

Applied Minerals, Inc.
Form 10-K
March 31, 2010

UNITED STATES
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, DC 20549

FORM 10-K

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

For the year ended December 31, 2009

Commission file number: 000-31380

APPLIED MINERALS, INC.

(Exact name of registrant as specified in its charter)

Delaware
(State or other jurisdiction of
incorporation or organization)

82-0096527

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

110 Greene Street – Ste 1101, New York, NY
(Address of principal executive offices)

10012
(Zip Code)

(800) 356-6463

Issuer's telephone number, including area code

Indicate by check mark if the registrant is a well-known seasoned issuer, as defined in Rule 405 of the Securities Act.

YES NOX

Indicate by check mark if the registrant is not required to file reports pursuant to Section 13 or 15(d) of the Act:

YES NOX

Indicate by check whether the registrant: (1) has filed all reports required to be filed by Section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 during the preceding 12 months (or for such shorter period that the registrant was required to file such reports), and (2) has been subject to such filing requirements for the past 90 days.

YES NOX

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

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

Edgar Filing: Applied Minerals, Inc. - Form 10-K

Large Accelerated Filer	Accelerated Filer	Non-accelerated Filer	Smaller Reporting Company
----------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------	------------------------------

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a shell company (as defined in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act).

YES NOX

The aggregate market value of the voting and non-voting common equity held by non-affiliates of the registrant on March 29, 2010, based on the last sales price on the OTC Bulletin Board on that date, was approximately \$58,616,335. The number of shares of the registrant's common stock, \$0.001 par value per share, outstanding as of December 31, 2009 was 69,781,351.

DOCUMENTS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

The registrant intends to file a definitive proxy statement pursuant to Regulation 14A within 120 days of the end of the fiscal year ended December 31, 2009 (the "2010 Proxy Statement"). Portions of such proxy statement are incorporated by reference into Part III of this Form 10-K. With the exception of such portions of the 2010 Proxy Statement expressly incorporated by into this Annual Report on Form 10-K by reference, such document shall not be deemed filed as part of this Annual Report on Form 10-K.

APPLIED MINERALS, INC. AND SUBSIDIARY
YEAR 2009 ANNUAL REPORT ON FORM 10-K
TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page(s)
PART I	
Item 1. Business	3
Item 1A. Risk Factors	8
Item 1B. Unresolved Staff Comments	11
Item 2. Properties	11
Item 3. Legal Proceedings	13
PART II	
Item 4. Market Price for the Registrant's Common Equity, Related Stockholders Matters and Issuer Purchases of Equity Securities	17
Item 5. Selected Financial Data	19
Item 6. Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operation	19
Item 6A. Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures About Market Risk	26
Item 7. Financial Statements and Supplementary Data	26
Item 8. Changes in and Disagreements with Accountants on Accounting and Financial Disclosure	26
Item 8A. Controls and Procedures	26
Item 8B. Other Information	28
PART III	
Item 9. Directors and Executive Officers and Corporate Governance	29
Item 10. Executive Compensation	29
Item 11. Security Ownership of Certain Beneficial Owners and Management and Related Stockholder Matters	29
Item 12. Certain Relationships and Related Transactions, and Director Independence	29
Item 13. Principal Accounting Fees and Services	29
Item 14. Exhibits	30
PART IV	
Item 15. Exhibits, Financial Statement Schedules and Reports on Form 8-K	32

NOTE REGARDING FORWARD LOOKING STATEMENTS

This Annual Report on Form 10-K contains "forward-looking statements" within the meaning of Section 27A of the Securities Act of 1933 and Section 21E of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. These forward-looking statements are based on our current expectations, assumptions, estimates and projections about our business and our industry. Words such as "believe," "anticipate," "expect," "intend," "plan," "will," "may," and other similar expressions identify forward-looking statements. In addition, any statements that refer to expectations, projections or other characterizations of future events or circumstances are forward-looking statements. These forward-looking statements are subject to certain risks and uncertainties that could cause actual results to differ materially from those reflected in the forward-looking statements. Factors that might cause such a difference include, but are not limited to, those discussed in the section of this Annual Report entitled "1A. RISK FACTORS."

PART I

ITEM 1. BUSINESS

HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE COMPANY

Applied Minerals, Inc. ("the Company"), formerly known as Atlas Mining Company, was incorporated in the state of Idaho in 1924 and reincorporated in the state of Delaware on October 30, 2009. The Company was originally formed for the purpose of exploring and developing the Atlas Mine, a consolidation of several patented mining claims located in the Coeur d'Alene Mining District near Mullan, Idaho. The Company eventually became inactive as a result of low silver prices. In September 1997, the Company became active again. During the years ended December 31, 2008 and 2007, the Company provided shaft sinking, underground mine development and mine labor primarily to companies in the mining and civil industries. Historically, the Company's contract mining operation have been its sole source of revenue and income.

We operated a contract mining business under the trade name Atlas Fausett Contracting ("AFC"). AFC was engaged in exploration and mine development as well as preparatory work such as site evaluation, feasibility studies, trouble-shooting and consultation. AFC's projects included all types of underground mine development, rehabilitation and diamond drilling. At December 31, 2008, we discontinued our contract mining efforts due to economic conditions and the desire to concentrate our efforts on commercializing the halloysite clay deposit at the Dragon Mine. There are no plans to resume contract mining activities.

The activities at our Dragon Mine property, located in Juab County, Utah, were suspended in October 2007 when previous management determined that both a resource survey and an appropriate processing facility were needed before the property could be successfully commercialized. In 2008, a geological consulting firm was hired by us to both carry out a detailed geological review of the property and develop an appropriate method by which to process the mineral resource. Geological work has been completed on certain parts of the property and continues on others.

Beginning in 2009, we began processing material from the mine and distributing samples to potential customers as part of a preliminary marketing program. In November 2009, we signed a Memorandum of Understanding with KaMin Performance Minerals LLC ("KaMin") upon which a binding toll manufacturing contract is to be developed.

The Dragon Mine property contains halloysite, kaolinite, alunite and other minerals located underground and in waste piles that are the result of previous mining operations. The geological resource survey being conducted on the Dragon Mine has involved both the assessment of the cores of an extensive borehole drill program and the analysis of samples taken from the five waste piles located at the mine site. The survey has included X-ray diffraction analysis to determine the levels of halloysite, kaolinite and other minerals found in the resource. Initial studies have indicated that conventional processing may be used to separate the halloysite and kaolinite fractions from alunite and other minerals found in the resource. The geology of the deposit shows alterations of feldspar identified along side the presence of monzanite, halloysite and kaolinite. Purer halloysite found at the mine has been identified along side the presence of iron ore. The morphology of the halloysite identified at the Dragon Mine, as determined by Scanning Electron Microscopy (“SEM”) analysis, demonstrates the existence of both lath-like and tubular formations. The kaolinite present at the Dragon Mine has been determined to possess a highly crystalline structure.

Management believes that the clay resource found at the Dragon Mine property possesses, among other things, certain structural and mineralogical characteristics that may possibly add functionality to applications such as, but not limited to, the controlled release of biological and chemical agents, polymer-related strengtheners and fire retardants, oil field drilling minerals, catalyst carriers, filtration technologies, hydrogen storage for fuel cells and cosmetics. For certain of the aforementioned applications, management believes the Dragon Mine resource has the potential to serve as a more effective alternative to the materials upon which these current technologies are established. Other above-mentioned applications are being developed to specifically utilize the structural characteristics of the clay resource.

Halloysite clay has been identified as a value-added filler for use in polymer-based nanocomposites. The global nanocomposites market is expected to grow to \$4.0 billion by 2015. According to BCC Research, clay-filled nanocomposites are expected to represent 47% of the nanocomposites market by 2010. The U.S. Department of the Navy, represented by the Naval Research Lab (NRL”), has patented a technology that provides for the controlled release of active agents using inorganic tubules such as halloysite clay. In February 2010, The Department of the Navy gave us notice that it intends to license to us a revocable, nonassignable, co-exclusive license to practice the (i) field of use of building materials which means the use of halloysite microtubules for the elution of any and all substances from them as a biocide and (ii) the field of use of paint which means the use of halloysite microtubules for the elution of any and all substances in paints, sealers, fillers, varnishes, shellac, polyurethane coatings, and any and all “paint-like” coatings applied in liquid form to any and all surfaces for the beautification or protection of surfaces in structures or components thereof, including but not limited to, buildings, marine structures (including boats), furniture and other normally "painted" materials in the United States. We believe both the building products and paint industries provide attractive market opportunities in which to utilize the licenses described above. The U.S. Navy has also patented a technology that permits a controlled release of an active agent as an anti-scaling treatment for environments such as oil wells, an application opportunity we are considering pursuing.

In 2009, the Company entered into a development agreement with Yuri M. Lvov, Ph.D., a professor of chemistry at Louisiana Tech University and the T.C. Pipes Eminent Endowed Chair on Micro and Nanosystems at the Institute for Micromanufacturing (LaTech). The scope of the agreement includes, among other things, the development of the Dragon Mine halloysite as part of an anti-corrosion paint application in addition to the development of other emerging applications. In 2009, the Company entered into a consulting agreement with Amit Dharia, PhD, President of Transmit Technology Group, LLC of Austin, TX. Dr. Dharia has over 23 years of experience in the plastics industry focused primarily on R&D and new product development. Dr. Dharia is advising the Company with regard to its pursuit of opportunities within the polymer composite market.

Processed clay samples have been distributed to potential customers who have requested halloysite and/or halloysite-kaolinite mixtures. A number of advanced applications to which the Company plans to market its mineral resource are currently using plate-like structured clays that must undergo expensive exfoliation process to achieve proper functionality. The tubular morphology of the Dragon Mine resource does not require such an exfoliation process to achieve similar or, in many instances, greater functionality.

In addition to certain advanced applications previously mentioned, we believe the Dragon Mine resource may also be marketed to certain established, low-tech applications such as, but not limited to, fine porcelain, bone china, high-performance advanced technical ceramics, paint fillers, suspension agents, animal feed, cement hardeners, and food and pharmaceutical additives. Markets, such as fine porcelain and bone china, would likely require the Dragon Mine clay resource be processed for increased brightness and reduced presence of titanium whereas applications, such as a cement hardener, would require a relatively unprocessed version of the Dragon Mine resource. Management, as part of its overall business strategy, will continually assess the economic feasibility of pursuing these markets.

Management believes that both existing and potential applications that utilize the Dragon Mine resource will require varying grades of clay to satisfy the unique technical requirements of each application. Some applications may require pure halloysite, composed of tubular and/or lath-shaped particles while other applications may require a grade of clay consisting of a specific halloysite-kaolinite ratio. The determination of the appropriate grade of clay will likely require significant technical cooperation between the Company and the developer of the related application. As previously mentioned, the Company signed a Memorandum of Understanding with KaMin upon which a binding toll manufacturing contract is to be developed.

CONTRACT MINING

AFC was engaged in exploration and mine development as well as preparatory work such as site evaluation, feasibility studies, trouble-shooting and consultation. AFC's projects included all types of underground mine development, rehabilitation and diamond drilling. At December 31, 2008 we discontinued our contract mining efforts due to economic conditions and the desire to concentrate efforts on commercializing the halloysite clay deposit at the Dragon Mine. There are no plans to resume the contract mining business.

DRAGON MINE

The Dragon Mine is located in the Tintic District of north central Utah. The property is 2 miles southwest the town of Eureka which, in turn, is approximately 75 miles southwest of Salt Lake City. The mine sits on approximately 230 acres.

From 1949 through 1976, Filtrol Corporation operated the Dragon Mine. To the best of our knowledge, Filtrol mined approximately 1.35 million tons of clay valued at approximately \$50 million for use as an input for a petroleum-cracking catalyst product. The mine was idle from 1977 until we leased it in 2001. We purchased the property for \$500,000 in 2005.

Until October 2007 we were focused on commercializing the Dragon Mine. Such activities were suspended by previous management in October 2007 due to, among other things, the lack of both a comprehensive resource survey of the Dragon Mine and an effective mineral processing system. In 2008, the Company retained an internationally recognized geological consulting firm to (i) conduct a geological review of the 230 acre Dragon Mine deposit and (ii) develop a system by which to process the potential mineral production of the mine. As of the date of the filing of this report, the Company has not received a final report regarding either a measurement of the mine's resource reserve or the development of a processing system. Prior to the suspension of operations at the mine in October 2007, we focused our marketing efforts primarily on the introduction of the Dragon Mine's clay resource to the controlled-release application and polymer filler markets.

We do not have "reserves" as defined in Guide 7 ("Description of Property by Issuers Engaged or To Be Engaged in Significant Mining Operations"), either proven or probable. A reserve is defined as that part of a mineral deposit that could be economically and legally extracted or produced at the time of the reserve determination. A proven reserve is a reserve for which (a) quantity is computed from dimensions revealed in drill holes; grade and/or quality are computed from the results of detailed sampling and (b) the sites for inspection, sampling and measurement are spaced so closely and the geologic character is so well defined that size, shape, depth and mineral content of reserves are well-established.

A probable reserve is one for which quantity and grade and/or quality are computed from information similar to that used for proven (measure) reserves, but the sites for inspection, sampling, and measurement are farther apart or are otherwise less adequately spaced. The degree of assurance, although lower than that for proven (measured) reserves, is high enough to assume continuity between points of observation.

The geological consulting firm hired by the Company will ultimately produce a detailed resource survey of the Dragon Mine that will provide the Company with volume figures for certain minerals present at the mine. Volumes, if any, for both halloysite and kaolinite will be provided. A reserve figure will be provided if the resource satisfies the definition of either proven or probable. The primary markets into which the Company hopes to sell its mineral resource are developing and, therefore, have little historical price data. This fact may prevent a reserve figure from being determined.

Our exploration expenses for the period ending December 31, 2009 and 2008 were \$1,299,753 and \$1,356,659 respectively, on the halloysite clay project.

In December 2008 we entered into a Management Agreement with Material Advisors LLC ("Manager"), a management services company, to provide services including, but not limited to, the development of the Dragon Mine and the marketing of its halloysite clay deposit.

PROCESSING

The resource at the Dragon Mine is a mixture of a number of minerals including, but not limited to, halloysite, kaolinite and alunite. During 2005 and 2006, the Company invested in the development of a processing plant at the site of the Dragon Mine that was designed to separate tubular halloysite from non-halloysite material. The plant utilized an air-based processing technique. This method was ultimately deemed inadequate for the mineralogy of the Dragon Mine resource. As of the date of the filing of this Annual Report on Form 10-K, we signed a Memorandum of Understanding with KaMin upon which a binding toll manufacturing contract is to be developed.

MARKETING AND SALES EFFORTS

From March 2006 until December 2008, Ronald Price was a director of Applied Minerals, Inc. and the President and CEO of NanoClay & Technologies, Inc., our wholly owned subsidiary focused on the marketing of our halloysite resource. He distributed samples of Dragon Mine halloysite to a number of companies. Only one sale of \$900 was made during his tenure. See "Litigation" for information regarding the NaturalNano transaction in 2004 and the restatement related to this transaction that was recognized in 2006. The NanoClay & Technologies, Inc. subsidiary was administratively dissolved in December 2008. Beginning in 2009, current management began contacting and distributing samples of the Dragon Mine resource material to companies that have expressed a commercial interest in the material. As the date of this report, management continues to focus on these marketing efforts.

GOVERNMENTAL REGULATION

DRAGON MINE

Utah requires a permit to handle explosives, and we maintain such a license under the U.S. Bureau of Alcohol Tobacco and Firearms (ATF, USC18, Chapter 40). As of December 31, 2009, we had such a license. We have conducted, and may continue to conduct, exploration activities at the Dragon Mine. The Utah Department of Natural Resources sets the guidelines for Exploration, and other mineral related activities based on provisions of the Mined Land Reclamation Act, Title 40-8, Utah Code Annotated 1953, as amended, and the General Rules and Rules of Practice and Procedures, R647-1 through R647-5. We have received the proper permit from them. We carry a Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA) license (#4202383) for this property and report as required to this agency. We currently have a permit that allows for small mining operations at the Dragon Mine and are in the process of obtaining a permit that will allow us to conduct large mining operations at the property.

EMPLOYEES

As of December 31, 2009, Applied Minerals, Inc. and its subsidiaries had 12 employees. None of our employees were covered by a collective bargaining agreement, we have never experienced a work stoppage, and we considered our labor relations to be excellent.

ITEM 1A. RISK FACTORS

RISK FACTORS

AN INVESTMENT IN OUR SECURITIES IS VERY SPECULATIVE AND INVOLVES A HIGH DEGREE OF RISK. YOU SHOULD CAREFULLY CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING RISK FACTORS, ALONG WITH THE OTHER MATTERS REFERRED TO IN THIS ANNUAL REPORT, BEFORE YOU DECIDE TO BUY OUR SECURITIES. IF YOU DECIDE TO BUY OUR SECURITIES, YOU SHOULD BE ABLE TO AFFORD A COMPLETE LOSS OF YOUR INVESTMENT.

As of the date of filing this report, the Company has not commercialized the Dragon Mine and, historically, had to rely on cash flow generated both from its contract mining business and the sale of stock to fund its operations. The contract mining business was discontinued in December 2008. At the current time the Company has obligations in excess of its liquid assets. If the Company is unable to fund its operations through the commercialization of the Dragon Mine, the sale of equity and/or debt or a combination of both, it may have to file bankruptcy. The Company is currently seeking additional financing though there is no assurance that it will be able to do so.

ABILITY TO CONTINUE TO OPERATE AS A GOING CONCERN

At December 31, 2009 and 2008, the Company had accumulated deficits of \$26,775,696 and \$20,009,496, respectively, in addition to limited cash and unprofitable operations. For the year ended December 31, 2009 and 2008, the Company sustained net losses before discontinued operations of \$6,701,498 and \$6,215,745, respectively. These factors, among others, indicate that the Company may be unable to continue as a going concern for a reasonable period of time. The Company's continuation as a going concern is contingent upon its ability to obtain additional financing and to generate revenue and cash flow to meet its obligations on a timely basis. Management's plans in this regard are to raise equity financing as required. There are no assurances we will be able to obtaining financing on acceptable terms if at all.

NO REVENUE HAS BEEN GENERATED FROM THE SALE OF HALLOYSITE CLAY

Through December 31, 2008, our only source of revenues from operations, with minor exceptions, has been the Contract Mining business. The Contract Mining business was closed on December 31, 2008 and will not be restarted. The Company generated no revenue from the sale of halloysite clay in 2009 and one cannot assume that any revenue will be generated from the sale of halloysite clay in 2010 or beyond.

COMMERCIALIZATION OF THE DRAGON MINE

Through October 2007, we were engaged in the commercialization of the Dragon Mine clay deposit, located in the state of Utah. Such activities were suspended in October 2007 when previous management determined that the lack of both a detailed resource analysis and an adequate mineral processing system would prevent a successful commercialization of the mine. In 2008, the Company engaged the services of an internationally recognized geological consulting firm to both conduct a detailed assessment of the Dragon Mine and develop an adequate processing system. At the time of the completion of this report, the geological work on the Dragon Mine was still ongoing and we signed a Memorandum of Understanding with KaMin upon which a binding toll manufacturing contract is to be developed. If a commercial source of clay is not identified or a definitive agreement with KaMin is not reached, the Company's ability to achieve commercial success would be materially impaired. Additionally, the Company's inability to obtain a permit for the allowance of large mining operations at its Dragon Mine property could materially impair its ability to successfully commercialize the property.

WE HAVE EXPERIENCED CONTINUED, ANNUAL OPERATING LOSSES SINCE SEPTEMBER 1997.

We have experienced annual operating losses since our reactivation in September 1997. As of December 31, 2009, we had an accumulated deficit of \$26,775,696. We cannot assure that our proposed products, if fully developed, can be successfully marketed or that we will ever achieve significant revenues or profit margins.

THERE IS COMPREHENSIVE FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL REGULATION OF THE EXPLORATION INDUSTRY THAT COULD HAVE A NEGATIVE IMPACT OUR MINING OPERATIONS.

Exploration operations are subject to federal, state and local laws relating to the protection of the environment, including laws regulating removal of natural resources from the ground and the discharge of materials into the environment. Exploration operations are also subject to federal, state and local laws and regulations which seek to maintain health and safety standards by regulating the design and use of exploration methods and equipment. We require various permits from government bodies for exploration operations to be conducted including a large mine permit from the state of Utah. We cannot assure you that such permits will be received. No assurance can be given that environmental standards imposed by federal, state or local authorities will not be changed or that any such changes would not have material adverse effects on our activities. Moreover, compliance with such laws may cause substantial delays or require capital outlays in excess of those anticipated, thus causing an adverse effect on our financial position. Additionally, we may be subject to liability for pollution or other environmental damages that we may elect not to insure against due to prohibitive premium costs and other reasons. Management is aware of the necessity of obtaining proper permits prior to conducting any exploration activity.

FAIR MARKET VALUE

We have recorded our properties and equipment held for sale at what we believe to be fair market value. We are actively seeking to sell such properties and equipment. There can be no assurance we can sell such properties and equipment at the value recorded, if at all.

APPLICABILITY OF "PENNY STOCK RULES" TO BROKER-DEALER SALES OF OUR COMMON STOCK COULD HAVE A NEGATIVE EFFECT ON THE LIQUIDITY AND MARKET PRICE OF OUR COMMON STOCK.

Our common stock is not quoted on any exchange or on NASDAQ, and no other exemptions currently apply. Therefore, the SEC "penny stock" rules govern the trading in our common stock. Before a broker-dealer can sell a penny stock, SEC rules require the firm to first approve the customer for the transaction and receive from the customer a written agreement to the transaction. The firm must furnish the customer a document describing the risks of investing in penny stocks. The firm must tell the customer the current market quotation, if any, for the penny stock and the compensation the firm and its broker will receive for the trade. Finally, the firm must send monthly account statements showing the market value of each penny stock held in the customer's account. Generally, brokers subject to the "penny stock" rules when effecting transactions in our securities may be less willing to comply with the "penny stock rules." This may make it more difficult for investors to dispose of our common stock.

SEC CEASE AND DESIST ORDER

On December 22, 2009, the Securities and Exchange Commission entered a cease and desist order against us. We consented to the order without admitting the facts recited in the SEC's order. The summary section in the Commission's order said that the proceeding arose from repeated registration violations, internal control deficiencies, and inaccurate and untimely financial filings. Specifically, from 2002 through late 2005, we improperly issued millions of shares of our common stock that purportedly had been registered with the Commission on Forms S-8 and/or SB-2. This misconduct allowed stock promoters and us to reap illicit profits by reselling our stock to investors who had been denied legally mandated disclosures. In late 2007, we announced our intention to restate our financial statements for the periods 2004 through 2006 when these improper stock issuances and other potential issues came to light. When we filed our restated financial statements in the Summer of 2009, we reported the correction of numerous errors in our past filings, including errors related to its improper S-8 and SB-2 stock issuances, and acknowledged longstanding material weaknesses in our internal controls, including the lack of effective oversight and monitoring of the financial reporting and accounting functions by past management.

The cease and desist order ordered us to cease and desist from committing or causing any violations and any future violations of Sections 5(a) and 5(c) of the Securities Act, and Sections 13(a), 13(b)(2)(A) and 13(b)(2)(B) of the Exchange Act and Rules 12b-20, 13a-1, and 13a-13 thereunder.

The cease and desist order was entered pursuant to Section 8A of the Securities Act of 1933 and Section 21C of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. Any violation of the order would expose us to the remedies available to the SEC, including accounting, disgorgement, monetary, and other remedies.

ITEM 1B. UNRESOLVED STAFF COMMENTS

None.

ITEM 2. PROPERTIES

PRINCIPAL OFFICE

As of the date of this filing, the primary corporate office was located at 110 Greene Street, Suite 1101, New York, N.Y., 10012. We also rent office space at 630 East Mullan Avenue #D, Osburn, Idaho 83849.

MINING PROPERTIES

We have assets of real property, mineral leases and options. The following section describes our right, title, or claim to our properties and each property's location. This section also discusses our present plans for exploration of the properties.

JUAB COUNTY, UTAH

Dragon Mine

The Dragon Mine property, located in Juab County, Utah near the City of Eureka (Tintic Mining District) has been principally exploited for halloysite clay. The property consists of 38 patented mining claims, approximately 230 acres, located in the following sections: T10S, R2W, sections 29, 30, 31, and T10S, R3W, Section 36, all relative to the Salt Lake Meridian. We leased the property in 2001 and on August 18, 2005, we purchased the property for approximately \$500,000 in cash.

From 1950 through 1977, the Dragon Mine was operated by Filtrol Corporation. To the best of our knowledge, the mineral mined at the property was used primarily as an input of a petroleum-cracking product. The property was idle from 1977 until 2001 when we entered into a lease on the property.

Previous owners' records indicate that over 1.35 million tons of clay mineral were mined at the property between 1950 and 1977. Those records also indicate approximately 300,000 tons of mineralized material remain on the property. The tonnage referred to above has not been geologically confirmed.

In July 2001, the Company began leasing the Dragon Mine from Conjecture Silver Mines, Inc. of Spokane, Washington. The Company initially paid 400,000 shares of common stock, valued at \$100,000, for a one-year lease. Under the terms of the lease agreement, the Company had the right to renew the lease annually in exchange for 100,000 additional shares of our common stock or the option to purchase the property for \$500,000. The Company issued 100,000 shares of stock for each year of the lease for the years 2002 – 2005 and exercised the right to purchase the mine on August 18, 2005 for \$500,000 cash.

At the Dragon Mine, the following minerals, among others, have been identified: halloysite, kaolinite, alunite, and iron.

The property is located approximately 2 miles southwest of Eureka, Utah and can be accessed via state highway and county road. The Union Pacific Railroad has a spur approximately 2 miles from the property. Electrical power is located approximately 1.5 miles from the site and there was no evidence of a water source on the property except in

the mine shaft.

11

All activity at the mine was suspended in October 2007 when previous management determined that the lack of both a detailed resource analysis and an adequate mineral processing system would prevent a successful commercialization of the mine.

In 2008, the Company engaged the services of an internationally recognized geological consulting firm to both conduct a detailed assessment of the Dragon Mine and develop an adequate processing system. At the time of the filing of this report, the work of the consulting firm was ongoing. In 2009, the Company signed a Memorandum of Understanding with KaMin upon which a binding toll manufacturing contract is to be developed.

PROPERTIES HELD FOR SALE

Shoshone County, ID

We own approximately 900 acres of fee simple property and patented mining claims, and 260 acres of mineral rights and unpatented claims, located in the Coeur d'Alene mining district in Shoshone County, Idaho, commonly referred to as the Silver Valley of North Idaho. We have no information whether the properties can be commercially exploited and no information as to the amount or quality of the minerals that may exist at the property. At December 31, 2009, this property was classified as held for sale. We are actively seeking to sell our properties in Idaho, however, we cannot provide any assurances that we will be able to do so.

ITEM 3. LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

Various lawsuits, claims, proceedings and investigations are pending involving us as described below in this section. In accordance with SFAS No. 5, Accounting for Contingencies, when applicable, we record accruals for contingencies when it is probable that a liability will be incurred and the amount of loss can be reasonably estimated. In addition to the matters described herein, we are involved in or subject to, or may become involved in or subject to, routine litigation, claims, disputes, proceedings and investigations in the ordinary course of business, which in our opinion will not have a material adverse effect on our financial condition, cash flows or results of operations.

Securities Litigation

The Company, certain of its directors and former officers and employees, its prior auditor, Chisolm, Bierwolf & Nilson, LLC, and NanoClay & Technologies, Inc., its defunct, wholly owned subsidiary, are defendants in a class action filed on October 11, 2007 In Re Atlas Mining Company Securities Litigation pending in the United States District Court for the District of Idaho, Civil Action No. 07-428-N-EJL(D. Idaho) (the "Class Action"). The Class Action was filed on behalf of purchasers of the Company's publicly traded common stock during the period January 19, 2005 through October 8, 2007. The First Amended Complaint ("Complaint") alleges that the Company damaged purchasers by making material misstatements in publicly disseminated press releases and Securities and Exchange Commission filings regarding the extent of the halloysite deposit on Company property, the availability and quality of halloysite for sale, and claimed sales of halloysite. The Complaint also alleges that the Company improperly manipulated reported earnings with respect to purported halloysite sales and misrepresentations by the individual defendants as to its financial statements. The plaintiffs seek remedies under Section 10(b) of the Securities and Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5 thereunder and for violations of Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act.

On July 2, 2009, the Company entered into a Settlement Agreement ("Class Action Settlement Agreement") with the lead plaintiffs in the class action Under the terms of the Class Action Settlement Agreement the Company will pay plaintiffs \$1,250,000 (which includes fees to plaintiff's counsel), to be funded by the proceeds of an insurance policy issued by Navigators Insurance Co.(as provided below), in exchange for release of all claims against the Company, NanoClay & Technologies, Inc., and William T. Jacobson, Robert Dumont, Ronald Price and Barbara Suveg (the "Individual Defendants"). The Company will also fund up to \$75,000 to fund expenses in connection with notification to class members. The Class Action Settlement Agreement is the settlement agreement contemplated by the Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") described in its prior response and the terms of it are consistent with the terms of such MOU. The Settlement Agreement is subject to a number of conditions including successful completion of confirmatory due diligence by the lead plaintiffs and final court approval.

Insurance Litigation

Atlas Mining Company v. Navigators Insurance Company et al.

Our complaint, filed in federal district court in Idaho, seeks coverage (“Coverage Claim”) for claims in connection with the securities litigation described above under (A) a primary \$5,000,000 D&O liability insurance policy issued by Navigators Insurance Company (“Navigators”) on October 1, 2007 (“Navigators \$5,000,000 Policy”), and (B) a \$5,000,000 excess D&O liability policy issued by RSUI Indemnity Company (“RSUI”) effective October 1, 2007. The Company has asserted claims for declaratory judgment, specific performance, and breach of contract, as well as claims alleging bad faith, against Navigators and RSUI. The Company also has asserted claims of negligence and fraud against a broker involved with the alleged issuance of the policies. This case was removed to federal court. Navigators, RSUI, and the broker are vigorously defending the lawsuit and have filed answers in federal court, arguing in part that such policies are not effective and pleading other affirmative defenses, such as accord and satisfaction.

Navigators Insurance Co. v. Atlas Mining Company, et. al.

This is an interpleader complaint filed by Navigators in federal district court in Idaho with respect to our coverage claims and those of certain of our former officers and directors arising from the securities litigation described above. The interpleader complaint alleges that Navigators issued a D&O liability policy to the Company for the period October 17, 2006 and October 17, 2007 that afforded \$2 million in limits. Navigators alleges that, based on the current rate of expenditures, the defense and investigation costs alone will soon exceed the policy’s \$2 million limit of liability, excess of applicable retentions, and the Company disagrees with certain of its former officers and directors on the appropriate priority of payments under the policy. As such, Navigators alleges that it was subject to multiple competing demands for the limits of the Policy. Based on such allegations, Navigators is seeking a court order permitting Navigators to tender \$2 million into the registry of the Court and to be discharged from liability. The Company filed a Motion to Dismiss on June 17, 2008, citing Navigators’ failure to advance defense costs under such policy and arguing that Navigators is not subject to multiple liability under the policy. The parties have filed several consent motions to stay the proceedings in this action. The court entered an indefinite stay on December 11, 2008 that will remain in effect until any party seeks to re-open the matter because (a) the parties have reached an agreement to resolve the matter, (b) the Coverage Action is resolved, or (c) a party seeks to terminate the stay and renew litigation.

Related to the Class Action Settlement, effective July 8, 2009, the Company entered into a Settlement Agreement and Release with Navigators, RSUI Indemnity Company and RSUI Group, Alexander, Morford & Woo, Inc., and the individual defendants listed above in settlement of the insurance litigation. Pursuant to this agreement (i) Navigators will deliver \$1,250,000 into a court registry, which will then be used upon final court approval of the Class Action Settlement to fund the \$1,250,000 payment to class action plaintiffs, (ii) Navigators will deliver \$750,000 to the Company for defense and investigative costs in connection with the Class Action and related matters, which Atlas will use in part to pay the individual defendants their costs in the class action and (iii) all claims under the insurance litigation will be released upon final court approval of the Class Action Settlement.

Forbearance Agreement

The Company and certain of its former officers were defendants in a class action In Re Atlas Mining Company Securities Litigation (the “Class Action”), whose settlement has been approved by the court. As an accommodation to facilitate the settlement of the Class Action, the following persons (the “Forbearing Shareholders”) entered into a Forbearance Agreement whereby they agreed not to submit claims for damages relating to shares that they own or control and that would otherwise be eligible to participate in the settlement: David Taft; The IBS Turnaround (QP) Fund (A Limited Partnership), the IBS Turnaround Fund (A Limited Partnership), The IBS Opportunity Fund (BVI), Ltd. (the prior three hereafter collectively “IBS”); Andre Zeitoun (the Company’s CEO), Chris Carney (the Company’s Interim CFO), and Eric Basroon (an employee of Material Advisors LLC). The Forbearance Agreement provided that:

In consideration for the forbearance and release, relinquishment, and discharging set forth above, the Company, by and through the disinterested directors, may, in its sole discretion, choose to provide an amount of compensation to the Forbearing Shareholders that it determines in its business judgment is appropriate. Compensation provided to Forbearing Shareholders shall not exceed the amount to which the Forbearing Shareholders would be entitled if they were Settling Class Members who submitted claims and were compensated under the Plan of Allocation.

Prior to the time that the Forbearing Shareholders entered into the Forbearance Agreement, certain members of the Board of Directors, without taking formal action as a Board, acknowledged that the Forbearing Shareholders were accommodating the Company in a manner not required and should be compensated “as if” they had submitted claims as class members in the Settlement and this acknowledgement was communicated to the Forbearing Shareholders.

The Board subsequently appointed a committee of disinterested directors to determine whether compensation should be paid, the amount of any such compensation, and whether to pay compensation in cash or Common Stock. The committee consists of John Levy, Morris Weiss, and Evan Stone.

On March 29, 2010, the committee adopted resolutions designed to treat the Forbearing Shareholders as if they had participated in the settlement.

To achieve this goal, damages of each Forbearing Shareholder were computed using the formula for determining damages in the Class Action. Damages per share are lesser of \$0.84 or the difference between the purchase price and \$0.80. The damages for each Forbearing Shareholders are approximately as follows: Taft - \$0; IBS - \$3,564,657; Zeitoun - \$479,411; Carney - \$231,735; and Basroon - \$89,250. The aggregate damages for all of the Forbearing Shareholders are approximately \$4,365,053.

The amount payable as compensation to the Forbearing Shareholders in the aggregate will be an amount equal to the Net Settlement Fund in the Class Action (approximately \$800,000) multiplied by the fraction in which the numerator is the aggregate damages of the Forbearing Shareholders and the denominator is the sum of (i) the aggregate damages of the Forbearing Shareholders and (ii) the dollar amount of claims actually submitted by shareholders against the Net Settlement Fund in the Class Action (this amount is different from the total damages of all shareholders other than the Forbearing Shareholders).

The deadline for submitting claims in the Class Action is May 6, 2010, so the amount that will be payable to the Forbearing Shareholders will not be known until that time. The amount payable to the Forbearing Shareholders varies depending on the dollar amount of claims actually submitted in the Class Action, the higher the dollar amount of claims submitted in the Class Action, the lower the amount payable to the Forbearing Shareholders. By way of example, if no claims at all were submitted by shareholders in the Class Action, the amount payable to all of the Forbearing Shareholders would be \$800,000; if \$3,000,000 in claims are submitted in the Class Action, the amount payable to the Forbearing Shareholders would be \$474,136.

In order to minimize the amount payable to the Forbearing Shareholders, the committee of disinterested directors has determined to take action prior to May 6, 2010 to increase the dollar amount of claims submitted by shareholders in the Class Action.

The committee of disinterested directors has determined that compensation to the Forbearing Shareholders will be paid in Common Stock of the Company. The shares will be valued at the market price of the Company's Common Stock as of the closing price on the first date on which the distribution agent in the Class Action sends or delivers distributions from the Net Settlement Fund to shareholders who have submitted claims.

If the Forbearing Shareholders had not entered into the Forbearance Agreement, they believe that the Company may not have been able to settle the Class Action on the favorable terms that it did. The damages suffered by the Forbearing Shareholders, based on an estimate of total damages provided by counsel to the plaintiffs in the Class Action, represented a majority of the total damages of the class. The plaintiff's counsel required a representation by the Company that any damages paid by the Company to the Forbearing Shareholders not exceed amounts granted to the class. The Forbearing Agreement had the effect of making the entire Net Settlement Fund available to other shareholders. The Forbearing Shareholders believe that if they did not enter into the Forbearance Agreement, plaintiffs would have insisted on a significantly higher settlement amount and this in all likelihood would have forced the Company to raise additional capital by selling stock at, what they believed to be, unfavorable terms at the time.