

respect to the '729 Patent are still pending, and we intend to pursue them vigorously. With the exception of these five more recently amended claims, which have not yet progressed beyond preliminary reexamination examiner review, all of the claims from all three patents asserted in the 2010 Complaint have either been canceled or otherwise found unpatentable by the PTAB.

On January 30, 2014, three weeks after the PTAB hearing that resulted in the rejection of all of Mr. Morley's and REM's remaining claims of the patents in the 2010 Complaint, Mr. Morley and REM filed a complaint against us and against Jack Dorsey and Mr. McKelvey, in the District Court, alleging that the formation of Square and the development of our card reader and decoding technologies constituted, among other things, breach of an alleged oral joint venture, fraud, negligent misrepresentation, civil conspiracy, unjust enrichment, and misappropriation of trade secrets, as well as other related claims (2014 Complaint). Mr. Morley contends as part of his alleged oral joint venture claim, among others, that he was an equal partner with Mr. Dorsey and Mr. McKelvey in the business enterprise that ultimately evolved into Square, and that Mr. Dorsey and Mr. McKelvey breached their alleged oral joint venture agreement with Mr. Morley by excluding him from ownership in Square. Mr. Morley claims that to the extent the defendants contend that no joint venture was formed, Mr. McKelvey and Mr. Dorsey committed fraud, negligent misrepresentation, and/or fraudulent nondisclosure. The 2014 Complaint also alleges infringement of another patent related to the '248, '394, and '729 Patents, U.S. Patent No. 8,584,946 ('946 Patent). Mr. Morley is seeking a judgment and order that Square, Mr. Dorsey, and Mr. McKelvey hold ownership of Square in constructive trust for Mr. Morley, as well as a variety of additional damages, injunctive relief, royalties, and correction of inventorship of certain of our patents.

Even prior to the filing of the 2014 Complaint, on December 31, 2013, we had filed a petition at the PTAB requesting inter partes review (IPR) proceedings to invalidate the '946 Patent. On July 7, 2015, the PTAB issued a decision on the IPR, rejecting 12 of the 17 claims of the '946 patent, including all independent claims, to be invalid based on prior art. Our request for rehearing on the invalidity of the remaining five claims is currently pending at the PTAB. We moved to consolidate the 2014 Complaint with the 2010 Complaint (the Complaints), and the District Court granted our motion on July 16, 2014. We moved to dismiss certain claims as time barred under California and Delaware law, and the District Court denied the motion on October 16, 2014, applying Missouri law. We moved to stay counts of the 2014 Complaint related to alleged infringement of the '946 Patent and inventorship of certain of our patents, pending the ongoing PTO proceedings, and on April 2, 2015, the District Court granted our motion to stay. The District Court has issued a scheduling order that sets forth the current expected schedule of important events in the proceedings, but no assurances can be given that the schedule will not change. We are vigorously defending against the Complaints. Given the early stage of the proceedings, we cannot reliably determine the potential liability that could result from this matter.

Additionally, we are involved in a class action lawsuit concerning independent contractors in connection with our Caviar business. On March 19, 2015, Jeffrey Levin, on behalf of a putative nationwide class, filed a lawsuit in the Northern District of California against our wholly owned subsidiary, Caviar, Inc., which, as amended, alleges that Caviar misclassified Mr. Levin and other similarly situated couriers as independent contractors and, in doing so, violated various provisions of

146

Table of Contents

the California Labor Code and California Business and Professions Code by requiring them to pay various business expenses that should have been borne by Caviar. Mr. Levin is also seeking an award of penalties pursuant to the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, on behalf of the putative class. On June 30, 2015, we filed a Motion to Compel Individual Arbitration and Motion to Dismiss the amended complaint. Our motion was heard on August 4, 2015, and we are now awaiting a written decision on the motion from the court. Regardless of the outcome, we will continue to vigorously defend against Mr. Levin's claims. Given the early stage of these proceedings, it is not yet possible to reliably determine any potential liability that could result from this matter.

In addition, from time to time, we are involved in various other litigation matters and disputes arising in the ordinary course of business. While it is not feasible to predict or determine the ultimate outcome of these matters, we believe that none of our current legal proceedings will have a material adverse effect on our business.

147

Table of Contents

MANAGEMENT