series of preferred stock, our general business conditions and future contractual restrictions on payment of dividends, if any. Accordingly, stockholders must look solely to appreciation of our common stock to realize a gain on their investment. This appreciation may not occur.

Because ownership of our common stock is concentrated, investors may have limited influence on stockholder decisions.

As of August 31, 2014, our executive officers and directors beneficially owned 30.3% of our outstanding common stock. As a result, these stockholders may be able to exercise substantial control over all matters requiring stockholder approval, including the election of directors and approval of significant corporate transactions, such as a merger or other sale of our company or its assets. This concentration of ownership will limit your ability to influence corporate matters and may have the effect of delaying or preventing a third party from acquiring control over us.

Our markets are subject to rapid technological change and our technologies face potential technology obsolescence.

The markets covered by our intellectual property are characterized by rapid technological changes, changing customer requirements, frequent new product introductions and enhancements, and evolving industry standards. The introduction of products embodying new technologies and the emergence of new industry standards may render our technologies obsolete or less marketable.

In addition, other companies may develop competing technologies that offer better or less expensive alternatives to PoE and the other technologies covered by our intellectual property. Several companies have notified the IEEE that they may have patents and proprietary technologies that are covered by the Standard pertaining to PoE. In the event any of those companies asserts claims relating to our patents, the licensing royalties available to us for our Remote Power Patent may be adversely impacted. Moreover, technological advances or entirely different approaches developed by one or more of our competitors or adopted by various standards groups could render our Remote Power Patent obsolete, less marketable or unenforceable.

Dependence upon CEO and Chairman.

Our success is largely dependent upon the personal efforts of Corey M. Horowitz, our Chairman, Chief Executive Officer and Chairman of our Board of Directors. On November 1, 2012, we entered into an employment agreement with Mr. Horowitz pursuant to which he continues to serve as our Chairman and Chief Executive Officer for three successive one-year terms (unless terminated by us). The loss of the services of Mr. Horowitz would have a material adverse effect on our business and prospects. We do not maintain key-man life insurance on the life of Mr. Horowitz.

The burdens of being a public company may adversely affect us including our ability to pursue litigation.

As a public company, our management must devote substantial time, attention and financial resources to comply with U.S. securities laws. This may have a material adverse effect on management's ability to effectively and efficiently pursue litigation as well as our other business initiatives. In addition, our disclosure obligations under U.S. securities laws require us to disclose information publicly that will be available to future litigation opponents. We may, from time to time, be required to disclose information that may have a material adverse affect on our litigation strategies. This information may enable our litigation opponents to develop effective litigation strategies that are contrary to our interests.

Because our common stock currently trades on the Over-the-Counter Bulletin Board, you may not be able to buy and sell our common stock at optimum prices and you face liquidity issues in terms of your ability to buy and sell our common stock.

The Over-the-Counter Bulletin Board ("OTCBB") is a regulated quotation service that displays quotes, last sales prices and volume in over-the-counter securities. The trading of our stock on the OTCBB imposes, among others, the following risks:

Availability of quotes and order information – Because OTCBB trades and quotations involve a manual process (over the telephone) rather than automated or electronically linked execution systems, the market information for our common stock cannot be guaranteed. In addition, quote information, or even firm quotes, may not be available. The manual execution process may delay order processing and intervening price fluctuations could result in the failure of a limit order to execute or the execution of a market order at a significantly different price. Execution of trades, execution reporting, and the delivery of trade confirmations may be delayed significantly. Consequently, one may not be able to sell shares of our common stock at the optimum trading prices.

Liquidity Risks – Liquidity refers to the ability to freely buy and sell securities at given prices and volumes. In general, the more activity in a given security, and the more market makers participating in a security, the greater the liquidity in the security. Because the OTC Bulletin Board generally has fewer market makers participating in a Bulletin Board security, the liquidity in our common stock may be significantly less than what might be experienced in the NASDAQ or listed markets. As such, you may only receive a partial execution or your order may not be executed at all. Additionally, the price received on a market order may be significantly different from the price quoted at the time of order entry. Additionally, when fewer shares of our common stock are being traded, larger spreads between bid and ask prices and volatile swings in price may result.

Dealer's Spread – The dealer's spread (the difference between the bid and ask prices) of our security may be large and may result in substantial losses to the seller of our common stock on the OTCBB if the common stock must be sold immediately. Further, purchasers of our common stock may incur an immediate "paper" loss due to the price spread. Moreover, dealers trading on the OTCBB may not have a bid price for securities bought and sold through the OTCBB. Due to the foregoing, there may be decreased demand for our common stock traded through the OTCBB.

The significant number of options and warrants outstanding may adversely affect the market price for our common stock.

As of August 31, 2014, there were outstanding options and warrants to purchase an aggregate of 3,700,000 shares of our common stock at exercise prices ranging from \$0.83 to \$2.10. To the extent that outstanding options and warrants are exercised, existing stockholder percentage ownership will be diluted and any sales in the public market of the common stock underlying such options may adversely affect prevailing market prices for our common stock.

We may seek to raise additional funds, finance intellectual property acquisitions or develop strategic relationships by issuing capital stock that would dilute your ownership.

We may elect to raise financing by issuing equity securities, which, if conducted in the future, would materially reduce the percentage ownership of our existing stockholders. Furthermore, any newly issued securities could have rights, preferences and privileges senior to those of our existing common stock. Moreover, any issuances by us of equity securities may be at or below the prevailing market price of our stock and in any event may have a dilutive impact on your ownership interest, which could cause the market price of stock to decline. We may also raise additional funds through the incurrence of debt or the issuance or sale of other securities or instruments senior to our common shares. The holders of any debt securities or instruments we may issue could have rights superior to the rights of our common stockholders.

Future sales of shares of our common stock may cause the prevailing market price of our shares to decline and could harm our ability to raise additional capital.

We have previously issued a substantial number of shares of common stock, which are eligible for resale under Rule 144 of Securities Act of 1933, and may become freely tradable. We have also registered a substantial number of shares including shares that are issuable upon the exercise of options and warrants. In addition, if holders of options and warrants choose to exercise their purchase rights and sell shares of common stock in the public market or if holders of currently restricted common stock or registered common stock sell such shares in the public market, or attempt to publicly sell such shares in a short time period, the prevailing market price for our common stock may decline. Such decline in the price of our common stock may also adversely affect our ability to raise additional capital.

Provisions in our corporate charter and in Delaware law could make it more difficult for a third party to acquire us, could discourage a takeover and adversely affect existing stockholders.

Our certificate of incorporation authorizes the board of directors to issue up to 10,000,000 shares of preferred stock. The preferred stock may be issued in one or more series, the terms of which may be determined at the time of issuance by our Board of Directors, without further action by stockholders, and may include, among other things, voting rights (including the right to vote as a series on particular matters), preferences as to dividends and liquidation, conversion and redemption rights, and sinking fund provisions, any of which could adversely affect holders of our common stock. Although there are currently no shares of preferred stock outstanding, future holders of preferred stock may have rights superior to our common stock and such rights could also be used to restrict our ability to merge with, or sell our assets to third parties.

We are also subject to the “anti-takeover” provisions of Section 203 of the Delaware General Corporation Law, which could prevent us from engaging in a “business combination” with a 15% or greater stockholder for a period of three years from the date such person acquired that status unless appropriate board or stockholder approvals are obtained.

These provisions could deter unsolicited takeovers or delay or prevent changes in our control or management, including transactions in which stockholders might otherwise receive a premium for their shares over the then current market price. These provisions may also limit the ability of stockholders to delay, deter or prevent a change of control, or approve transactions that they may deem to be in their best interests.

Our stock price may be volatile.

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

- our ability to successfully enforce and/or defend our Remote Power Patent and other patents;

- our ability to continue to receive material revenue from licensees of our Remote Power Patent;

- our ability to enter into favorable license agreements with third parties with respect to our Remote Power Patent;

- our ability to license and monetize our patents besides the Remote Power Patent including the Mirror Worlds Patent Portfolio and the Cox Patent Portfolio;

- our ability to acquire additional intellectual property;

- our ability to achieve material revenue and profits;

- our ability to enter into strategic relationships with third parties to license or otherwise monetize their intellectual property;

- our ability to raise capital when needed;

sales of our common stock;
our ability to execute our business plan;
technology changes;
legislative, regulatory and competitive developments; and
economic and other external factors.

In addition, the securities markets have from time to time experienced significant price and volume fluctuations that are unrelated to the operating performance of particular companies. These market fluctuations may also have a material and adverse effect on the market price of our common stock.

SPECIAL NOTE REGARDING FORWARD-LOOKING STATEMENTS

This Prospectus contains certain forward-looking statements that are statements that include information based upon beliefs of our management, as well as assumptions made by, and information available to, our management. Statements containing terms such as “believes”, “expects,” “anticipates,” “intends” or similar words are intended to identify forward-looking statements.

Our management, based upon assumptions it considers reasonable, has compiled these forward-looking statements. Such statements reflect our current views with respect to future events. These statements involve known and unknown risks and uncertainties that may cause our actual results in future periods to differ materially from what is currently anticipated. We make cautionary statements in certain sections of this Prospectus, including under “Risk Factors”. You should read these cautionary statements as being applicable to all related forward-looking statements wherever they appear in this Prospectus, the materials referred to in this Prospectus or the materials incorporated by reference into this Prospectus.

You are cautioned that no forward-looking statement is a guarantee of future performance and you should not place undue reliance on any forward-looking statement. Such statements speak only as of the date of this Prospectus and we are not undertaking any obligation to publicly release any revisions to these forward-looking statements to reflect events or circumstances after the date of this Prospectus or to reflect the occurrence of unanticipated events.

PRICE RANGE OF OUR COMMON STOCK

Our common stock currently trades on the OTC Bulletin Board under the symbol NTIP. The following table sets forth, for the periods indicated, the range of the high and low bid prices for our common stock as reported by OTCBB.com. Such prices reflect inter-dealer quotations, without retail mark-up, mark-down or commission and may not necessarily represent actual transactions.

YEAR ENDING DECEMBER 31, 2014	HIGH	LOW
Second Quarter	\$2.00	\$1.46
First Quarter	\$1.75	\$1.40
YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2013	HIGH	LOW
Fourth Quarter	\$1.73	\$1.43
Third Quarter	\$1.78	\$1.60
Second Quarter	\$1.90	\$1.23
First Quarter	\$1.50	\$1.12
YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2012	HIGH	LOW
Fourth Quarter	\$1.28	\$1.10
Third Quarter	\$1.32	\$1.16
Second Quarter	\$1.37	\$1.18
First Quarter	\$1.35	\$1.13

On September 26, 2014, the closing price for our common stock as reported on the OTC Bulletin Board was \$2.15 per share. The number of record holders of our common stock was 66 as of September 26, 2014. In addition, we believe there are in excess of approximately 500 holders of our common stock in “street name” as of September 30, 2014.

DIVIDEND POLICY

Dividend Policy. We have not paid any dividends to our stockholders since 2010. In December 2010, the only time in our history, we paid a special dividend of \$0.10 per share on our outstanding shares of common stock. We do not have any plans to pay dividends in the foreseeable future. The declaration and payment of any future dividends will be at the discretion of our Board of Directors and will depend upon a variety of factors, including future earnings, if any, operations, capital requirements, our general financial condition, the preferences of any series of preferred stock, our general business conditions and future contractual restrictions on payment of dividends, if any.

EQUITY COMPENSATION PLAN INFORMATION

The following table summarizes share and exercise price information about our equity compensation plans as of December 31, 2013.

	Number of securities to be issued upon exercise of outstanding options and rights (a)	Weighted-average exercise price of outstanding options 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 (1) (2)	417,500(2)	\$0.68	2,600,000(1)
Equity compensation plans not approved by security holders(3)	3,865,000(3)	\$0.94	—
Total	4,282,500	\$0.91	2,600,000(1)

(1) Our 2013 Stock Incentive Plan (“2013 Plan”) was approved by our stockholders on October 9, 2013 and by our Board of Directors on August 7, 2013. Subject to standard anti-dilution adjustments as provided in the 2013 Plan, the 2013 Plan provides for an aggregate of 2,600,000 shares of our common stock to be available for distribution pursuant to the 2013 Plan. At December 31, 2013, no award had been made under our 2013 Stock Incentive Plan.

(2) Our 1996 Amended and Restated Stock Option Plan (“1996 Stock Option Plan”) provided for the issuance of options to purchase up to 4,000,000 shares of our common stock. As of March 2006, no additional options were eligible to be issued under the plan in accordance with its terms. The outstanding options contain customary anti-dilution provisions.

(3) Represents aggregate individual option grants outside the 2013 Stock Incentive Plan and the 1996 Stock Option Plan referred to in the above table which includes individual option grants issued to our officers, directors, employees and consultants in consideration for certain services rendered to us. The option agreements pertaining to such individual option grants contain customary anti-dilution provisions.

BUSINESS

Overview

Our principal business is the development, licensing and protection of our intellectual property assets. We presently own twenty-two (22) patents that relate to various technologies including patents covering (i) the delivery of power over Ethernet cables for the purpose of remotely powering network devices, such as wireless access ports, IP phones and network based cameras; (ii) foundational technologies that enable unified search and indexing, displaying and archiving of documents in a computer system; (iii) enabling technology for identifying media content on the Internet and taking further action to be performed based on such identification including, among others, the insertion of advertising and the facilitation of the purchase of goods and services related to such content; and (iv) systems and methods for the transmission of audio, video and data in order to achieve high quality of service (QoS) over computer and telephony networks. In addition, we continually review opportunities to acquire or license additional intellectual property.

We have been actively engaged in the licensing of our patent (U.S. Patent No. 6,218,930) covering the delivery of power over Ethernet cables (the “Remote Power Patent”). As of the date of this Prospectus, we have entered into sixteen (16) license agreements with respect to our Remote Power Patent which, among others, include license agreements with Cisco Systems, Inc. and Cisco Linksys, LLC, Extreme Networks, Inc., Netgear, Inc., Microsemi Corporation, Motorola Solutions, Inc. and NEC Corporation (see Notes D[2], D[3] and D[4] to our financial statements for the quarterly period ended June 30, 2014 included in this Prospectus). Our current strategy includes continuing our licensing efforts with respect to our Remote Power Patent and efforts to monetize the two patent portfolios (the Cox and Mirror Worlds patent portfolios) we acquired in 2013 (see “Business-Patents Related to Identification of Media on the Internet” and “Business - Patents Covering Document Stream Operating Systems” on pages 27-29 of this Prospectus). In addition, we continue to seek to acquire additional intellectual property assets to develop, commercialize, license or otherwise monetize such intellectual property. Our strategy includes working with inventors and patent owners to assist in the development and monetization of their patented technologies. We may also enter into strategic relationships with third parties to develop, commercialize, license or otherwise monetize their intellectual property. The form of such relationships may differ depending upon the opportunity and may include, among other things, a strategic investment in such third party, the provision of financing to such third party or the formation of a joint venture with such third party or others for the purpose of monetizing their intellectual property assets.

Our acquisition strategy is to focus on acquiring high quality patents which management believes have the potential to generate significant licensing opportunities as we have achieved with respect to our Remote Power Patent. Our Remote Power Patent has generated licensing revenue in excess of \$65,000,000 from May 2007 through June 30, 2014. As part of our acquisition strategy, in 2013 we acquired an aggregate of thirteen (13) additional patents and six (6) pending patent applications. On February 28, 2013, we acquired from Dr. Ingemar Cox, a technology leader in digital watermarking content identification, digital rights management and related technologies, four (4) U.S. patents (as well as a pending patent application) (the “Cox Patent Portfolio”). In 2014, we were issued three (3) additional patents by the United States Patent and Trademark Office related to the Cox Patent Portfolio (see Note B[2] to our financial statements for the quarterly period ended June 30, 2014 included in this Prospectus). On May 21, 2013, Mirror Worlds Technologies, LLC, our wholly-owned subsidiary, acquired from Mirror Worlds, LLC (which subsequently changed its name to Looking Glass LLC) nine (9) U.S. patents and five (5) pending patent applications that enable unified search and indexing, displaying and archiving of documents in a computer system (the “Mirror Worlds Patent Portfolio”). On May 22, 2013, we initiated

patent litigation against Apple, Inc., Microsoft, Inc., and other major vendors of document system software and computer systems, in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Tyler Division, for infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,006,227 (part of the Mirror Worlds Patent Portfolio) (see “Legal Proceedings” at pages 32-33 of this Prospectus). On April 4, 2014, we initiated patent litigation against Google and YouTube in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York for infringement of several of our patents within our Cox Patent Portfolio. On May 22, 2014, the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (PTAB) of the USPTO issued its written decision in the IPR Proceeding in favor of us, rejecting the challenge of Avaya Inc., Dell Inc., Sony Corporation of America and Hewlett Packard Co. that sought to cancel certain claims of the Remote Power Patent as unpatentable. On August 13, 2014, the USPTO issued a Notice of Intent to Issue a Reexamination Certificate (“NIRC”), also rejecting a challenge to the patentability of our Remote Power Patent. The NIRC states that the USPTO intends to confirm the validity of the challenged claims of the Remote Power (claims 6, 8 and 9) without any amendment or modification. The USPTO also intends to allow fourteen new claims, bringing the total claims in the Remote Power Patent to twenty-three claims. No claims were rejected. (see “Legal Proceedings” at pages 33-35 of this Prospectus).

Our Patents

Our intellectual property currently consists of twenty-two (22) patents:

Remote Power Patent

- U.S. Patent No. 6,218,930: Apparatus and method for remotely powering access equipment over a 10/100 switched Ethernet network;

Mirror Worlds Patent Portfolio

Patents covering foundational technologies that enable unified search and indexing, displaying and archiving of documents in a computer system.

- U.S. Patent No. 6,006,227: Document stream operating system;
- U.S. Patent No. 6,638,313: Document stream operating system;
- U.S. Patent No. 6,725,427: Document stream operating system with document organizing and display facilities;
- U.S. Patent No 6,496,857: Delivering targeted, enhanced advertisements across electronic networks;
- U.S. Patent No. 7,865,538: Desktop, stream-based, information management system;
- U.S. Patent No. 7,849,105: Desktop, stream-based, information management system;
- U.S. Patent No. 8,255,439: Desktop, stream-based, information management system;
- U.S. Patent No. 8,280,931: Desktop, stream-based, information management system; and
- U.S. Patent No. 8,572,139: Desktop, stream-based, information management system.

We also have four (4) pending patent applications (acquired in May 2013 as part of acquisition of the Mirror Worlds Patent Portfolio) covering foundational technologies that enable unified search and indexing, displaying and archiving of documents in a computer system.

Cox Patent Portfolio

Identification of Media Content on the Internet

- U.S. Patent No. 7,058,223: Identifying works for initiating a work-based action, such as an action on the Internet;
- U.S. Patent No. 8,010,998: Using features extracted from an audio and/or video work to obtain information about the work;
- U.S. Patent No. 8,020,187: Identifying works, using a sub-linear time search or a non exhaustive search, for initiating a work-based action, such as an action on the Internet;
- U.S. Patent No. 8,205,237: Identifying works, using a sub-linear time search, such as an approximate nearest neighbor search, for initiating a work-based action, such as an action on the Internet;
- U.S. Patent No. 8,640,179: Method for using extracted features from an electronic work;
- U.S. Patent No. 8,656,441: Systems for using extracted features from an electronic work; and
- U.S. Patent No. 8,7121,726: “Method for taking action based on a request related to an electronic media work.

We have filed seven (7) patent applications (2 of which have been issued and 5 of which are pending) since acquisition of the Cox Portfolio in February 2013 with the United States Patent and Trademark Office relating to the identification of media content on the Internet.

QoS Family of Patents

- U.S. Patent No. 6,574,242: Method for the transmission and control of audio, video, and computer data over a single network fabric;
- U.S. Patent No. 6,570,890: Method for the transmission and control of audio, video, and computer data over a single network fabric using Ethernet packets;
- U.S. Patent No. 6,539,011: Method for initializing and allocating bandwidth in a permanent virtual connection for the transmission and control of audio, video, and computer data over a single network fabric; and
- U.S. Patent No. 6,215,789: Local area network for the transmission and control of audio, video, and computer data.

In August 2008, we were issued European Patent No. 1086556 titled “Integrated Voice and Data Communications over a Local Area Network” which covers the same technology as covered by our U.S. QoS family of patents. The patent has issued in France, Germany, Spain, United Kingdom, Ireland and Canada.

Our future success is largely dependent upon our proprietary technologies, our ability to protect our intellectual property assets, to consummate license agreements with respect to our intellectual property assets as well as our ability to acquire additional intellectual property assets or enter into strategic relationships with third parties to license or otherwise monetize their intellectual property. The complexity of patent and common law and the inherent uncertainty of litigation creates risks that our efforts to protect our intellectual property assets, or those of our strategic partners, may not be successful. We cannot be assured that our intellectual property assets will be upheld, or that third parties will not invalidate such intellectual property assets. In addition, we may not be able to (i) acquire additional intellectual property assets or successfully license such assets or (ii) successfully enter into strategic relationships with third parties to license or otherwise monetize their intellectual property.

We were incorporated under the laws of the State of Delaware in July 1990. Our principal offices are located at 445 Park Avenue, Suite 912, New York, New York 10022 and our telephone number is (212) 829-5770. On October 9, 2013, we changed our name to Network-1 Technologies, Inc. (from Network-1 Security Solutions, Inc.) to better reflect the nature of our business as a company engaged in the development, licensing and protection of its intellectual property assets.

Remote Power Patent – Market Overview

Our Remote Power Patent (U.S. Patent No. 6,218,930) relates to several technologies which describe a methodology for controlling the delivery of power to certain devices over an Ethernet network.

The Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers (IEEE) is a non-profit, technical professional association of more than 370,000 individual members in approximately 160 countries. The Standards Association of the IEEE is responsible for the creation of global industry standards for a broad range of technology industries. In 2000, at the urging of several industry vendors, the IEEE formed a task force to facilitate the adoption of a standardized methodology for the delivery of remote power over Ethernet networks which would insure interoperability among vendors of switches and terminal devices. On June 13, 2003 the IEEE Standards Association approved the 802.3af Power over Ethernet standard (the “Standard”), which covers technologies deployed in delivering power over Ethernet networks. The Standard provides for the Power Sourcing Equipment (PSE) to be deployed in switches or as standalone midspan hubs to provide power to remote devices such as wireless access points, IP phones and network-based cameras. The technology is commonly referred to as Power over Ethernet (“PoE”). We believe that our Remote Power Patent covers several of the key technologies covered by the Standard.

Ethernet is the leading local area networking technology in use today. PoE technology allows for the delivery of PoE cables rather than by separate power cords. As a result, a variety of network devices, including IP telephones, wireless LAN Access Points, web-based network security cameras, data collection terminals and other network devices, are able to receive power over existing data cables without the need to modify the existing infrastructure to facilitate the provision of power for such devices through traditional AC outlets. Advantages such as lower installation costs, remote management capabilities, lower maintenance costs, centralized power backup, and flexibility of device location as well as the advent of worldwide power compatibility, create the possibility of PoE becoming widely adopted in networks throughout the world.

PoE provides numerous benefits including quantifiable returns on investment. The cost of hiring electricians to pull power cables to remote locations used for access points or security cameras can rival or exceed the cost of the devices. Another key benefit is the need for Voice over IP power reliability in the face of power failures. Using PoE enables data center power supply systems to ensure ongoing power – a function that would be difficult and expensive to implement if each phone required AC outlets.

These and other advantages such as remote management capabilities, lower maintenance costs, and flexibility of device location have led to forecasts that PoE will be widely adopted in networks throughout the world. The benefits of PoE are compelling as evidenced by the introduction of products by such leading vendors such as Cisco Systems, Foundry Networks, Extreme Networks, 3Com, Siemens, Nortel Networks and Avaya, as well as many others.

Mirror Worlds Patent Portfolio

Patents Covering Document Stream Operating Systems

On May 21, 2013, Mirror Worlds Technologies, LLC, our wholly-owned subsidiary, acquired all of the patents previously owned by Mirror Worlds, LLC (which subsequently changed its name to Looking Glass LLC), consisting of nine (9) issued United States patents and five (5) pending applications covering foundational technologies that enable unified search and indexing, displaying and archiving of documents in a computer system (the “Mirror Worlds Patent Portfolio”). As consideration for the acquisition of the Mirror Worlds Patent Portfolio, we paid Mirror Worlds, LLC \$3,000,000 in cash, and issued 5-year warrants to purchase an aggregate of 1,750,000 shares of our common stock (875,000 shares of our common stock at an exercise price of \$1.40 per share and 875,000 shares of our common stock at an exercise price of \$2.10 per share). In June 2014, we repurchased from Looking Glass LLC for \$505,000 all of the aforementioned warrants to purchase an aggregate of 1,750,000 shares of our common stock. In November 2013, we received a new patent (U.S. Patent No. 8,572,139) from the United States Patent and Trademark Office entitled “Desktop Streamed-Based, Information Management System”. This new patent issuance related to one of the pending applications acquired as part of the Mirror Worlds Patent Portfolio in May 2013.

The inventions relating to document stream operating systems covered by the Mirror Worlds Patent Portfolio resulted from the work done by Yale University computer scientist, Professor David Gelernter, and his then graduate student, Dr. Eric Freeman, in the mid-1990s. Certain aspects of the technologies developed by David Gelernter were commercialized in their company’s product offering called “Scopeware.” Technologies embodied in Scopeware are now common in various computer and web-based operating systems. Professor Gelernter and Dr. Freeman each entered into consulting agreements with us as part of our acquisition of the Mirror Worlds Patent Portfolio. Professor Gelernter and Dr. Freeman are currently associated with Lifestreams Technologies Corporation (“Lifestreams”), a company that develops next generation applications and methodologies aimed at organizing and displaying digital data. Lifestreams is a licensee of the Mirror Worlds Patent Portfolio. In connection with the acquisition of the Mirror Worlds Patent Portfolio, we also acquired an equity interest in Lifestreams. In addition, in July 2013 and April 2014 we made additional investments in Lifestreams and, as part of an amended license agreement with Lifestreams, we received a warrant to purchase 7.5% of the then outstanding common stock of Lifestreams on a fully diluted basis. In March 2014, we agreed to make an additional investment of \$380,200 in Lifestreams in the form of a convertible note. The convertible notes are due March 31, 2015 and shall automatically convert into shares of preferred stock upon a Lifestreams “qualified” equity financing (at least \$3.0 million).

As part of the acquisition of the Mirror Worlds Patent Portfolio, we also entered into an agreement with Recognition Interface, LLC (“Recognition”), a New York based investment partnership that financed the commercialization of the Mirror Worlds Patent Portfolio prior to its sale to Mirror Worlds, LLC and also retained an interest in the licensing proceeds of the Mirror Worlds Patent Portfolio. Pursuant to the terms of the agreement with us, Recognition received (i) 5-year warrants to purchase 250,000 shares of our common stock at \$1.40 per share, and (ii) 5-year warrants to purchase 250,000 shares of our common stock at \$2.10 per share. Recognition also was granted the right to designate one member of the Board of Directors of our wholly-owned subsidiary, Mirror Worlds Technologies, LLC, that consists of three members. Recognition’s initial Board designee was Frank Weil, Chairman of Abacus and Associates, Inc., a private investment firm in New York, New York. Mr. Weil headed the International Trade Administration of the United States Department of Commerce from 1977-1979. He was Chairman of the Finance Committee and Chief Financial Officer of the investment firm of Paine Webber Inc. from 1972-1977. Mr. Weil first met Professor Gelernter in the mid 1990’s and assisted in the early development and financing of Mirror Worlds and its Scopeware product offering.

Recognition also received from us an interest in the net proceeds realized from the monetization of the Mirror Worlds Patent Portfolio as follows: (i) 10% of the first \$125 million of net proceeds, (ii) 15% of the next \$125 million of net proceeds, and (iii) 20% of any portion of the net proceeds in excess of \$250 million.

In addition, in connection with our agreement with Recognition, Abacus and Associates, Inc., an investment entity affiliated with Recognition, received a 60-day warrant to purchase 500,000 shares of our common stock at \$2.05 per share (the “60 Day Warrant”). In accordance with the Recognition Agreement, as a result of the exercise of the 60 Day Warrant on July 22, 2013, we issued to Recognition additional 5-year warrants to purchase 250,000 shares of our common stock consisting of (i) warrants to purchase 125,000 shares of common stock at an exercise price of \$1.40 per share and (ii) warrants to purchase 125,000 shares of common stock at an exercise price of \$2.10 per share.

Cox Patent Portfolio

Patents Related to Identification of Media Content on the Internet

On February 28, 2013, we acquired from Dr. Ingemar Cox four (4) patents (as well as a pending patent application) pertaining to enabling technology for identifying media content on the Internet (the “Cox Patent Portfolio”) for a purchase price of \$1,000,000 in cash and 403,226 shares of our common stock. In addition, we are obligated to pay Dr. Cox 12.5% of the net proceeds generated by us from licensing, sale or enforcement of the patents. Dr. Cox provides consulting services to us with respect to the Cox Patent Portfolio and future patent applications and assists our efforts to develop the patent portfolio.

The Cox Patent Portfolio relates to enabling technology for identifying media content on the Internet, such as audio and video, and taking further action to be performed based on such identification, including among others, the insertion of advertising and the facilitation of the purchase of goods and services relating to such content. The patents (U.S. Patent No. 7,058,223, No. 8,010,988, No. 8,020,187, No. 8,205,237, No. 8,640,179 and No.8,656,4-41) are based on a patent application filed in 2000 and have patent terms extending into 2023. Since the acquisition of the Cox Patent Portfolio in February 2013, we were issued three additional patents by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office including U.S. Patent No. 8,640,179 entitled “Method for Using Extracted Features From An Electronic Work”, U.S. Patent No. 8,656,441 entitled “Systems for Using Extracted Features From and Electronic Work” and U.S. Patent No. 8,782,726 entitled “Method for taking action based on a request related to an electronic media work”. The claims in the aforementioned three additional patents are generally directed towards systems and methods for using extracted features from electronic works to identify actions to be performed including, among others, inserting an advertisement or a link to a World Wide Web site for a variety of purposes.

There has been significant growth in the uploading of media content to the Internet over the past decade. The ability to identify content being uploaded to protect against copyright infringement, combined with the ability to facilitate e-commerce transactions based on the identification and tagging of such content is at the core of the patents. We plan on further developing the technology with Dr. Cox and pursuing licensing opportunities for these technologies.

Dr. Cox is currently a Professor at the University of Copenhagen and the University College of London where he is head of its Media Futures Group. Dr. Cox was formerly a member of the Technical Staff at AT&T Bell Labs and a Fellow at NEC Research Institute. He is a Fellow of the IEEE, the IET (formerly IEE), and the British Computer Society and is a member of the UK Computing Research Committee. He was founding co-editor in chief of the IEE Proc. On Information Security and was an associate editor of the IEEE Trans. on Information Forensics and Security. He is co-author of a book entitled "Digital Watermarking" and its second edition "Digital Watermarking and Steganography". He is an inventor on 35 United States Patents.

QoS Family of Patents

We also own five (5) additional patents, besides our Remote Power Patent, the Mirror Worlds Patent Portfolio and the Cox Patent Portfolio, covering various methodologies that provide for allocating bandwidth and establishing QoS for delay sensitive data, such as voice, on packet data networks. QoS issues become important when data networks carry packets that contain audio and video which may require priority over data packets traveling over the same network. Covered within these patents are also technologies that establish bi-directional communications control channels between network-connected devices in order to support advanced applications on traditional data networks. We believe that potential licensees of the technologies contained in these patents would be vendors deploying applications that require the low latency transport of delay sensitive data such as video over data networks.

Potential Patent Acquisitions or Strategic Relationships

We continually seek to acquire additional intellectual property assets in order to develop, commercialize, license or otherwise monetize such intellectual property. In 2013, we acquired thirteen (13) additional patents as a result of the acquisitions of the Cox Patent Portfolio and the Mirror Worlds Patent Portfolio (see Note D[2] to our audited financial statements for the year ended December 31, 2013 included in this Prospectus). We continually review opportunities to acquire or license additional intellectual property assets from individual inventors, technology companies and others for the purpose of pursuing licensing opportunities related to our existing intellectual property portfolio or otherwise. In addition, we may enter into strategic relationships with such parties to develop, commercialize, license or otherwise monetize their intellectual property. The form of such relationships may vary depending upon the opportunity and may include, among other things, a strategic investment in such third party, the provision of financing to such third party or the formation of a joint venture for the purpose of monetizing such third party's intellectual property assets.

Network-1 Strategy

Our strategy is to capitalize on our intellectual property assets by entering into licensing arrangements with third parties including manufacturers and users that utilize our intellectual property's proprietary technologies as well as any additional proprietary technologies covered by patents which may be acquired by us in the future. Our current acquisition strategy is to focus on acquiring high quality patents which management believes have the potential to generate significant licensing opportunities as has been the case with our Remote Power Patent. Our Remote Power Patent has generated licensing revenue in excess of \$65,000,000 from May 2007 through June 30, 2014. In addition, we may enter into third party strategic relationships with inventors and patent owners to assist in the development and monetization of their patent technologies. We also seek to enter into licensing arrangements with users of our proprietary technologies, including corporate entities and educational institutions who benefit from our patented technologies.

In connection with our activities relating to the protection of our intellectual property assets, or the intellectual property assets of third parties with whom we have strategic relationships in the future, it may be necessary to assert patent infringement claims against third parties whom we believe are infringing our patents or those of our strategic partners. We are currently involved in several litigations to protect our patents including our Remote Power Patent, the Mirror Worlds Patent Portfolio and the Cox Patent Portfolio (see "Legal Proceedings" at pages 32-33 hereof). We have in the past successfully asserted litigation to protect our Remote Power Patent and have also been successful in defending proceedings at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (see Legal Proceedings at pages 34-35 of this Prospectus).

Licensing – Remote Power Patent

To date we have entered into sixteen (16) license agreements with respect to our Remote Power Patent. Licensees of our Remote Power Patent include major data network equipment manufacturers and others as follows:

- Cisco Systems, Inc. and Cisco Linksys
- Motorola Solutions, Inc.
- Microsemi Corporation
- NEC Corporation
- Extreme Networks, Inc.
- Adtran, Inc.
- Netgear, Inc.
- Allied Telesis, Inc.
- Transition Networks, Inc.
- Enterasys Networks, Inc.
- GarretCom, Inc.
- Foundry Networks, Inc.
- D-Link Corporation and D-Link Systems, Inc.
- SEH Technology, Inc.
- BRG Precision Products, Inc.
- Buffalo Technology (USA), Inc.

We believe that additional potential licensees for our Remote Power Patent include, among others, Wireless Local Area Networking (WLAN) equipment manufacturers, Local Area Networking (LAN) equipment manufacturers, Voice Over IP Telephony (VOIP) equipment manufacturers, and network camera manufacturers. In addition, we believe that additional potential licensees include users of the equipment embodying the PoE technology covered by our Remote Power Patent, including corporate, educational and federal, state and local government users, as we believe that they are significant beneficiaries of the technologies covered by our Remote Power Patent.

Cisco License Agreement and July 2010 Settlement

In July 2010, we settled our patent litigation pending in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Tyler Division, against Adtran, Inc, Cisco Systems, Inc. and Cisco-Linksys, LLC, (collectively, “Cisco”), Enterasys Networks, Inc., Extreme Networks, Inc., Foundry Networks, Inc., and 3Com Corporation, Inc. As part of the settlement, Adtran, Cisco, Enterasys, Extreme Networks and Foundry Networks each entered into a settlement agreement with us and entered into non-exclusive licenses for our Remote Power Patent (the “Licensed Defendants”). Under the terms of the licenses, the Licensed Defendants paid us aggregate upfront payments of approximately \$32 million and also agreed to license our Remote Power Patent for its full term, which expires in March 2020. In accordance with our Settlement and License Agreement, dated May 25, 2011 (the “Agreement”), which expanded upon the July 2010 agreement, Cisco is obligated to pay us royalties (which began in the first quarter of 2011) based on its sales of PoE products up to maximum royalty payments per year of \$8 million through 2015 and \$9 million per year thereafter for the remaining term of the patent. The royalty payments are subject to certain conditions including the continued validity of our Remote Power Patent, and the actual royalty amounts received may be less than the caps stated above as was the case for 2013 and prior years. Under the terms of the Agreement, if we grant other licenses with lower royalty rates to third parties (as defined in the Agreement), Cisco shall be entitled to the benefit of the lower royalty rates provided it agrees to the material terms of such other license. Under the terms of the Agreement, we have certain obligations to Cisco and if we materially breach such terms, Cisco will be entitled to stop paying royalties to us. This would have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations. For more details about the settlement, please see our Current Reports on Form 8-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on July 20, 2010 and June 1, 2011, respectively.

Significant Licensees

For the year ended December 31, 2013, Cisco accounted for 77% of our revenue and 92% of our revenue for the six months period ended June 30, 2014. It is anticipated that a few of our licensees will continue to constitute a significant portion of our revenue for the foreseeable future.

Legal Representation

Russ, August & Kabat provides legal services to us with respect to our pending patent litigation filed in April 2014 against Google and YouTube in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York relating to certain patents within our Cox Patent Portfolio (see “Legal Proceedings” at pages 32-33 of this Prospectus). The terms of our agreement with Russ, August & Kabat provides for legal fees on a full contingency basis ranging from 15% to 30% of the net recovery (after deduction of expenses) depending on the stage of the proceeding in which the result (settlement or judgment) is achieved. We are responsible for all of the expenses incurred with respect to this litigation.

Dovel & Luner, LLP provides legal services to us with respect to our patent litigation commenced in May 2013 against Apple, Inc., Microsoft, Inc. and other major vendors of document system software and computer systems in the United States District Court of Texas, Tyler Division for infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,006,227 which is part of our Mirror Worlds Patent Portfolio (see Note D[2] to our financial statements for the quarterly period ended June 30, 2014 included in this Prospectus). The terms of our agreement with Dovel & Luner LLP provide for legal fees on a contingency basis ranging from 25% to 40% of the net recovery (after deduction of expenses) depending upon the stage of proceeding in which a result (settlement or judgment) is achieved, subject to certain agreed upon contingency fee caps depending upon the amount of the net recovery. We are responsible for a certain portion of the expenses incurred with respect to the litigation.

Dovel & Luner, LLP provides legal services to us with respect to our pending patent litigation filed in September 2011 against sixteen (16) data networking equipment manufacturers in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Tyler relating to our Remote Power Patent (see Note D[3] to our financial statements for the quarterly period ended June 30, 2014 included in this Prospectus). The terms of our agreement with Dovel & Luner LLP essentially provide for legal fees on a full contingency basis ranging from 12.5% to 35% of the net recovery (after deduction for expenses) depending on the stage of the proceeding in which a result (settlement or judgment) is achieved. We are responsible for a certain portion of the expenses incurred with respect to the litigation. During the year ended December 31, 2013 we incurred legal fees of \$206,000 with respect to this matter.

Dovel & Luner, LLP also provided legal services to us with respect to our litigation settled in July 2010 against Cisco and several other major data networking equipment manufacturers relating to our Remote Power Patent (see Note D[4] to our financial statements for the quarterly period ended June 30, 2014 included in this Prospectus). The terms of our agreement with Dovel & Luner, LLP provided for us to pay legal fees of up to a maximum aggregate cash payment of \$1.5 million plus a contingency fee of up to 24% (based on the settlement being achieved at the trial stage). Accordingly, we have a continuing obligation to pay Dovel & Luner LLP (including local counsel) a contingency fee of 24% with respect to the ongoing royalties we receive from Cisco. During the year ended December 31, 2013 we incurred total contingency fees of approximately \$1,611,000 to Dovel & Luner, LLP with respect to this matter (which included legal fees of local counsel).

Competition

With respect to our ability to acquire additional intellectual property assets or enter into strategic relationships with third parties to monetize their intellectual property assets, we face considerable competition from other companies, many of which have significantly greater financial and other resources than we have. The patent licensing and enforcement industry has grown over the past several years and there has been a material increase in the number of companies seeking to acquire intellectual property assets from third parties or to provide financing to third parties seeking to monetize their intellectual property. Entities including, among others, Acacia Research Corporation (NASDAQ:ACTG), Vringo, Inc. (NYSE MKT:VRNG), Intellectual Ventures, VirnetX Holdings Corp. (NYSE MKT:VHC), Marathon Patent Group, Inc. (NASDAQ:MARA) and RPX Corporation (NASDAQ:RPXC) seek to acquire intellectual property or partner with third parties to license or enforce intellectual property rights. In addition, we also compete with strategic corporate buyers with respect to the acquisition of intellectual property assets. It is expected that others will enter this market as well. Many of these competitors have significantly greater financial and human resources than us.

We may also compete with litigation funding firms such as Burford Capital Limited, Fortress Investment Group, Gerchen Keller Capital, LLC, Parabellum Capital LLC and Betham Capital LLC, venture capital firms and hedge funds for intellectual property acquisitions and licensing opportunities. Many of these competitors also have greater financial resources and human resources than us.

The industries and markets covered by our intellectual property are characterized by intense competition and rapidly changing business conditions, customer requirements and technologies. Other companies may develop competing technologies that offer better or less expensive alternatives to PoE (covered by our Remote Power Patent) or the technologies covered by our other intellectual property assets. Such competing technologies may adversely impact our licensing royalties. Moreover, technological advances or entirely different approaches developed by one or more of our competitors or adopted by various standards groups could render our Remote Power Patent and our other intellectual property assets obsolete, less marketable or unenforceable.

Employees and Consultants

As of the date of this Prospectus, we had three full time employees and one consultant providing monthly services to us.

Description of Property

We currently lease office space in New York City at a base rent of \$3,610 per month under a lease which expires in November 2014. On June 16, 2011, we entered into a four-year lease commencing July 18, 2011 to rent office space, consisting of approximately 2,400 square feet, for offices in New Canaan, Connecticut. In accordance with the lease, we are obligated to pay a base rent of \$6,400 per month for the first two years, \$6,800 per month for the third year and \$7,000 per month for the fourth year. The base rent is subject to annual adjustments to reflect increases in real estate taxes and operating expenses. On May 15, 2014, Mirror Worlds Technologies, LLC, our wholly-owned subsidiary, entered into a one year lease, at a base rent of \$620 per month, to rent office space consisting of approximately 420 square feet in Tyler, Texas. On January 7, 2014, the lease was renewed for a fifteen (15) month period expiring on April 30, 2015.

LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

On April 4, 2014, we initiated litigation against Google and YouTube in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York for infringement of several of our patents within our Cox Patent Portfolio which relate to the identification of media content on the Internet. The lawsuit alleges that Google and YouTube have infringed and continue to infringe certain of our patents by making, using, selling and offering to sell unlicensed systems and related products and services, which include YouTube's Content ID system.

On May 23, 2013, through our wholly-owned subsidiary Mirror Worlds Technologies, LLC, we initiated patent litigation in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Tyler Division, against Apple, Inc., Microsoft, Inc., Hewlett-Packard Company, Lenovo Group Ltd., Lenovo (United States), Inc., Dell, Inc., Best Buy Co., Inc., Samsu