

BLOX, INC.

NEWS RELEASE – March 1st, 2026

Blox Inc. Wishes to keep its investors and other interested parties informed and up to date with various matters to the current time.

New York, New York – Blox, Inc (“Blox” or the “Company”) is pleased to announce recent events:

1. Further to the recent supreme court decision in which the judge declared our injunction had expired, but failed to record his deliberations, has been declared suspended. This now permits us to seek to have an earlier judgement in the Court of First Instance be annulled by virtue of the Supreme Courts suspension.
2. Blox Inc is pleased to announce that a summons from the Supreme Court of Western Australia has today been served on N. Kaba and Penta Goldfields Company SA. This summons has been delivered in full compliance with Western Australian laws, International laws, and Guinea laws.

In accordance with the Sale and Purchase Agreement of 15th April 2014, to which Mr and Mrs Kaba were signatories, item 14.1 states the proper law for this contract is the Law of Western Australia, whilst Item 14.2 states the Courts of Western Australia shall have jurisdiction in respect of any dispute between the parties.

The pending case seeks to sue Kaba and or Penta for several breaches, and for compensation and damages in the sum of USD 275M, or a sum agreed by an expert valuer, in addition to various other damages caused by the defendants’ actions. Also, an order that the Defendants take all steps necessary to assign to the Plaintiff or its nominated beneficiary all interests held by the Defendants in the mining tenement over the same area as the Mansounia Tenement.

Additional Information

Detailed below are some of the alleged breaches by the Defendant N. Kaba. There are similar allegations against the Second Defendant, not listed here.

The First Defendant has breached the Kaba Joint Venture Agreement (JVA.)

42. In breach of clause 6.2 of the Kaba JVA, the First Defendant helped and/or had business relations with a company (namely the Second Defendant) Penta applying for a research permit or mining tenement in the Prefecture of Kouroussa in the Republic of Guinea, without the written approval of Leo Shield or any of its successors in title.

43. Further or alternatively, in breach of the implied terms pleaded, engaged in conduct that frustrated, obstructed and undermined the joint venture’s purpose by:

43.1. competing for a mining tenement within the joint venture area, by causing the Second Defendant to apply for and obtain a mining tenement over the same area as the Mansounia Tenement.

43.2. misusing confidential information obtained through the joint venture

and/or the Consulting Agreement for personal or third-party gain.

43.3. failing to act in a manner that supported the joint venture's commercial success.

Breach of the Primary Agreement

The First Defendant has breached the Primary Agreement in that he has failed to comply with the terms and obligations of the Kaba JVA, in breach of the terms pleaded at paragraphs 20 and 21 above, by engaging in the conduct particularised at paragraphs 37 and 41 above.

45. Further or alternatively, the First Defendant has breached the Primary Agreement in that, by the conduct pleaded at paragraphs 37 and 41, he acted in a manner inconsistent with the acknowledgment of the Plaintiff's interest in the Mansounia Tenement as pleaded at paragraph 21.3 and 21.4 above

Breach of the Consulting Agreement

46. The First Defendant has breached the Consulting Agreement in that he:

46.1. failed to maintain the Mansounia Tenement in good standing for the Plaintiff, in breach of the obligations pleaded.

46.2. failed to disclose to the President and Chief Executive Officer of the Plaintiff the matters referred to in paragraph 37 above, in breach of the obligation pleaded at paragraph 27.7

46.3. failed to maintain confidentiality in relation to matters concerning the Mansounia Tenement and used confidential information for his own benefit or for the benefit of the Second Defendant or third parties, in breach of the Confidentiality Obligation pleaded.

46.4. diverted assets and opportunities held by the Plaintiff to himself and/or to entities under his control (namely the Second Defendant), in breach of the Non-Diversion Obligation pleaded.

Breach of Fiduciary Duty

47. By reason of the conduct pleaded at paragraphs 37 to 41 above, the First Defendant has breached the fiduciary duties he owed to the Plaintiff as pleaded at paragraph 28 above, in that he:

47.1. failed to act in good faith in the interests of the Plaintiff;

47.2. placed himself in a position of conflict between his duty to the Plaintiff and his personal interests and the interests of the Second Defendant;

47.3. obtained an unauthorised personal benefit and profit from his position as the Plaintiff's country manager, namely the mining tenement obtained through the Second Defendant and benefits derived from dealings with third parties in respect thereof;

47.4. diverted a corporate opportunity belonging to the Plaintiff, being the opportunity to renew or reapply for the Mansounia Tenement, to himself and to the Second Defendant;

47.5. failed to disclose to the Plaintiff the matters which were material to the affairs of the Plaintiff as particularised in paragraph 37.4 above;
47.6. used confidential information obtained in the course of his engagement by the Plaintiff for his own benefit and for the benefit of the Second Defendant.

Misuse of Confidential Information

48. By reason of the matters pleaded at paragraph 39 above, at all material times the First Defendant was in possession of confidential information belonging to the Plaintiff concerning the Mansounia Tenement (the “Confidential Information”).

49. The First Defendant used the Confidential Information, or part thereof, for his own benefit and/or for the benefit of the Second Defendant and/or third parties, by engaging in the conduct particularised at paragraph 37 above. 50. The use of the Confidential Information by the First Defendant was unauthorised and in breach of the Confidentiality Obligation, the fiduciary duties owed by the First Defendant to the Plaintiff, and the equitable duty of confidence.

“We will keep the shareholders and interested parties informed of future developments,” said Tony Pickett - Chairman.

On behalf of the Board of Directors of Blox, Inc.:

/s/ Tony Pickett

Chairman

Statements included in this announcement, including statements concerning our plans, intentions and expectations, which are not historical in nature are intended to be, and are hereby identified as “forward-looking statements”. Forward looking statements may be identified by words including “anticipates”, “believes”, “intends”, “estimates”, “expects” and similar expressions. The Company cautions readers that forward-looking statements, including without limitation those relating to the Company’s future operations and business prospects, are subject to certain risks and uncertainties that could cause actual results to differ materially from those indicated in the forward-looking statements. Readers are advised to rely on their own evaluation of such risks and uncertainties and should not place undue reliance on forward-looking statements. Any forward-looking statements are made as of the date of this news release, and the Company assumes no obligation to update the forward-looking statements, except in accordance with the applicable laws.