

URANIUM ENERGY CORP  
Form 10-K  
October 15, 2009

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

FORM 10-K

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

**For the Fiscal Year Ended July 31, 2009**

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

For the transition period from \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_.

Commission file number 001-33706

URANIUM ENERGY CORP.

(Exact name of registrant as specified in its charter)

Nevada

98-0399476

(State or other jurisdiction of incorporation of organization)

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

Suite 230, 9801 Anderson Mill Road, Austin, Texas 78750

(Address of Principal Executive Offices)

(512) 828-6980

(Registrant's telephone number, including area code)

Securities registered pursuant to Section 12(b) of the Act:

**None**

Securities registered pursuant to Section 12(g) of the Act:

Common Stock, Par Value \$0.001

(Title of class)

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

Yes No

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

Yes  No

## Edgar Filing: URANIUM ENERGY CORP - Form 10-K

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

Indicate by check mark if disclosure of delinquent filers pursuant to Item 405 of Regulation 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 checkmark whether the registrant is a large accelerated filer, an accelerated filer, a non-accelerated filer, or a smaller reporting company. See the definitions of "large accelerated filer", "accelerated filer" and "smaller reporting company" in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act.

Large accelerated filer

Accelerated filer

Non-accelerated filer  (do not check if a smaller reporting company)

Smaller reporting company

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

The aggregate market value of the voting and non-voting common equity held by non-affiliates of the registrant as of January 31, 2009 was approximately

\$19,510,969 based upon the average bid and asked price of the registrant's shares of common stock on that date.

The registrant had 56,725,516 shares of common stock outstanding as of October 9, 2009.

ii

---

### FORWARD LOOKING STATEMENTS

This annual report contains forward-looking statements that involve risks and uncertainties. Any statements contained herein that are not statements of historical fact may be deemed to be forward-looking statements. In some cases, you can identify forward-looking statements by terminology such as "may", "will", "should", "expect", "plan", "intend", "anticipate", "believe", "estimate", "predict", "potential" or "continue", the negative of such terms or other comparable terminology. In evaluating these statements, you should consider various factors, including the assumptions, risks and uncertainties outlined in this annual report under "Risk Factors". These factors or any of them may cause our actual results to differ materially from any forward-looking statement made in this annual report. Forward-looking statements in this annual report include, among others, statements regarding:

- our capital needs;
- business plans; and
- expectations.

While these forward-looking statements, and any assumptions upon which they are based, are made in good faith and reflect our current judgment regarding future events, our actual results will likely vary, sometimes materially, from any estimates, predictions, projections, assumptions or other future performance suggested herein. Some of the risks and assumptions include:

- our need for additional financing;

- our exploration activities may not result in commercially exploitable quantities of ore on our mineral properties;
- the risks inherent in the exploration for minerals such as geologic formation, weather, accidents, equipment failures and governmental restrictions;
- our limited operating history;
- our history of operating losses;
- the potential for environmental damage;
- our lack of insurance coverage;
- the competitive environment in which we operate;
- the level of government regulation, including environmental regulation;
- changes in governmental regulation and administrative practices;
- our dependence on key personnel;
- conflicts of interest of our directors and officers;
- our ability to fully implement our business plan;
- our ability to effectively manage our growth; and
- other regulatory, legislative and judicial developments.

iii

---

We advise the reader that these cautionary remarks expressly qualify in their entirety all forward-looking statements attributable to us or persons acting on our behalf. Important factors that you should also consider, include, but are not limited to, the factors discussed under "Risk Factors" in this annual report.

The forward-looking statements in this annual report are made as of the date of this annual report and we do not intend or undertake to update any of the forward-looking statements to conform these statements to actual results, except as required by applicable law, including the securities laws of the United States.

#### AVAILABLE INFORMATION

Uranium Energy Corp. files annual, quarterly and current reports, proxy statements, and other information with the Securities and Exchange Commission (the "Commission" or "SEC"). You may read and copy documents referred to in this Annual Report on Form 10-K that have been filed with the Commission at the Commission's Public Reference Room, 450 Fifth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. You may obtain information on the operation of the Public Reference Room by calling the Commission at 1-800-SEC-0330. You can also obtain copies of our Commission filings by going to the Commission's website at <http://www.sec.gov>.

#### CERTAIN FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

## Edgar Filing: URANIUM ENERGY CORP - Form 10-K

This Form 10-K of Uranium Energy Corp. (the "Company") includes financial information for the period ended July 31, 2007 which has been restated. As disclosed in the Company's Form 10-KSB/A Amendment No. 3 for the fiscal period ended July 31, 2007 filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on June 9, 2008 (the "Amended Form 10-KSB"), the Company amended its Form 10-KSB for the period ended July 31, 2007 to, among other things, include restated audited financial statements for the period ended July 31, 2007 and year ended December 31, 2006 which reflect a re-evaluation of the impairment analysis of capitalized acquisition costs of the Company's mineral properties. See the Amended Form 10-KSB for more detailed information. Accordingly, the financial information for the period ended July 31, 2007 included in this Form 10-K may not be comparable to the financial information for such periods included in certain filings by the Company prior to the filing of the Amended Form 10-KSB.

### REFERENCES

As used in this annual report: (i) the terms "we", "us", "our", "Uranium Energy" and the "Company" mean Uranium Energy Corp.; (ii) "SEC" refers to the Securities and Exchange Commission; (iii) "Securities Act" refers to the United States *Securities Act of 1933*, as amended; (iv) "Exchange Act" refers to the United States *Securities Exchange Act of 1934*, as amended; and (v) all dollar amounts refer to United States dollars unless otherwise indicated.

iv

---

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

ITEM 1.	DESCRIPTION OF BUSINESS	1
ITEM 1A.	RISK FACTORS	42
ITEM 1B.	UNRESOLVED STAFF COMMENTS	49
ITEM 2.	PROPERTIES	49
ITEM 3.	LEGAL PROCEEDINGS	49
ITEM 4.	SUBMISSIONS OF MATTERS TO A VOTE OF SECURITY HOLDERS	50
ITEM 5.	MARKET FOR REGISTRANT'S COMMON EQUITY AND RELATED STOCKHOLDER MATTERS	51
ITEM 6.	SELECTED FINANCIAL DATA	54
ITEM 7.	MANAGEMENT'S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL CONDITION AND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS	54
ITEM 7A.	QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE DISCLOSURES ABOUT MARKET RISK	68
ITEM 8.	FINANCIAL STATEMENTS	69
ITEM 9.	CHANGES IN AND DISAGREEMENTS WITH ACCOUNTANTS ON ACCOUNTING AND FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE	99
ITEM 9A.	CONTROLS AND PROCEDURES	99

ITEM 9B.	OTHER INFORMATION	100
ITEM 10.	DIRECTORS, EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AND CORPORATE GOVERNANCE	100
ITEM 11.	EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION	105
ITEM 12.	SECURITY OWNERSHIP OF CERTAIN BENEFICIAL OWNERS AND MANAGEMENT AND RELATED STOCKHOLDER MATTERS	110
ITEM 13.	CERTAIN RELATIONSHIPS AND RELATED TRANSACTIONS AND DIRECTOR INDEPENDENCE	111
ITEM 14.	PRINCIPAL ACCOUNTING FEES AND SERVICES	117
ITEM 15.	EXHIBITS	117

v

---

## PART I

### ITEM 1. DESCRIPTION OF BUSINESS

#### Corporate Organization

Our company was incorporated under the laws of the State of Nevada on May 16, 2003 under the name "Carlin Gold Inc." During 2004 we changed our business operations and focus from precious metals exploration in the State of Nevada to the exploration for economic reserves of uranium throughout the United States. On January 24, 2005, we filed an amendment to our Articles of Incorporation changing our name to "Uranium Energy Corp.". On December 31, 2007, we incorporated a wholly-owned subsidiary under the laws of the Province of British Columbia, Canada, UEC Resources Ltd.

On January 24, 2005, we completed a reverse stock split of our shares of common stock on the basis of one share for each two outstanding shares. Effective February 28, 2006, we completed a forward split of our shares of common stock on the basis of 1.5 shares for each outstanding share to increase liquidity for our shares of common stock. Effective February 28, 2006, we amended our Articles of Incorporation with the Nevada Secretary of State increasing our authorized capital stock from 75,000,000 shares of common stock, with a \$0.001 par value, to 750,000,000 shares of common stock with a similar par value.

In June 2007, we determined to change our fiscal year end from December 31 to July 31. Accordingly, on October 29, 2007, we filed a Transition Report on Form 10-KSB for the period year ended July 31, 2007, as subsequently amended, with the SEC and commenced a new reporting period.

Our principal offices are located at 9801 Anderson Mill Road, Suite 230, Austin Texas, U.S.A., 78750, and our telephone number is (512) 828-6980, and our web site address is [www.uraniumenergy.com](http://www.uraniumenergy.com).

#### General

We are a natural resource exploration company engaged in the exploration of properties that may contain uranium minerals in the United States. Our strategy is to acquire properties that are prospective for uranium exploration, and

have undergone some degree of uranium exploration but have not yet been mined. As of the date of this annual report, we have interests in 46,752 gross acres of leased or staked mineral properties, consisting of claim blocks located in the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Texas, Utah and Wyoming. Our ability to complete future acquisitions will be subject to obtaining sufficient financing and being able to conclude agreements with property owners on terms that are acceptable to us.

As of the date of this annual report we have interests in an aggregate of 46,752 gross acres (39,224 net mineral acres) of properties that have been either leased or staked, which we intend to explore for economic deposits of uranium. Some of these leases are subject to varying net royalty interests. These properties consist of claim blocks located in the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Texas, Utah and Wyoming. Most of these properties have been the subject of historical exploration by other mining companies, and provide indications that further exploration for uranium is warranted.

Our properties do not have any reserves. We plan to conduct exploration programs on these properties with the objective of ascertaining whether any of our properties contain economic concentrations of uranium that are prospective for mining. As such, we are considered an exploration, or exploratory stage company. Since we are an exploration stage company, there is no assurance that a commercially viable mineral deposit exists on any of our properties, and a great deal of further exploration will be required before a final evaluation as to the economic and legal feasibility for our future exploration is determined. We have no known reserves of uranium or any other type of mineral. Since inception we have not established any proven or probable reserves on our mineral property interests.

---

#### Goliad Project Technical Report

On March 4, 2008, we issued a news release entitled "Uranium Energy Corp Reports Independent NI 43-101 Resource Estimate at Goliad Project." This news release is attached as Exhibit 99.1 to our Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the SEC on the same day.

As described in more detail in the news release, we have received an updated technical report (the "Technical Report") in accordance with the provisions of National Instrument 43-101, Standards of Disclosure for Mineral Projects ("NI 43-101"), of the Canadian Securities Administrators for our Goliad Project located in Goliad County, Texas. The complete Technical Report was filed under our company's profile on the Canadian Securities Administrators public disclosure website, at [www.sedar.com](http://www.sedar.com), on March 10, 2008. The Technical Report is authored by Thomas A. Carothers, P.Geo., a qualified person as defined in NI 43-101, who has over 30 years of uranium experience, substantially in the South Texas Uranium trend. His experience includes working directly for two operating ISR mining companies in South Texas, US Steel and Tenneco Uranium, during the 1970s and 1980s.

As required by NI 43-101, the Technical Report contains certain disclosure relating to measured, indicated and inferred mineral resource estimates for the Company's Goliad Project. Such mineral resources have been estimated in accordance with the definition standards on mineral resources of the Canadian Institute of Mining, Metallurgy and Petroleum referred to in NI 43-101. Measured mineral resources, indicated mineral resources and inferred mineral resources, while recognized and required by Canadian regulations, are not defined terms under the SEC's Industry Guide 7, and are normally not permitted to be used in reports and registration statements filed with the SEC. Accordingly, we have not reported them in this annual report or otherwise in the United States.

Investors are cautioned not to assume that any part or all of the mineral resources in these categories will ever be converted into mineral reserves. These terms have a great amount of uncertainty as to their existence, and great uncertainty as to their economic and legal feasibility. In particular, it should be noted that mineral resources which are not mineral reserves do not have demonstrated economic viability. It cannot be assumed that all or any part of measured mineral resources, indicated mineral resources or inferred mineral resources discussed in the news release

and Technical Report will ever be upgraded to a higher category. In accordance with Canadian rules, estimates of inferred mineral resources cannot form the basis of feasibility or other economic studies. Investors are cautioned not to assume that any part of the reported measured mineral resources, indicated mineral resources or inferred mineral resources referred to in this news release and in the Technical Report are economically or legally mineable.

## Background

The United States is the largest consumer of uranium in the world and consumed approximately 55 million pounds of uranium in 2006. Production of uranium in the United States in 2006 was approximately four million pounds. Nuclear power supplied approximately 20% of the electricity consumed in the United States in 2006.

The price for uranium is generally determined by supply and demand. We believe that there is potential for further increases in the price for uranium based upon an expected decrease in the available supply for uranium in 2009 and 2010.

Between 1960 and 1985 a significant amount of exploration work was conducted in the United States for uranium. A large number of these exploration projects were not pursued, however, these projects accumulated a significant amount of exploration data.

We have acquired a significant amount of this exploration data and have acquired interests in properties that we believe warrant further exploration for uranium based upon the exploration data we have acquired. Our properties do not have any reserves. We plan to conduct exploration programs on these properties with the objective of ascertaining whether any of our properties contain economic concentrations of uranium that are prospective for mining. We have identified a number of low grade projects that we believe we can fast-track to production by conducting a number of different exploration and permitting activities at the same time, particularly in the State of Texas. Currently, most of our exploration activity is focused in the State of Texas. Subject to many factors outside the control of the Company and including, without limitation, further exploration and development work and the

2

---

completion of an acceptable feasibility study, we are currently targeting the fourth quarter of 2010 to begin production. However, there can be no assurance that we will achieve our objectives in this regard within the time frames targeted or at all.

We plan to utilize the in-situ recovery method ("ISR") when mining for uranium, which is an alternative to conventional mining. We believe that this method of mining requires lower capital expenditures and has less impact on the environment, as well as a shorter lead time than conventional mining with respect to beginning production. ISR mining of uranium involves pumping oxidized water through an underground uranium deposit, dissolving it and then pumping it to surface for further processing. Monitor wells on sides of the deposit assure none of the uranium-rich waters leak away from the production zone.

According to a survey by the U.S. Department of Energy, in 1979 there were over 20,000 people employed in the uranium mining industry, compared to just over 400 people in 2004. We believe that there is a shortage of human resources in the uranium mining industry currently which acts as a barrier in respect of the exploration for uranium. We employ a team of 30 highly experienced uranium mining professionals, comprised primarily of geologists, engineers, technicians, field personnel, administrative and support staff, which we believe is a competitive advantage for our company. These persons are involved in the review of the historical exploration data we have acquired in order to determine projects that warrant pursuing, as well as the exploration of our properties.

## Our Database

We have acquired historical exploration data that will assist in the direction of proposed exploration program on lands held in our current property portfolio. This prior exploration data consists of management information and work product derived from various reports, drill hole assay results, drill hole logs, studies, maps, radioactive rock samples, exploratory drill logs, state organization reports, consultants, geological study and other exploratory information.

The following provides information relating to our database:

#### Tronox Worldwide

Effective February 20, 2008, we acquired from Tronox Worldwide LLC certain assets, consisting of certain maps, data, exploration results and other information pertaining to lands within the United States (excluding New Mexico and Wyoming), Canada and Australia, and specifically including the former uranium exploration projects by Kerr McGee Corporation. The Tronox database contains records on some of our properties located in Arizona, the Colorado Plateau and Texas.

We have exclusive ownership of this database.

#### Jebsen

The Jebsen database covers territory in Wyoming and New Mexico, including some of our existing properties. The database belonged to a pioneering uranium developer and represents work conducted from the 1950s through to the present.

This database adds over 500 drill holes and over 500,000 feet of drilling data results to the Company's existing library of data. Other than logs, the data set consists of volumes of maps, lithographic logs, geologic reports, and feasibility studies, and many other essential tools for uranium exploration and development.

Our geologists have linked contents of the database to some of our existing properties, specifically pertaining to our projects in the Shirley Basin and Powder River Basin of Wyoming, and in the Grants Uranium District of New Mexico.

We have exclusive ownership of this database.

#### Paul Pierce

The Paul Pierce database covers the 6,700 acre Cebolleta property located in the Grants Mineral District, New Mexico, and consists of 601,486 feet of drill logs from 996 holes, drill hole location maps, geological and mine planning maps, various geological and mining reports, and surface and underground mine facility designs that were related to the past-producing JJ Number 1/L-Bar uranium mining and milling complex. The locations of multiple pre-existing mine shafts and underground access ways to uranium mineralized zones are also detailed.

This database was compiled by the Standard Oil Company of Ohio ("SOHIO") during the course of their development and production at JJ Number 1/L-Bar. We acquired the database from Paul Pierce, the Company's former Manager of Mine Production. Mr. Pierce was employed by SOHIO from 1981 to 1986 as Senior Mining Engineer and Resource Development Specialist at the L-Bar operations.

We, and our joint venture partner of Cibola Resources, LLC ("Cibola Resources") share exclusive ownership of this database.



Halterman

The Halterman database consists of exploratory and development work compiled during the 1970s and 80s, including extensive data on significant prospects and projects in the following known uranium districts in the States of Colorado, New Mexico and Utah, including Grants, San Juan Basin, Chama Basin, Moab, Lisbon Valley, Dove Creek, Slick Rock and Uravan districts.

This database includes drilling and logging data from over 200,000 feet of uranium exploration and development drilling, resource evaluations and calculations, drill-hole locations and grade thickness maps, competitor activity maps as well as several dozen geological and project evaluation reports covering uranium projects in New Mexico, Colorado, Utah, Texas and California.

We have exclusive ownership of this database.

Brenniman

The Brenniman database includes drilling and logging data from over 2 million feet of uranium exploration and development drilling, resource calculation reports and various other geological reports, drill hole location maps and other mapping. This database includes approximately 142 drill hole gamma and E-logs. The data was originally compiled from 1972 to 1981 by various exploration companies, and covers over 100 uranium prospects in 15 southern US states. This library will be used by our technical personnel to determine locations of where drill-indicated uranium may exist.

We have exclusive ownership of this database.

Nueces

We have acquired copies of uranium drill logs from previous uranium exploration drilling projects covering a large area in the South Texas uranium trend. The data consists of approximately 150,000 feet of drill logs from 366 drill holes. This drill data provides regional geologic information and will be used to locate possible mineralized zones within the area of the South Texas uranium trend.

The data was acquired from Nueces Minerals Company, a privately-held oil and gas production company which owns the mineral rights to 72,000 contiguous acres covering portions of four counties in south Texas.

We do not have ownership or exclusive rights to this data.

---

Kirkwood

We acquired a database of uranium exploration results covering an area of approximately 13,000 acres within the uranium zone known as the Poison Spider area, in central Wyoming. The area covered includes property already held by us, as well as by other publicly-traded uranium exploration companies. The database was compiled by William Kirkwood of North American Mining and Minerals Company ("NAMMCO"), a significant participant in the uranium, coal, gold and oil and gas industries in the western United States since the 1960s. The data acquired was generated from exploration originally conducted by companies such as Homestake Mining, Kennecott Corp, Rampart Exploration, as well as Kirkwood Oil and Gas, largely between 1969 and 1982. The database consists of drill hole assay logs for 470 holes, including 75,200 feet of drilling, 22,000 feet of gamma logs, drill hole location maps, cross sections, geological maps, geological reports, and other assay data and will be used to locate possible mineralized zones in the Poison Spider area in central Wyoming.

We have exclusive ownership of this database.

#### Knupke

We acquired rights to a uranium database consisting of 40 years worth of uranium exploration results, gathered largely from the South Texas uranium trend, where we have already been actively acquiring interests in land on the basis of the data, and will be used to locate possible mineralized zones.

The rights to this exploration database were provided to the Company by James A. Knupke, Consulting Geologist of Corpus Christi, Texas. Under terms of an agreement Mr. Knupke provided consulting services to the Company, which included the review of his database. Upon review of the database we acquired several prospective properties. We have terminated the agreement as we had substantially exhausted our review of Mr. Knupke's data.

We do not own or have exclusive rights to this database.

#### Odell

We acquired the rights to a database containing over 50 years of uranium exploration data for the State of Wyoming.

This database consists of 315,000 feet of drill logs, over 400 maps, copies of all US geological survey uranium publications dating back to 1954, and geological reports on uranium ore bodies throughout Wyoming. The database will be used to locate possible mineralized zones. The database is made available to the Company by Robert Odell, the compiler and publisher of the Rocky Mountain Uranium Minerals Scout since 1974.

We do not own or have exclusive rights to this database.

#### Moore

We acquired a database of US uranium exploration results from Moore Energy Corporation ("Moore Energy"), a private Oklahoma-based uranium exploration company.

The Moore Energy US uranium database consists of over 30 years of uranium exploration information in the States of Texas, New Mexico and Wyoming, originally conducted during the 1970s, 80s and 90s. It includes results of over 10,000 drill holes, plus primary maps, and geological reports. It covers approximately one million acres of prospective uranium claims, in the South Texas uranium trend, New Mexico, and Powder River Basin, Wyoming, as well as zones in Texas, and will be used to locate possible mineralized zones.

The database also provides the Company with exploration data about its Goliad Project in south Texas, including 250,000 feet of drill logs and further delineates zones of potential uranium mineralization. It also contains drilling results from properties that are being developed by other uranium exploration companies, and also widespread regional data from throughout the South Texas uranium trend.

---

We have exclusive ownership of this database.

#### Our Plan of Operations

Our plan of operations for the next 12 months is to conduct further exploratory drilling at the Goliad Project in Goliad County, Texas, as described under "Plan of Exploration - 2009/2010" under the discussion relating to the Goliad Project below.

We may also undertake the exploration work programs described below under "Mineral Exploration Properties" in the next 12 months.

We may also acquire further acres of mineral properties in the states of interest that include Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Texas, Utah and Wyoming. Our ability to complete these acquisitions will be subject to obtaining sufficient financing and being able to conclude agreements with the property owners on terms that are acceptable to us.

#### Our Principal Mineral Properties

The Goliad Project in Goliad County, Texas, and the Cebolleta Project, in Cibola County, New Mexico, are our principal mineral properties.

None of our other properties are currently considered material properties, however, we may plan to conduct further exploration to determine if economic deposits of mineralization exist on these properties.

The following provides information relating to our principal mineral properties:

Goliad Project, Goliad County, Texas

#### Property Description and Location

The Goliad Project property is located in south Texas near the northeast end of the extensive South Texas Uranium trend. The Goliad Project consists of multiple contiguous leases that would allow the mining of uranium by ISR methods while utilizing the land surface (with variable conditions) as needed, for mining wells and aboveground facilities for fluid processing and ore capture during the mining and groundwater restoration phases of the project. The UEC Goliad Project area is about 14 miles north of the town of Goliad and is located on the east side of US route 77A/183 (Figure 4-1), a primary highway that intersects with US 59 in Goliad and IH-10 to the north. The approximate center of the project area is 28 d 52' 7" N latitude, 97 d 20 36" W longitude. Site drilling roads are mostly gravel based and allow reasonable weather access for trucks and cars. Four-wheel drive vehicles may be needed during high rainfall periods.

Virtually all mining in Texas is on private lands with leases negotiated with each individual landowner/mineral owner. Moore Energy obtained leases for exploration work in the project area in the early 1980s and completed an extensive drilling program resulting in a historic uranium mineral estimate in 1985. We obtained mining leases from individuals and by assignment from a private entity in 2006.

The current leases range in size from 14 acres to 331.98 acres. Most of the leases have starting dates in 2005 or 2006 with term periods of five years with a five-year renewal option (Figure 4-2). The various lease fees and royalty conditions are negotiated with individual lessors and conditions may vary from lease to lease. Because the leases are negotiated with individual private land and/or mineral owners and none of the properties are located on government land, the details of the lease information and terms are considered confidential.

No historic uranium mining is known to have occurred on any of the Goliad Project lease properties and only state permitted uranium exploration drilling has taken place. There are believed to be no existing environmental liabilities at the property leases. Prior to any mining activity at the Goliad Project, we are required to obtain a Radioactive Materials License, a large area Underground Injection Control ("UIC") Mine permit and a Production Area Authorization (PAA) permit for each wellfield developed for mining within the Mine Permit area. In addition, a waste disposal well will, if needed, require a separate UIC Permit. These permits will be issued by Texas regulatory agencies. The current drilling and abandonment of uranium exploration holes on any of the leases is permitted by the Texas Railroad Commission. Potential future environmental liability as a result of the mining must be addressed by the permit holder jointly with the permit granting agency. Most permits now have bonding requirements for ensuring that the restoration of groundwater, the land surface and any ancillary facility structures or equipment is properly completed.

#### Accessibility, Climate, Local Resources, Infrastructure and Physiography

The Goliad Project area is situated in the interior portion of the Gulf Coastal Plain physiographic province. The area is characterized by rolling topography with parallel to sub-parallel ridges and valleys. There is about 130 feet of relief at the site with ground surface elevations ranging from a low of 150 to a high of 280 feet above mean sea level. The leased property for the Goliad Project is used mostly for livestock grazing pasture and woodland. The overall property

area is shown as having a Post Oak Woods, Forest, and Grassland Mosaic vegetation/cover type.

---

The site property is accessed from combined route US 77A / 183 that trends north-south to the west of the property. Highway FM 1961 intersects with 77A-183 at the crossroad town of Weser. Highway FM 1961 to the east of the intersection trends along the south side of the property. Access from either of these roads into the property is via vehicular traffic on private gravel roads.

The property is in a rural setting at the north end of Goliad County. The nearest population centers are Goliad (14 miles south), Cuero (18 miles north) and Victoria (about 30 miles east). While Goliad and Cuero are relatively small towns, they provide basic needs for food and lodging and some supplies. Victoria is a much larger city and provides a well-developed infrastructure that has resulted from being a regional center to support oil and gas exploration and production. The Goliad Project site area has generally very good accessibility for light to heavy equipment. There is an excellent network of county, state and federal highways that serve the region and the moderate topography, with dominantly sandy, well-drained soils, provides good construction conditions for building gravel site roads necessary for site access.

The climate in Goliad County is mild with hot summers and cool to warm winters. The moderate temperatures and precipitation result in excellent conditions for developing an ISR mine. Periods of freezing temperatures are generally very brief and infrequent. Tropical weather from the Gulf of Mexico can occur during the hurricane season and may affect the site area with large rain storms. The periodic freezing weather and abnormally large rainfalls are the primary conditions that can cause temporary shutdowns. Otherwise there is not a regular non-operating season.

The necessary rights for constructing needed surface processing facilities are in-place on selected lease agreements. Sufficient electric power is believed to be available in the area, however, new lines may be needed to bring additional service to the plant site and wellfields. We believe that within a 30 mile radius of the planned Goliad Project facility there is located sufficient population to supply the necessary number of suitable mining personnel.

## History

### Ownership History of the Property

The Goliad Project site is located in the north-central portion of Goliad County to the east and north of the intersection of U.S. Routes 77A/183 and Farm to Market Route 1961. There has been a long history of oil and gas exploration and production in the area and oil and gas is still a primary part of the economy for the relatively lightly populated county. In the period from October 1979 to June 1980, as a part of a large oil, gas and other minerals lease holding (approximately 55,000 acres), Coastal Uranium utilized the opportunity to drill several widely spaced exploration holes in the region. There were reported to be eight holes drilled at or near the Goliad Project area.

In the early 1980s Moore Energy obtained access to review some of the Coastal States wide-spaced drilling exploration data. The review resulted in Moore Energy obtaining several leases from Coastal Uranium, including several of the current Goliad Project leases. During the period from March 1983 through August 1984, Moore Energy conducted an exploration program in the Goliad Project area.

No further drilling was done at the Goliad Project area until we obtained the leases through assignment from a private entity. During the period from May 2006 to present we began and are continuing an extended drilling program at the site.

### Exploration and Development Work Undertaken

This description of previous exploration and development work undertaken at the Goliad Project is based primarily on electric logs and maps produced by Moore Energy during the period 1983 to 1984. Moore Energy completed 479 borings on various leases. Eight widespread exploration borings were completed by Coastal Uranium in 1980. We obtained leases from a private entity in 2006 and began confirmation drilling in May 2006. As of October 1, 2009, approximately 958 confirmation-delineation holes totalling 338,615 feet have been drilled by us to confirm and expand the mineralization base at the Goliad Project with the intention of permitting the project as an ISR mining and recovery facility.

All of the exploration holes (Coastal Uranium, Moore Energy and the Company) have been drilled using truck-mounted drilling rigs contracted with various drilling companies. The holes were drilled by conventional rotary drilling methods using drilling mud fluids. All known uranium exploration or confirmation drilling at the Goliad property has been by way of vertical holes. Drill cuttings were typically collected from the drilling fluid returns circulating up the annulus of the borehole. These samples were generally taken at 10-foot intervals and laid out on the ground in rows (10 cuttings piles per 100 feet of drilling) by the driller for review and description by a geologist. At completion the holes were logged for gamma ray, self potential and resistance by contract logging companies. The logging companies utilized by both Coastal Uranium and Moore Energy provided and primarily analog data. No down-hole deviation tool was available at the time. In contrast, the Company has utilized a company (Century Geophysical) that has provided digital log data along with downhole deviation. In an effort to be cost effective we have recently purchased and had built our own logging trucks.

#### Historical Mineral Estimates and Their Reliability

Historical mineral estimates were prepared by Moore Energy from 1983 through 1985. For each drill hole, a grade thickness (GT) was determined. GT is the product of the average equivalent uranium mineral grade, as determined by  $eU_3O_8$  gamma ray readings, and the thickness of the mineralized zone. An outline contouring all of the drill holes with intercepts meeting these criteria was produced and the area within the outline was determined using a planimeter. The average GT of the holes within the contoured outline was then used to estimate the mineralization meeting the specified criteria.

During the field investigation by Moore Energy a prompt fission neutron ("PFN") specialty logging unit was used to determine the disequilibrium factor ("DEF") in the four different mineralized zones identified at the site. The logging unit was designed to determine the grade of uranium only while excluding the daughter products that develop over time from the half-life decay rates. The unit utilized by Moore Energy was provided by Princeton Gamma Technologies ("PGT"). A total of 30 boreholes were logged with the PFN unit by Moore Energy during the field investigation. The log output data is on a printout with one-foot values for the logged mineralized intercepts. Numerical values of the PGT uranium were assayed in  $\%U_3O_8$ , the gross gamma equivalent  $e\%U_3O_8$ , and the unit calculated the DEF. The log header contains logging unit factors and location and hole identification data. The log output also provides a calculation of the thickness, average grade, starting depth, grade thickness and DEF. A review of the historic data and discussion with the Moore Energy geologist shows that DEF data from PGT logged holes were sorted by intervals according to what zone that interval was situated. The DEF values from each zone were then averaged if there were enough values and those values used to adjust the historical estimate of Moore Energy.

#### Geological Setting

##### Regional Geology

The Goliad Project area is situated in the Texas Gulf Coastal Plain physiographic province that is geologically characterized by sedimentary deposits that typically dip and thicken toward the Gulf of Mexico from the northwest source areas. Additionally, the regional dip generally increases with distance in the down dip direction as the overall

thickness of sediments increase. The sedimentary units are dominantly continental clastic deposits with some near shore and shallow marine facies. The uranium-bearing units are virtually all sands and sandstones in Tertiary formations ranging in age from Eocene (oldest) to Upper Miocene (youngest).

#### Local and Property Geology

The surface of the property is all within the outcrop area of the Goliad Formation (Figure 4-3). The mineralized units are sands and sandstone within the Goliad Formation and are designated by us as the A through D sands from younger (upper) to older (lower), respectively. The sand units are generally fine to medium grained sands with silt and varying amounts of secondary calcite. The sand units vary in color depending upon the degree of oxidation-reduction and could be from light brown-tan to grays. The sands units are generally separated from each other by silty clay or clayey silts that serve as confining units between the sand units.



The Goliad Formation at the project site occurs from the surface to a depth of about 500 feet. Depending upon the land surface elevation, groundwater occurs in the sands of the formation below depths of about 30 to 60 feet. The four sand/sandstone zones (A-D) designated as containing uranium mineralization at the site are all considered to be a part of the Gulf Coast Aquifer on a regional basis. At the project area, however, each zone is a hydrogeologic unit with similar but variable characteristics. The A zone is the uppermost unit and based on resistance logs, groundwater in this unit may be unconfined over portions of the site. The three deeper zones are confined units with confining clays and silts above and below the water-bearing unit.

---

Groundwater from sands of the Goliad Formation is used for water supplies over much of the northern portion of Goliad County. Water quality in the Goliad Formation is variable and wells typically can yield small to moderate amounts of water. Data indicates an approximate average hydraulic conductivity of the water-bearing zones of the Goliad Formation in Goliad County is 100 gallons per day per square foot. Based on this value, a 20 foot sand unit would have an approximate transmissivity of 2,000 gallons per day. With sufficient available drawdown properly completed ISR wells could have average yields in the range of 25 to 50 gallons per minute.

The hydrogeologic characteristics of the water-bearing sands at the Goliad Project have not been determined yet, but aquifer tests are required prior to submitting a mining permit application. Hydrogeologic tests will determine the hydraulic character of the sands and the confining beds separating the individual sand zones.

The site area structures include two faults that intersect and offset the mineralized units. These faults are normal, with one downthrown toward the coast and one downthrown toward the northwest. The fault throws range from about 40 to 80 feet.

#### Project Type

The Goliad uranium project is characteristic of other known Goliad sand / sandstone deposits in south Texas. The mineralization occurs within fluvial sands and silts as roll front deposits that are typically a "C" or cutoff "C" shape. The roll fronts are generally associated with an extended oxidation-reduction boundary or front.

The other Goliad projects in the region include the Mt. Lucas mine at Lake Corpus Christi, the Kingsville Dome mine southeast of Kingsville, the Rosita mine west of Alice and the Mestena mine in Brooks County. These mines are all located south of the Goliad Project from about 60 to 160 miles. The average tons and uranium grade information for these mines is not known, but all these ISR projects mining Goliad Formation sand units have been very successful with the following characteristics in common: excellent leaching characteristics rate, favorable hydraulic conductivity of host sands, mineral resources have DEF mostly above 1.0 and mineral resource mining recoveries of 80-100 percent.

At the Goliad Project there are four stacked mineralized sand horizons (A-D) that are separated vertically by zones of finer sand, silt and clay. Deposition and concentration of uranium in the Goliad Formation likely resulted due to a combination of leaching of uranium from volcanic tuff or ash deposits within the Goliad Formation or erosion of uranium-bearing materials from older Oakville deposits. The leaching process occurred near the outcrop area where recharge of oxidizing groundwater increased the solubility of uranium minerals in the interstices and coating sand grains in the sediments. Subsequent downgradient migration of the soluble uranium within the oxygenated groundwater continued until the geochemical conditions became reducing and uranium minerals were deposited in roll front or tabular bodies due to varying stratigraphic or structural conditions.

There are at least two northeast-southwest trending faults at the Goliad property that are likely related to the formation of the Goliad Project mineralization. The northwesterly fault is a typical Gulf Coast normal fault, downthrown toward the coast, while the southeastern fault is downthrown to the northwest, forming a graben structure. Both faults are normal faults. Throw on the northwest fault is about 75 feet and the southeast fault has about 50 feet of throw. The presence of these faults is likely related to the increased mineralization at the site. The faulting has probably served as a conduit for reducing waters-gases to migrate from deeper horizons as well as altering the groundwater flow system in the uranium-bearing sands.

#### Mineralization

The Goliad Project uranium-bearing units occur as multiple roll-front type structures in vertically stacked sands and sandstones. Groundwater flowing from northwest to southeast in the Goliad sands likely contained low concentrations of dissolved uranium resulting from oxidizing conditions and the relatively short distance from the recharge area. The geochemical conditions in the sands near our property changed from oxidizing to reducing due to an influx of reductants. Hydrogen sulfide and/or methane dissolved in groundwater are likely sources of creating a reduction-oxidation boundary in the area with consequent precipitation and concentration of uranium mineralization.

12

---

Specific identification of the uranium minerals has not been done at the Goliad Project. The very fine uranium minerals found coating quartz grains and within the interstices in most south Texas sand and sandstone roll-front deposits has generally been found to be dominantly uraninite. No uraninite has been identified on the Goliad Project and the presence of uraninite on other properties does not mean that such mineralization will be found on the Goliad Project. Detailed petrographic examination of disseminated uranium mineralization within sands/sandstones is generally not suitable for identification of the specific uranium minerals. Laboratory equipment such as x-ray diffraction units may be used to identify the minerals, however the specific mineral species typically found in reduced sands are generally similar in south Texas ISR projects and leaching characteristics are also similar. Based on the experience of the ISR mines throughout south Texas, the use of gamma-ray logging with a calibrated logging probe has become the standard method to determine the thickness and estimated grade of uranium bearing minerals.

At the project site the Goliad Formation is exposed at the surface and extends to depths exceeding 500 feet. Uranium mineralization occurs in four sand/sandstone units that are all below the saturated zone. The zones are designated A to D from the top to the bottom of the sequence. The sands are fluvial-deltaic in origin, and thicken and thin across the project site. Each Zone is hydrologically separated by 10 to 50 feet or more of clay or silty clay. The uranium deposits are tabular in nature and can range from about one foot to over 45 feet in thickness. The "C"-shaped configuration is typically convex in a down-dip direction with leading edge tails on the upper end. Most of the exploration and delineation holes with elevated gamma ray log anomalies are situated within a southwest-northeast trending graben and most of the gamma ray anomaly holes are situated along the northernmost of the two faults comprising the graben. This northernmost fault is downthrown to the southeast, which is typical for the majority of faults along the Texas coastal area.

The A and B gamma ray anomaly zones are continuous, tabular bodies which extend for over 2000 feet along trend. The A Zone mineralized body ranges from about 100 feet to over 600 feet in width and the B Zone ranges from about 50 feet to over 300 feet in width. The D Zone gamma ray anomaly extends for over 5,000 feet along trend and appears to be comprised of extensive, isolated pods of high grade gamma anomalies which range from 50 feet to over 500 feet in width. Confirmation drilling, however, has shown high-grade gamma ray anomaly connections between some of the pods. The C Zone is the least extensive of the four gamma anomaly zones.

#### Exploration

A review of the available records for the Goliad Project indicated that approximately eight holes were drilled by Coastal Uranium on or near the current Goliad Project leases. This original exploration program resulted in the original find of gamma ray logging responses indicating potential low grade uranium as a part of a very wide spaced preliminary exploration program by Coastal Uranium during the period from October 1979 through June 1980.

Records indicate that Moore Energy obtained leases from Coastal Uranium for properties in the current Goliad Project area and conducted a thorough exploration program that consisted of drilling 479 exploration holes from March 1983 to August 1984. The program utilized gamma ray, resistance and self-potential logging of each hole and a geologic description of the lithology from five to 10-foot interval drill cuttings. In addition to gamma logs, several holes were also logged with a Princeton Gamma Tech Geophysical Services PFN type tool. This logging tool was used to differentiate gamma radiation from uranium and daughter products, and determine a DEF for the mineralization

intervals. The Moore Energy exploration program provided the geological basis for the Goliad Project.

Current (2006-2007) drilling at the property has been to confirm the geological details of the uranium mineralization at the property. The Goliad property work by our geologists is not exploration but confirmation-verification drilling. Additionally, our staff has continued peripheral as well as internal drilling to expand the historical mineralization.

### Drilling

Drilling for the Goliad Project has been conducted by truck-mounted rigs drilling vertical holes ranging from about four to six inches in diameter. After reaching the designated total depth, the hole is circulated from bottom to clear the heavy cuttings from the hole and condition the hole for logging with a specialized calibrated tool that recorded resistance, spontaneous potential and gamma ray. The gamma ray probe on each logging truck working on uranium drilling projects has to maintain calibration by regular cross checking the probe at a US Department of Energy test

13

---

pit near George West, Texas. The pit is set up for logging units to calibrate the gamma probe with a known radioactive source. This method has been successfully used in Texas since at least the mid-1970s. The available data indicate that the logging companies contracted for this project have maintained industry standard calibration procedures for their probes.

Based on a review of drilling records and discussions with former Moore Energy and our current employees, previous drilling on the property was conducted using rotary mud drilling and truck-mounted drilling rigs. Cuttings are typically taken at 10-foot intervals and placed in piles on the ground for a geologist to review for lithology and alteration. The drill holes were completed at various depths depending on which of the four sand units may have been mineralized in the vicinity location. Once completed, the drill holes were logged by a contract logger using a probe with gamma ray, self-potential and single point resistance capability. Drift tools for bottom hole deviation were not used by Coastal Uranium nor for the vast majority of Moore Energy holes. We have utilized the digital logging capability of Century Geophysical Corp. and have downhole deviation records for these holes. The drill hole collar location was used to position the hole location for map locations of individual holes. Although several boreholes had no deviation records, all drilling to date has been set up to be vertical drilling. At the depth range (300-500 ft) of most Goliad Project drilling, measured bottom hole deviations from vertical are generally less than 10 feet.

Initial exploration drilling in the general areas was conducted by Coastal Uranium in 1980. Some scattered low level gamma ray anomalies were noted in the geophysical logs that indicated potential low grade uranium mineralization was possible in three of the eight Coastal drill holes. Moore Energy established leases in the area in 1982 and began an exploration program in early 1983. Between 1983 and August 1984 Moore Energy completed 479 borings by mud rotary methods on several of their leases. We obtained leases for the property by assignment from a private entity in 2006 and began confirmation drilling in May 2006.

As of the date of this annual report we had drilled a total of 958 confirmation holes. Of the total 958 holes, 61 were strongly mineralized.

All uranium grades have been determined from evaluation (manual calculations or computerized logging equipment) of gamma logs of the drill holes. The resulting grades are designated as equivalent percent uranium that have not been corrected or verified by chemical assay. Because there has not been sufficient verification of the gamma log and PFN log data to arrive at a validated resource or reserve classification, the following data in Table 1 cannot be used to define a resource at this time.

14

Table 1. Representative Thickness and Grade by Zone					
A - A'					
Hole #	30892-62	30892-116	32202-64	32202-117	32202-108
Depth to Top (ft)	81	68	58	50	48
Depth to Base (ft)	144	130	120	116	108
Mineral Thickness (ft)	23.0	7.5	40.0	23.0	8.5
Grade (%U <sub>3</sub> O <sub>8</sub> )	0.05	0.03	0.04	0.05	0.03
Operator	Moore Energy	UEC	Moore Energy	UEC	UEC
Date Completed	27-Oct-83	3-Nov-06	31-Oct-83	15-Nov-06	8-Nov-06
Probe Used	414-1B	9055C-238	414-1B	9055C-82	9055C-238
B - B'					
Hole #	32201-N105	32201-N103	32201-N114	32201-N85	32201-N86
Depth to Top (ft)	160	160	160	153	155
Depth to Base (ft)	206	207	207	206	202
Mineral Thickness (ft)	7.0	14.0	14.5	10.5	10.0
Grade (%U <sub>3</sub> O <sub>8</sub> )	0.04	0.10	0.11	0.03	0.04
Operator	UEC	UEC	UEC	UEC	UEC
Date Completed	7-Mar-07	7-Mar-07	8-Mar-07	14-Feb-07	14-Feb-07
Probe Used	9056C-33	9056C-33	9056C-33	9056C-33	9056C-33
C - C'					
Hole #	30898-2	32201-N6	32201-N10	32201-N47	32201-N51
Depth to Top (ft)	160	226	220	214	219
Depth to Base (ft)	230	292	286	279	294

Edgar Filing: URANIUM ENERGY CORP - Form 10-K

Mineral Thickness (ft)	11.0	15.0	22.0	8.5	6.0
Grade (%U <sub>3</sub> O <sub>8</sub> )	0.06	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.03
Operator	Moore Energy	UEC	UEC	UEC	UEC
Date Completed	27-Sep-83	7-Dec-06	7-Dec-06	22-Mar-07	9-Jan-07
Probe Used	414-1B	9055C-238	9055C-238	9056C-33	9056C-33

D - D'					
Hole #	30898-10	30892-13	30892-111	30892-37	32202-108
Depth to Top (ft)	265	268	342	330	330
Depth to Base (ft)	348	350	420	418	423
Mineral Thickness (ft)	23.5	12.0	7.5	5.5	13.0
Grade (%U <sub>3</sub> O <sub>8</sub> )	0.11	0.09	0.03	0.04	0.03
Operator	Moore Energy	Moore Energy	UEC	Moore Energy	UEC
Date Completed	30-Sep-83	21-Jul-83	25-Oct-06	26-Aug-83	8-Nov-06
Probe Used	414-1B	SPB-01	9055C-82	SPB-01	9055C-238

### Disequilibrium

Uranium disequilibrium can be defined as the ratio of chemical uranium (cU<sub>3</sub>O<sub>8</sub>) over gamma-ray equivalent uranium (eU<sub>3</sub>O<sub>8</sub>). The first determination is made in a laboratory, as described below, whereas the second determination is typically a field measurement, from which an indirect or equivalent estimate of uranium content can be made. The ratio, or disequilibrium, between "chemical" laboratory techniques and "equivalent" field techniques exists because of the ongoing radioactive decay of uranium over time. A positive DEF of 1.0 or greater indicates the presence of more chemical uranium than equivalent uranium.

---

During exploration of the Goliad property in the early 1980s, Moore Energy utilized the prompt fission neutron (PFN) downhole logging technology of the Princeton Gamma-Tech Corporation (PGT) to identify disequilibrium. A review of available logs identified 30 Moore Energy drill holes on which PGT's PFN downhole logging tool was used to develop DEFs for the four mineralized zones on the project. Approximately 2,000 feet of hole was logged by PGT, which included all four of the mineralized zones. Both chemical (PFN direct reading) and equivalent (gamma log) U<sub>3</sub>O<sub>8</sub> readings were obtained for each foot of logged hole.

The DEF for each of the four zones at the Goliad Project were estimated by Moore Energy during the 1982-85 field

investigation. There were 30 borings during the Moore work that were logged with the PGT PFN tool to provide a direct comparison of the PGT uranium assay (%U3O8) with the gross gamma equivalent (eU3O8) from the radiometric signature of the material being logged. The A zone was the most logged unit, with about 14 PGT logs of mineralized zones. The average DEF for these logs was approximately 1.7. The B zone was penetrated by four PGT logs. The B zone DEF was thus conservatively designated as 1.439. The D zone was PGT logged at 6 holes had an average DEF of 1.435. No PGT logs were obtained of the C zone during the field program, due to the more limited areal extent of this unit and the limited time periods the PGT logger was at the project site. Because of the geologic similarity of the C zone sand with the B and D zones sands, Moore Energy assigned a DEF of 1.4 to the C zone to be consistent with the B and D zone sands. Although the PFN derived DEFs are believed to be reliable based on the operator's experience and knowledge of the technology utilized, direct chemical assays were not done to verify the technique when this work was done.

Modern day field logging continues to use the PFN tool as an effective direct assay technique to assess the disequilibrium between standard gamma ray logging results and the actual grade of uranium in the borehole. However, in order to verify the values obtained by historical or current PFN logging, a suitable verification program that uses laboratory chemical assays of core and/or definitive calibration testing by the equipment manufacturer or at certified test facilities would be needed.

#### Drill Cuttings

Drill cuttings are important sources of information for distinguishing and mapping alteration fronts and for use in correlating geophysical logs for lithology. Field geologists will review the drill cuttings in the field and describe the sediments encountered in the boring in terms of color, grain size, and other distinguishing characteristics. An important aspect of the lithology logs is to provide the level of the sediment alteration as an indication of reduction and oxidation conditions. This information is important to locate the reduction-oxidation front/boundary. Cutting samples are generally not used for chemical assay or other laboratory testing due to dilution and contamination with drilling mud. Lithology logs are present for all of the drill holes, but they were not reviewed in full detail during this study.

Our policy has been to take samples of drill cuttings at 10-foot intervals from the surface to total depth. Once the cuttings have been observed and the lithologic logs prepared, the cuttings are discarded back into the mud pit. After allowing some drying time, the mud in the pit and the cuttings are eventually covered with soil that has been stored from the excavation of the pits.

#### Probe Truck and Calibration

Contract logging companies were utilized by Moore Energy and UEC for logging of drill holes. The contract logging companies maintained scheduled calibration of the gamma probes on each of their trucks against standards in a US Department of Energy maintained and monitored test pit facility outside George West, Texas. Probe truck and calibration information records were kept by the logging companies. We recently purchased two logging trucks and began using them on the Goliad Project in early June 2007, and January 2008.

#### Core Samples

We have taken three-inch core samples from eight drill holes representative of the occurrence of uranium mineralization at the site. The core holes are as follows: 30892-74C, 30892-85C, 30892-86C, 30892-102C, 30892-111C, 30892-118AC 30892-120C, and 32201-N100C) (Figure 13-1). The cores have included samples from all

mineralized zones but the C zone. Samples have been used for the purpose of moisture content, total metals (U and Mo),  $cU_3O_8$  for disequilibrium evaluations, leachability tests, density analyses and X-ray diffraction for mineral identification. Selected intervals were put in bags, labeled and placed in core boxes for transport to the respective laboratories for analyses. The remaining core is locked in a storage shed on the project site. All of the analyses except density determinations were conducted by Energy Labs in Casper, Wyoming. The laboratory has been in business since 1952, is fully certified, but not ISO certified. Certifications include the US Environmental Protection Agency, US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and the following US states: AZ, CA, CO, FL, ID, NV, OR, SD, TX, UT and WA. The density analyses were conducted by Professional Service Industries in Austin, Texas.

#### Borehole Remediation and Abandonment

The Texas Railroad Commission requires exploration companies to obtain exploration permits before conducting drilling in any area. The permits include standards for the abandonment and remediation of test bore holes. The standards include the cementing of test bore holes, the filling and abandonment of mud pits, and the marking of bore holes at the surface. Remediation requirements are sometimes specific to the area of exploration and may include segregation, storage, and re-covering with topsoil, regrading, and revegetation. The Railroad Commission conducts monthly remediation inspections of the Goliad Project site. Our Goliad Project site is in compliance with Railroad Commission remediation requirements.

#### Data Verification

Most of the historic logs were run with analog equipment except for some run by Century Geophysical with digital equipment, while our holes have all been logged with digital equipment. Century Geophysical initially logged, and continues to log the drill holes when required. In June 2007 and January 2008 we obtained new logging units and have logged with these units since that time in conjunction with Century Geophysical.

The use of selected core analyses by an analytical laboratory and field logging selected borings with a specialized logging tool that distinguishes uranium from its daughter products (such as delayed fission neutron or prompt fission neutron) will allow the operator to determine the average DEF of the project and utilize that and assay data to adjust (if necessary) the gamma-ray grade and thickness data.

The radiometric data from the gamma ray logging of each hole has provided the primary tool to determine the approximate grade of uranium in the subsurface. Additionally, some individual cores with chemical assays that verified the occurrence of  $cU_3O_8$  have been collected and analyzed during our drilling program. Primary verification that uranium mineralization is present at the site is from the large number of exploration/confirmation boreholes and the geophysical logs that document the presence of  $eU_3O_8$  with the gamma logs and lithology with the resistance logs. An independent geologist has reviewed core intervals representative of mineralization and, based on his review and evaluation of the historic and our current files and procedures, he determined that the records and files from the drilling programs have been well conducted and the information is suitable for estimated historical mineralization determination in a manner consistent with accepted practices in the ISR uranium mining industry.

For partial verification of the historic DEFs the Company contracted from Energy Labs of Casper, Wyoming, laboratory analyses on samples from three A Zone cores and one B Zone core. For the A Zone cores the analyses consisted of the determination of total chemical uranium and radiometric uranium from 28 selected one foot mineralized core intervals. This consisted of 15 intervals from core hole 30892-111C, eight intervals from core hole 30893-85C and five intervals from core hole 30893-118AC. From the B Zone, 30 continuous one foot samples were taken from core hole 32201-N100C.

Samples for chemical and radiometric gamma analysis are dried in a convection oven followed by grinding to -100 mesh. A 200 g sample is taken for the gamma analysis, placed in a tin and sealed with tape. A minimum 15 day period is required to establish equilibrium between  $^{226}\text{Ra}$  and the daughter  $^{214}\text{Bi}$ . The principal behind the gamma analysis is



that in a particular uranium occurrence,  $^{238}\text{U}$  and  $^{226}\text{Ra}$  will be in equilibrium. Since  $^{238}\text{U}$  is the only source of  $^{226}\text{Ra}$ , one can assume that ideally, measuring the activity of  $^{214}\text{Bi}$  can be used to indirectly determine the total uranium concentration. Accuracy is determined by using certified  $^{226}\text{Ra}$  standards. The chemical analysis uses a one-gram sample digested in a nitric acid-hydrogen peroxide mixture and measured by Inductively Coupled Argon Plasma (ICP) emission spectroscopy using certified standards for control.

17

---

Assay results indicate average DEFs for the A Sand core holes of 1.71, 1.15, and 0.16 for core holes 30892-111C, 85C, and 118AC, respectively. The 1.71 value was derived from the average of 15 one-foot sample intervals and the 1.15 value from eight one-foot sample intervals. The five one-foot intervals from the third core suggest a thin interval where the average  $\text{eU}_3\text{O}_8$  values exceed the chemical values. Such intervals are common, even in core holes with high overall DEFs, but their presence in a limited sample group such as the present one will skew the results in a negative fashion. The 1.71 value from the larger 15 sample group in core hole 30892-111C is consistent with the average 1.7 value derived from historic PGT logging by Moore Energy and is considered to be representative of the A Zone. The 30 one-foot sample intervals from the B Sand core hole had an average DEF of 1.26; a value similar in magnitude to the 1.439 PGT value determined by Moore Energy. Again, the PGT value was established from a larger sample grouping and may be considered more representative of the B Sand than that derived from the smaller sample group.

The development and refinement of the PFN and similar specialty logging methods over the past 30 years has resulted in a tool that provides an accurate field determination of potential uranium grade and infrequent need for laboratory assays of core. In order to maintain a consistent analysis of the disequilibrium factors throughout the mineral bodies, we are purchasing a PFN logging tool which will be used in conjunction with standard gamma ray logging on the Goliad project. Use of the PFN technology will assist in developing more concise future mineralization estimates, but still requires a level of verification with the accepted laboratory assay of core and/or calibration testing.

Additional verification of select historical Moore Energy drilling-and our current logging data was done by comparing sets of gamma logs from a Moore hole and a recent hole we drilled that was located in close proximity. The log pairs were located and then data tabulated for each pair to compare thickness of zone, equivalent  $\text{U}_3\text{O}_8$  grade, GT. A positive correlation indicated the drill hole sets were comparable in character regarding the potential mineral grade and thickness and representative of the same general portion of the project.

#### Adjacent Properties

There has been no uranium exploration or mining activity on adjacent properties to our Goliad Project. The nearest known uranium mining from the Goliad Formation was the Everest Mount Lucas ISR mine near Lake Corpus Christi. Uranium Resources Inc. has been mining from the Goliad Formation in Kleberg County, southeast of Kingsville, for several years at the Kingsville Dome ISR mine and at the Rosita ISR mine in Duval County west of Alice, Texas. With the large concentration of uranium mining and exploration properties in the Goliad, Oakville, Catahoula and Jackson formations throughout the South Texas uranium trend, it is likely that additional uranium target areas could be developed in the vicinity of our Goliad Project in the future. The current or historic ISR operations mining from the Goliad Formation range from about 60 to 160 miles south and on strike of the Goliad Project.

Several historic ISR and open pit operations mining from the Oakville and Jackson Formations are located within about 50 miles west of the property

#### Leach Amenability

Mineral processing or metallurgical testing was not reported as being conducted on any of the samples drilled or recovered during the Moore Energy exploration in the mid-1980s. We submitted selected core samples from our core hole # 30892-111C to Energy Laboratories, Inc. in Casper, Wyoming, in January 2007. These samples from the

Goliad Project were sent to the laboratory for leach amenability studies intended to demonstrate that uranium mineralization at the property was capable of being leached using conventional in situ leach chemistry. The tests do not approximate other in-situ variables (permeability, porosity, and pressure) but provide an indication of a sample's reaction rate and the potential chemical recovery.

Split sections of core were placed in laboratory containers and a lixivate solution with 2.0 grams per liter  $\text{HCO}_3$  ( $\text{NaHCO}_3$ ) and either 0.50 or 0.25 g/L of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  (hydrogen peroxide) was added to each test container. The containers were then rotated at 30 rpm for 16 hours. The lixivate was then extracted from each test container and analyzed for uranium, molybdenum, sodium, sulfate, alkalinity (bicarbonate, carbonate), pH and conductance. A clean charge of lixivate was added and the container rotated another 16 hours. Each sample rotation and lixivate

18

---

charge cycle was representative of 5 pore volumes with chemical analyses after each cycle. The cycle was repeated for a total of 6 cycles or the equivalent of 30 pore volumes.

The four core samples subjected to the leach amenability tests were determined to contain from 0.04% to 0.08%  $\text{cU}_3\text{O}_8$  before testing. Leach tests conducted on the core samples from the A Zone indicate leach efficiencies of 60 to 80%  $\text{U}_3\text{O}_8$  extraction, while the tails analyses indicate efficiencies of 87-89%. The differences between the two calculations involve the loss of solid clay based materials during multiple filtrations. Based on post leach solids analysis, the core intervals were leachable to a very favorable 86 to 89%. After tests the tails were reanalyzed for uranium concentration to determine the recovery, which ranged on the 4 samples using 2 methods from 60% to 89%.

Laboratory amenability testing of the cores samples indicated the uranium (dissolved elemental U) recoveries ranged from 86.4% to 88.9% in the four tests. These results show that the mineralized intervals at the Goliad Project are very amenable to ISR mining even when exposed to only one-half of the oxidant concentration normally used in the Leach Amenability test. Based on the Company's experience with ISR mining of Catahoula and Oakville uranium deposits, as well as discussions with other Goliad deposit mining personnel, the geologically younger deposits in Texas (Goliad formation) have been the most amenable to in situ leaching. The uranium recovery is generally more complete (% recovery) and occurs in a shorter time period. Both of these factors are important for ISR mine development economics.

Based on the amenability test results, the size of the mineral resource at the Goliad Project, the geologic setting and the current and projected future demand and price of uranium, the most feasible and cost effective mining method for the Goliad property uranium is by ISR. This method is most suitable for the size and grade of the deposits in sands that are below the water table and situated at depths that would be prohibitive for open pit or underground mining.

The amenability testing described above was conducted on core recovered from four depth intervals from one boring. While this was a limited sampling for this property, the samples are believed to be generally representative of the characteristics of the mineralized intervals and the determined recovery ranges for these intervals is considered to be reliable. Two of the four samples tested contained approximately 0.08%  $\text{cU}_3\text{O}_8$  and two contained lower grades of uranium (~0.04%  $\text{cU}_3\text{O}_8$ ). Energy Laboratories, Inc. in Casper, Wyoming, conducted the laboratory testing for this project. The laboratory has been in business since 1952, is fully certified, but not ISO certified. Certifications include the US Environmental Protection Agency, US Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the following US states: AZ, CA, CO, FL, ID, NV, OR, SD, TX, UT and WA.

#### ISR Considerations

The Goliad Project appears to be most suitable for mining as an ISR (in-situ recovery) project. Although leach and permeability tests are still being conducted, south Texas uranium deposits in permeable sands situated below the groundwater table are generally favorable to ISR production.

## Environmental Considerations

We have completed all of the required environmental baseline studies for the various permits needed for production. The Mine Permit application was submitted to the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) in mid August 2007. The TCEQ completed their technical review in May, 2008 and issued a draft mine permit in early June, 2008. The Radioactive Material License application was submitted to the TCEQ in early December, 2008. Studies completed to compile this document include: cultural resources (including archaeology), socioeconomic impact and soils mapping, baseline gamma survey, baseline soil/sediment/surface water/vegetation, baseline radon, and gamma exposure rates. The cultural resources study found no adverse impacts to the site and socioeconomic impacts are projected to be positive for the community. Texas Parks and Wildlife issued their report concerning the project stating that the proposed operation will have no adverse impact on natural resources. Additionally the U.S. Corp of Army Engineers have submitted a Jurisdictional Determination (JD) that the project will not impact neighboring wetlands. The Waste Disposal Well application was completed and submitted in late September, 2008. The TCEQ issued a final draft permit in September, 2009. The initial Production Permit Area (PAA-1) was completed and submitted in early September 2008, and a final draft permit was issued by the TCEQ in June, 2009.

19

---

## Engineering Studies

The geotechnical engineering study for the proposed plant site has been completed and mine planning, including engineering design for the proposed plant site, is in progress. 20 Regional Baseline water quality wells have been installed for monitoring the aquifer within the mineralized zones and pump tests on the aquifer are planned. Laboratory testing has indicated 86-89% leach ability of tested core samples and the results indicate that the mineralization is amenable to in situ leaching with an oxygenated bicarbonate lixiviant.

Soils in the upper 25 feet at the proposed site are variable with dominantly brown to light brown sandy silty clay in the upper 4 to 6 feet. Soils grade to tan sandy clayey silt that is generally present to depth of the investigation (25 feet). The shallow clayey soils have relatively high plasticity indices (PI) with lower PIs in the silty soils below. Groundwater was not encountered while drilling the borings.

The primary recommendation in the report is to construct a reinforced concrete mat type foundation sized for a uniform allowable loading of 2,000 pounds per square foot.

The report and recommendations indicates there are no apparent problem soils and the recommended slab and foundation should be suitable for the intended use of the slab.

## Goliad Project Plan of Exploration - 2009/2010

Our company successfully completed the planned 2007 two-phase drilling program which consisted of support to the ongoing environmental permitting, coring for agitation leach studies, and an exploration program designed to explore additional acreage acquired during our company's 2006-2007 leasing program. All 2007 drilling at the Goliad Project was carried out under our approved Texas Railroad Commission Exploration Permit No. 123 dated February 3, 2006. The Permit is being extended on an on-going basis as required.

The 2008-2009 exploratory program at the Goliad Project consisted of evaluating previous drilling efforts and adding to the geologic model of the mineralization system.

In regards to the environmental permitting at the Goliad Project, geologists and engineers performing work at the Goliad Project have developed a timetable of forecasted workflow, which includes the forecasted completion dates of various tasks which have been assigned to various personnel. The workflow has been broken down into two broad

categories, which have then been further broken down into individual tasks, many of which can be performed contemporaneously. The two major categories of work relate to radioactive materials licenses and mine permits.

Within these two broad categories of work are included the following tasks, many of which are required by the regulatory bodies to whom the Company is subject to oversight for its exploration activities. The forecasted dates of completion of these tasks is also indicated. These are internal forecasts only, and the actual dates of the beginning or completion of these tasks may differ materially from the forecasts:

20

---

Radioactive Materials License

Mine Permit

Upon the satisfactory completion of these tasks, and with approval of all applicable regulatory agencies involved in these tasks, the Company may then proceed with uranium extraction, provided that this exploration property can establish economic uranium reserves.

#### Permitting

The permitting process is well underway and the Company has accomplished the following key elements to that end:

- (a) quality assurance and quality control measures have been completed on water well samples;
- (b) Holt Engineering has completed geotechnical studies at the proposed processing facility;
- (c) a qualified soil scientist has completed a draft map of the entire project site, as part of the soils and sediments study;
- (d) the economic impact study and the ecological study have been completed;

21

---

- (e) the mine plan and full process facility designs have been completed;
- (f) established a regional baseline, or background, water quality conditions within the area to be mined. As part of the establishment of baseline water quality conditions within the planned permit area, the TCEQ required that 20 regional water quality wells be installed within the proposed permit area. The purpose of the wells is to assess the pre-mining water quality of the four mineralized sands (A, B, C and D). Also included in the establishment of regional baseline water quality conditions is the sampling and analysis of private water wells within a one-kilometer radius of the permit area. This action has been completed; and
- (g) the Cultural Resource Survey and Assessment has been completed and concluded that the Goliad Project will not have any impact on cultural resources in the permit area, and that no further work is required on this matter by the Company. The assessment was reviewed and approved by the Texas Historical Commission.
- (h) Texas Parks and Wildlife have reviewed our proposal mine plan and have concluded that no significant impact to wildlife, May - 2008.
- (i) The Corp of Army Engineers have also received our mine plan and have determined that it will not have any adverse impacts to area wetlands.

Cebolleta Project, Cibola County, New Mexico

Property Description and Location

The Cebolleta Project is situated in the eastern-most portion of Cibola County, New Mexico. It is located approximately 45 air miles (72 kilometers) west-northwest of the City of Albuquerque, and approximately 10 miles (16 kilometers) north of the town of Laguna. Three small villages, Bibo, Moquino and Seboyeta, are located a short distance west and northwest of the project area.

Neutron Energy Inc. ("NEI"), the managing partner of Cibola Resources, obtained a lease from the Board of Trustees of the Cebolleta Land Grant Board for an area of the land grant covering approximately 6,700 acres (2,994 hectares) of mineral rights. The majority of the leased mineral rights are covered by the surface estate held by the Cebolleta Land Grant, and surface use and access rights are included as provisions of the lease. A portion of the leased mineral rights are covered by surface rights held by a third party, and are not leased by NEI. NEI has assigned the lease to Cibola Resources, of which, Uranium Energy owns 49% of the shares.

The leased lands are part of a land grant that was made to certain individuals by the King of Spain prior to the inclusion of the State of New Mexico as part of the United States.

When the territory of New Mexico was acquired by the United States, the rights and title first conveyed by the creation of the Cebolleta Land Grant were honored by the United States Senate through the ratification of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. Although the area of the Cebolleta Land Grant, including a portion of the Cebolleta project, was never surveyed into the US Section-Township-Range system, the property has been legally surveyed by a registered land surveyor and the appropriate monuments have been put in place.

Cibola Resources has accepted assignment of the Cebolleta Land Grant mineral lease from NEI. The lease, which has an initial term of ten years, may be extended beyond the initial term by Cibola Resources by undertaking mineral exploration, mine development and mining and/or mineral processing activities. The lease agreement requires Cibola Resources to make periodic (annual) advance royalty payments to the Cebolleta Land Grant, pay a sliding scale production royalty (based upon the sales price of U3O8) on any mine production from the property and provide employment opportunities and job training programs for the members of the Cebolleta Land Grant. Cibola Resources is required to complete an independent "third-party" feasibility study within six years of the effective date

23

---

of the lease, and make a "reserve bonus" payment of US\$1 per pound of U3O8, within the "Measured" or "Proven" reserve category and determined to be recoverable by a feasibility study. All annual payments made to the Cebolleta Land Grant prior to the completion of a feasibility study are to be deducted from the "reserve bonus" payment. The lease agreement conveys the rights to explore for, mine and process uranium deposits present on the leased lands. A "Short Form Memorandum of Uranium Mining Lease and Agreement" has been filed and recorded with the offices of the County Clerk and Recorder for Cibola County, New Mexico.

A portion of the leased properties are subject to a pre-existing 1/48th (2.08%) royalty on a "Uranium Value". This third-party royalty is deductible from production royalties payable to the Cebolleta Land Grant, and does not represent a further economic burden to Cibola Resources or the project.

The leased property was formerly the site of several underground uranium and open pit mines and processing plant (uranium mill). Open pit and underground mines in the St. Anthony area of the Cebolleta Land Grant lease are currently being reclaimed by the former operators of those mines, UNC Resources (a subsidiary of General Electric). The L-Bar mine and uranium mill were reclaimed by the successor to Sohio Western Mining Company ("Sohio"), Kennecott Energy Company ("Kennecott"), and the mill site has been transferred to the US Department of Energy for long-term monitoring and management. The former L-Bar mill site is not a part the lease from Cebolleta Land Grant. An examination of the files of the State of New Mexico Environment Department and the New Mexico Energy and Minerals Department indicates that Kennecott has some limited reclamation obligations relating to subsidence associated with several ventilation holes for the former JJ #1 underground mine. UNC Resources has obligations to reclaim portions of the former St. Anthony mine area, and they are currently undertaking a comprehensive restoration program in accordance with the directives of the State of New Mexico. Cibola Resources and its members, NEI and Uranium Energy, have not assumed any reclamation liabilities for the properties.

As with all drilling projects proposed in the State of New Mexico, Cibola Resources will be required to obtain permits from the New Mexico Energy, Minerals and Natural Resources Department. Cibola Resources is currently preparing an application for drilling on the project. Mining and milling operations will require additional permits from the New Mexico Energy, Minerals, and Natural Resources Department, the New Mexico Environment Department, as well as the US Environmental Protection Agency and the US Nuclear Regulatory Commission. At this time Cibola Resources does not hold permits for any activities for the Cebolleta project.

#### Accessibility, Climate, Local Resources, Infrastructure and Physiography

The Cebolleta project is situated on the southern margin of the San Juan Basin of west-central and northwestern New Mexico. The project area adjoins Mesa Chivato, a broad volcanic capped mesa that surrounds Mount Taylor, a dormant volcano that is a prominent landmark. Elevations within the project area range from 6,400 feet to 7,100 feet above sea level (1,950 meters to 2,164 meters). Topography is typical of the mesa-and-canyon landforms that dominate this portion of New Mexico, with sharp local variations in elevation, on the order of 200 to 400 feet (61 meters to 122 meters) over short distances. A series of rounded hills, raising 200 to 300 feet (61 to 91 meters) above the surrounding landscape, are present in the vicinity of the former L-Bar uranium mine (in the western part of the project area). A prominent canyon, developed along Meyer Draw and Arroyo Pedro Padilla, cuts the southern part of



the project area.

In spite of these local variations in topography, access to nearly all of the project area is good. Access to the project is over a paved state-maintained highway to the village of Seboyeta (a distance of approximately 10 miles, or 16

kilometers). One all-weather graded gravel road, maintained by Cibola County, and several private roads of varying quality, cross the project lands and provide access to nearly all parts of the project area. Rail service is available from the BNSF Railroad at the towns of Grants and Milan, and scheduled air service is available in Albuquerque.



The area is populated with sparse mixed grasses, with very limited stands of mesquite and pinion pine trees, typical of a semi-arid high desert climate. Temperatures at Grants (the nearest town with meaningful weather records) range from lows of approximately 50°F to 80°F (9.9°C to 26.6°C) in the summer season, and 10°F to 40°F (-12.2°C to 4.4°C) in the winter. The area receives approximately 11 inches (279 millimeters) of precipitation annually. Much of this precipitation comes in the form of afternoon thundershowers during the months of July and August, and as much as 13 inches (330 millimeters) of snow during the winter months. Winter snows and summer thunderstorms may create temporary muddy ground conditions that interrupt access for short periods of time. Other than these short periods of muddy ground conditions, mineral exploration and mining activities normally can be conducted without interruption throughout the year.

The project area has sufficient surface resources to support mining and processing operations, tailings ponds, and mine waste dumps. There are numerous sources of water, electricity, and fuel in the area. Personnel experienced in open pit and underground mining, construction and mineral processing are available in Grants (40 miles, or 64 kilometers, to the southwest of the project area) and at the town of Laguna. Two high voltage electrical transmission lines cross the region several miles north of the project area, and electrical lines have been constructed to the sites of the former Sohio L-Bar uranium mine.

### History

The Cebolleta project is located in the northern portion of the Laguna mining district, the eastern-most portion of the Grants mineral belt. The first discovery of uranium mineralization in the Laguna district was made by geologists and engineers of the Anaconda Copper Company in late 1951. The identification of strong uranium mineralization resulted in the discovery of the Jackpile-Paguete uranium mine. Anaconda also undertook an exploration program on the nearby Evans Ranch, located northeast of the Jackpile mine, in 1955 and this program continued until 1957. During this period of exploration more than 350 holes were drilled in the area of the Cebolleta project by Anaconda.

Climax Uranium, a subsidiary of American Metals Climax, obtained a lease from the Cebolleta Land Grant for the St. Anthony area and subsequently discovered several uranium deposits on the leased properties. Climax operated a series of small-scale open pit and underground mines, commencing in 1953 and ending in 1960, when the lease was acquired by United Nuclear Corporation (later to become UNC Resources, now a subsidiary of General Electric). During the period of Climax's operations the company produced 320,942 pounds of U<sub>3</sub>O<sub>8</sub>. UNC's mining activities are reported to have commenced in 1977. Production rates for the last two years of production at St. Anthony (1979 and 1980) were 1.134 million pounds of U<sub>3</sub>O<sub>8</sub> from stockpiles at the mine site.

Reserve Oil and Minerals, a publicly-traded resource development company, purchased the Evans Ranch (surface and mineral rights) in 1968. Reserve sold an undivided 50 percent interest in the ranch, including the mineral rights, to Sohio (then a subsidiary of the Standard Oil Company of Ohio) in 1969 and formed a joint venture to explore for and develop uranium deposits on the Evans Ranch. Sohio operated the joint venture and discovered extensive uranium mineralization on the property prior to the construction of an underground mine and uranium mill complex (the L-Bar mine and mill). Sohio acquired Reserve's interests in the property in 1982, and subsequently deeded their property interests in the area to the Cebolleta Land Grant in 1989.

Areas I and II were considered to be open pit development targets by Sohio, while the remaining deposits were considered to be underground mining targets only.

Mining at the Cebolleta project removed, prior to shut-down of mining operations due to depressed commodity prices, only a portion of the previously identified mineral resources in place at the project.

This work verified earlier studies by Sohio, based upon 150 core samples, that the deposits were generally in radiometric equilibrium.

The staff of Sohio Western Mining Company updated the historical resources periodically based upon mine production, cut-off grade changes, additional drilling results, underground long-hole drilling and underground sampling of mine workings and muck-piles. Underground sampling was undertaken with the aid of underground probes for muck-pile sampling, while grades of hauled muck were determined by the use of a scanner, with both

27

---

methods yielding radiometric assays ( $^{238}\text{U}$ ). Sohio based the 1981 estimate, along with the 1982 and 1984 updates on the following criteria:

- (a) Surface Resources: The maximum area of influence assigned to each hole is a 50 foot (15.24 meters) radius. Base elevations for mineralization were evaluated in developing the mineralized outlines. Once the final mineralized outline was established, the surface area of each mineralized block was determined by planimeter. The average thickness of the mineralized interval and the grade was calculated from drill hole data. Tonnages were computed using a tonnage factor of 16 cubic feet per short ton;
- (b) Underground Long-hole Resources: The area of influence for long-hole mineralization was 25 feet (7.6 meters) or one-half the distance to the nearest "waste" intercept. Tonnages and grades were calculated in the same manner as surface resources; and
- (c) Development Resources: This category of mineralization was calculated before the mining phase commenced. Average grades were calculated from muck-pile sampling (radiometric and chemical assaying). "Back-ore" and "floor-ore" were calculated from jackleg long-hole drilling data (radiometric assays). Pillar mineralization thickness was based upon the average height of underground drifts.

### Geological Setting

The Cebolleta project is situated at the eastern end of the prolific Grants mineral belt, which is located on the southern and south-eastern margins of the San Juan Basin and the northern margin of the ancestral Mogollan Highland. The geology of the region is dominated by a thick sequence of sedimentary rocks ranging from Triassic to Late Cretaceous in age. This sedimentary sequence is overlain by volcanic rocks (basalt) that were erupted from the Mount Taylor volcanic center, which is located a short distance to the northwest of the project area. Additionally, isolated basalt plugs and diabase dikes have been intruded into Cretaceous-aged rocks immediately north and southwest of the project area.

### Stratigraphy

A thick sequence of sedimentary rocks, ranging in age from Triassic through upper Cretaceous is present within the immediate project area. Of particular importance is the Jurassic-aged Morrison Formation, which is the host unit for nearly all of the significant uranium deposits in the Grants mineral belt. The Morrison Formation has been subdivided by various workers into three principal units (in ascending order) in the southern portion of the San Juan Basin: the Recapture unit, the overlying Westwater Canyon Member, and the upper-most Brushy Basin Member. The Morrison Formation is unconformably overlain by the Cretaceous-aged Dakota Sandstone, which in turn is overlain by the Mancos Shale.

Regionally, the Recapture Member of the Morrison Formation ranges from 50 to 600 feet (15 to 183 meters) in thickness, and is about 50 feet (15 meters) thick in the project area. It is comprised of interbedded mudstones, siltstone, sandstones, and occasional limestone. Historic reports indicated that the unit was normally greyish-red on surface exposures, while fresh exposures of the various lithologies were grey (limestone), greyish-green (mudstone),

or greyish-yellow (sandstone).

The Westwater Canyon Member ranges from 10 to 90 feet (three to 27 meters) in thickness in the project area. While the Westwater Canyon conformably overlies the Recapture Member there is evidence, on a local scale, for Westwater Canyon channels having "scoured" into the uppermost parts of the underlying Recapture Member. The Westwater Canyon, which is the principal host for uranium mineralization throughout the Grants mineral belt, is a greyish-yellow to pale orange sandstone. The sandstones are poorly sorted, range from fine to coarse-grained, and are sub-arkosic to arkosic in composition. In the Marquez Canyon area, approximately 15 miles (24 kilometers) north of the project area, the Westwater is comprised of several sandstone lenses that are separated by thin lenses of mudstone and siltstone.

28

---

The uppermost unit of the Morrison Formation is the Brushy Basin Member, a thick unit comprised primarily of variegated mudstones and claystones, which range in thickness from 220 to 300 feet (67 to 91 meters) in the vicinity of the project. The mudstone and claystone units are greyish-red, greyish-green to greenish-grey in color and form distinctive rounded outcrops. Several sandstone beds are present within the Brushy Basin throughout the Grants mineral belt, and certain of these sandstones have economic significance for hosting uranium deposits. Several of the sandstone units are similar in character to the Westwater Canyon sandstone.

The Jackpile sandstone is a distinct, yet local, unit that is in the uppermost part of the Brushy Basin Member. This unit is the host for the significant uranium deposits at the Jackpile - Paguete, St. Anthony, and L-Bar mines. The Jackpile sandstone extends in a north-easterly-trending belt that may be as much as 13 miles (21 kilometers) wide and more than 65 miles (105 kilometers) long. The unit may achieve a thickness of 200 feet (61 meters). In the St. Anthony mine complex the Jackpile ranges from 80 to 120 feet (24 to 37 meters), while at the adjoining L-Bar mine it ranges from 80 to 100 feet (24 to 30 meters) in thickness.

Thick, essentially uninterrupted, sequences of sandstone are characteristic of the Jackpile. Shale or mudstone beds are not totally absent but they are reported to be rare. The unit is a fine to medium-grained feldspathic sandstone, which is often cemented with clay. It is composed of 60 to 90% quartz, with clay and feldspar making up the remainder. Rock fragments are present, but are minor constituents. Clays occur as kaolinite, and more importantly, montmorillonite, and often serves as cement in the sandstone. Locally, the Jackpile has also been cemented with calcite.

The Dakota Sandstone, of Cretaceous age, unconformably overlies the Brushy Basin Member of the Morrison Formation throughout the project area. It is tan, orange, and white, well cemented sandstone that has minor interbeds of black shale. It averages about 50 feet (15 meters) in the project area. The Mancos Shale, also of Cretaceous age conformably overlies the Dakota Sandstone and is the uppermost sedimentary rock unit in the project area. It attains a thickness of approximately 400 feet (122 meters) in the area. It is comprised of grey to black friable shale with various interbedded sandstones that range from five to 30 feet (1.5 to nine meters) in thickness (Schlee and Moench, 1963).

## Structure

Sedimentary rocks in the project area dip gently to the northwest, into the San Juan Basin, at less than two degrees. Several small scale dip-slip faults, generally down-dropped to the west, have been mapped on the surface several miles north of the project, and two similar structures, down-dropped to the east, have been mapped northeast and southwest of the immediate project area. No major faulting has been recognized in the area.

Several small-scale high-angle faults were observed in the workings of the JJ #1 underground mine, but these structures do not appear to have disrupted uranium mineralization in the mine and do not appear to have influenced the localization of mineralization.

## Ground Water

Throughout the Grants mineral belt sandstones of the Morrison Formation, particularly the Westwater Canyon, and the Dakota Sandstone are aquifers. Various reports for the L-Bar mine, groundwater inflows from the Jackpile sandstone member of the Morrison Formation range from 25 to 100 gallons per minute (113 to 454 liters). Water wells capable of producing between 25 and 35 gallons per minute (113 and 159 liters) were completed into the Jackpile sandstone at L-Bar, and wells capable of producing between 35 and 50 gallons per minute (159 and 227 liters) from the Westwater Canyon Member of the Morrison Formation (Geo-Management, 1972). Although pumping data is not available to determine the ability of either aquifer to provide sustained water supplies considerable water is known to exist in the Westwater Canyon in the vicinity of the Cebolleta project.

#### Deposit Types

The mineralization at the Cebolleta project is classified as tabular sandstone-hosted uranium deposits. The St. Anthony and L-Bar uranium occurrences were formed by the mobilization of uranium from either granitic rocks of

29

---

the ancestral Mogollon Highlands, located south of the Cebolleta project area, or from the devitrification of tuffaceous rocks and tuffaceous material contained in the host sandstones and in the Brushy Basin Member. The uranium was transported from its "source" area to current locations by alkaline ground waters. Uranium minerals were deposited in the host sandstones, where humic acids derived from decayed vegetal material and transported by ground water "scavenged" uranium from the active ground water system.

At the L-Bar deposits carbonaceous material, which was the reductant for the precipitation of uranium occurs in two forms, as detritus, and as humate. No significant uranium mineralization occurs where carbonaceous material is absent.

As previously noted, the uranium mineralization is hosted (primarily) in porous and permeable sandstones within the Jackpile unit of the Brushy Basin Member of the Morrison Formation. This type of uranium deposit generally occurs at several different levels in the host, and a group of deposits may extend along an ill-defined "trend", which may reflect channel facies of the host, for a distance of several miles. This style of uranium deposit is very well known in the Grants mineral belt where it is the dominant mode of uranium occurrence.

Uranium minerals at the Cebolleta project are reported to be Coffinite [ $U(SiO_4)_{1-x}(OH)_{4x}$ ], Uraninite [ $UO_2$ ], organo-uranium complexes, and unidentified oxidized uranium complexes.

#### Mineralization

There are several uranium prospects located on the Cebolleta project. The L-Bar portion of the project includes four distinct zones of mineralization, known as Area I, Area II, Area VI, and Area V. Mining operations undertaken by Sohio were limited to the Area II and Area III deposits, but based upon historical resources data prepared by Sohio after the closure of the L-Bar mine substantial mineralization remains in both deposits. The Area I deposit, located in the southern part of the L-Bar complex (and was never mined), extends south of the former property boundary onto the former St. Anthony area, and additional uranium mineralization is present in the St. Anthony area adjacent to the St. Anthony open pit and the Willie P. underground mine.

The six known uranium prospects located on the Cebolleta project share a common set of geological controls;

- (a) all are hosted in medium to coarse-grained sandstones that exhibit a high degree of large-scale tabular cross-stratification;

- (b) near the margins of the prospects the mineralization thins appreciably, although halos of low-grade mineralization exist surrounding the deposits;
- (c) higher grade mineralization usually occurs in the core of the mineralized zones;
- (d) strong mineralization appears to be concentrated in the lowermost portions of the Jackpile, although anomalous concentrations of uranium are present throughout the vertical extent of the unit;
- (e) most of the mineralization appears to be "reduced", with only isolated small pods, especially in the Willie P area, of discontinuous mineralization exhibiting oxidation;
- (f) extensive chemical and radiometric analyses on core holes by Sohio demonstrated that the mineralization is generally within equilibrium;
- (g) individual prospects do not show a preferred orientation or trend, and do not fully reflect the orientation of the main Jackpile sandstone channel trend;
- (h) nearly all of the prospects show a strong spatial relationship with carbonaceous material; and

30

---

- (i) the prospects range in depth from approximately 200 feet (61 meters) in the south, at the St. Anthony area, to approximately 700 feet (213 meters) in the vicinity of the Area II and Area III deposits at L-Bar.

At the L-Bar complex, mineralization occurs in tabular bodies that may be more than 1,000 feet (305 meters) in length, and attain thicknesses of 6 to 12 feet (1.8 to 3.7 meters). The upper and lower boundaries of these mineralized bodies are generally quite abrupt. There is some tendency for individual prospects to develop in clusters. Locally, these clusters may be related to the coalescence of separate channel sandstone bodies. In this instance, mineralization is often thicker and higher grade than adjoining areas.

#### Exploration

During 2007 through first quarter 2008, Cibola Resources has not undertaken any exploration on the properties covered by this report, other than a review and analysis of available historical and published information, modeling of the known uranium mineralization, and planning for a drill program during the second half of 2008.

#### Drilling

Cibola Resources has not carried out any drilling on the subject properties.

The drilling data that served as the basis for the historical mineral resources for the Cebolleta project includes more than 1,500 conventional (open-hole) rotary and core holes (totaling in excess of 600,000 feet [182,880 meters]) that were drilled between the late 1950's and the early 1980's. All drill holes were logged with truck mounted surface recording gamma/Self-Potential/single point resistivity logging units, which is a standard method of determining the presence and magnitude of subsurface uranium mineralization. This method of "sampling" provided a continuous record of the intensity of uranium mineralization in each drill hole. Cibola Resources has a significant number of the gamma/S-P/resistivity logs for holes at the Cebolleta project, and this data effectively defines the nature and extent not only of the subsurface uranium mineralization in the project areas, but also the thickness and lateral extent of the host rocks within the areas of drilling.



Drill holes were generally drilled on a square grid pattern, with holes spaced at 100 feet (30.48 meters), although some drilling at the "Area III" uranium deposit was spaced at 200 foot (60.96 meters) intervals. All drill holes were drilled vertically (-90 degrees) and intersected the generally flat-lying host rocks in a manner that gave an accurate depiction of the true thicknesses of the host rocks and the mineralized horizons.

Samples collected from the conventional rotary and core holes have not been available for examination, and likely no longer exist.

#### Sample Preparation, Analysis, and Security

All of the historical drill holes drilled at the Cebolleta project were logged with truck-mounted continuous surface recording natural gamma-ray/S-P/resistivity probe units. This process provided a continuous reading of gamma radioactivity through the entire length of the drill hole. Gamma-ray log values were then used to calculate radiometric grades from all of the mineralized holes. Most of the gamma logging was done by Dalton Well Logging and Geoscience Associates, Inc., both of whom were competent, experienced and independent geophysical logging contractors, on behalf of Reserve Oil and Minerals, Sohio and United Nuclear/UNC Resources. The gamma logging equipment was periodically calibrated at "test pits" of the US Atomic Energy Commission (now US Department of Energy) near Grants, New Mexico and Grand Junction, Colorado, in accordance with the standard operating procedures utilized in the industry at the time.

Radiometric assays, calculated from gamma ray logging of the exploration drill holes at the Cebolleta project, were checked by the then project operators, Sohio and United Nuclear, by drilling core holes at selected locations. Sohio collected more than 150 samples that were analyzed by chemical and radiometric assay methods. Samples were collected from drill holes in several areas of the project area. Analytical results tabulated by Geo-Management show

31

---

minor differences between radiometric and chemical assays, with general pattern of chemical assays being slightly higher than radiometric assays, especially at grades in excess of 0.20%  $U_3O_8$ .

Cibola Resources has no information regarding the preparation of samples for chemical assay, methods of determination of the uranium content of these samples or the security of those samples. The methods of sampling of the uranium prospects at the Cebolleta project were standard operating procedures utilized throughout the US uranium industry during the time that the project was active.

#### Adjacent Properties

The Cebolleta project is situated in the Laguna mining district, and adjoins the former Jackpile-Paguete open pit and underground uranium operations of Anaconda. At one time the Jackpile-Paguete mine was the largest uranium mine in the United States, and is reported to have produced more than 80 million pounds of  $U_3O_8$  prior to its shut-down in the early 1980's.

We are not aware of any current uranium mining or exploration on properties adjoining the Cebolleta project.

#### Mineral Processing and Metallurgical Testing

Cibola Resources has not carried out any metallurgical test work on the mineral deposits at the Cebolleta project. An audit of several former uranium mills, including the former Sohio L-Bar processing facility, outlines the general process design for the mill. The mill included conventional SAG mill grinding, CCD liquid/solid separation and an acid leach-solvent extraction process. The mill operated from late 1976 through mid-1981 and processed approximately 2.5 million short tons of feed material.

Cibola Resources has not examined any metallurgical test work that led to the development of process design criteria or any mill performance and recovery data.

#### Mineral Exploration Properties

We are participating in our mineral properties in the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Texas, Utah, and Wyoming by way of mining claims and mineral leases. The mining claim properties were staked and claimed by us and registered with the US Bureau of Land Management ("BLM"). There are claim blocks acquired in this manner in Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah and Wyoming. We have surface access and complete mineral rights to an unlimited depth below surface. The claims are in effect for an indefinite period provided the claims are kept in good standing with the BLM and the counties. The claims were entered into between November 4, 2004 and July 2008.

Annual maintenance fees to be paid to the BLM are relatively nominal. We will also be required to remediate the land upon release of the claim - bringing the land back into the state it was originally in prior to the commencement of our exploration activities. These costs are determined by the BLM and bonded accordingly.

In the States of Arizona, New Mexico, Texas and Utah we are participating in our mineral properties by way of property leases directly from the owners of the land/mineral rights. As of the date of this report we have executed leases in Arizona, New Mexico, Texas and Utah. These leases give us similar access and privileges as described above, however with some important differences. Although we will have access to the surface, the mineral rights below surface are restricted to uranium and associated fissionable minerals only, with any other minerals and hydrocarbons, including, for example, petroleum, retained by the lessor. The lease terms are for five years, and include five-year renewal periods. After the expiration of the second five-year term the leases will be either held by production or the leases will be terminated. Royalty payments must be made to the lessor in event that we extract uranium ore from the properties. Royalty payments vary based on a sliding scale tied to the price of uranium. All royalties are based on the gross sales revenue less certain charges and fees.

---

We have the following gross and net acre mineral property interests in states indicated below under lease:

	Gross Acres	Net Acres (1)
Arizona	3,371.48	3,371.48
Colorado	2,488.67	2,488.67
New Mexico	21,132.58	14,447.24
Texas	9,802.06	8,959.11
Utah	5,642.23	5,642.23
Wyoming	4,315.37	4,315.37

46,752.37 39,224.10

(1) Certain of our interests in our mineral properties in New Mexico and Texas are less than 100%. Accordingly, we have presented the acreage of our mineral properties on a net acre basis.

We plan to conduct exploration programs on these properties with the objective of determining the existence of any economic concentrations of uranium.

Since inception we have not established any proven or probable reserves on our mineral property interests.

On October 11, 2005, we entered into a Mineral Asset Option Agreement (the "Option") with Brad A. Moore giving us the option to acquire certain uranium leases from Mr. Moore in the State of Texas. In consideration for the Option we have paid Mr. Moore a cash payment of \$50,000 and issued 1,000,000 shares of our restricted common stock. The Option, which was exercised, required the further issuance of 2,000,000 restricted shares of common stock in varying share installments over the three, six month intervals following the effective date of the Option Agreement (October 11, 2005). A further payment of \$150,000 was paid under the Option on February 1, 2006. Title to the properties transferred upon payment of all remaining stock required under the Option. During the Option term we had the right as operator to conduct or otherwise direct all the exploration on the properties to be acquired. As of this date all cash consideration and share issuances required pursuant to the terms of the Option have been completed.

On May 1, 2007, we entered into a joint venture with Neutron Energy Inc. ("NEI"), a Wyoming corporation, in connection with the exploration of a property covering approximately 6,700 acres located in Cibola County, New Mexico, for uranium resources. In connection with the joint venture, Cibola Resources, a limited liability company under the laws of the State of Delaware, was formed to undertake the exploration activities contemplated by the parties. NEI acquired the mining lease to the property from La Merced del Pueblo de Cebolleta ("Cebolleta"), a private entity that has the authority over the natural resources of the property, pursuant to a letter agreement between Cebolleta and NEI dated January 27, 2007, and has contributed the lease to Cibola Resources. In connection with the acquisition of the lease, NEI has made cash payments to Cebolleta of \$5,000,000 to date. The Company has reimbursed an aggregate of \$2,450,000 to NEI to date. As a result, NEI and the Company hold a 51% and 49% interest, respectively, in Cibola Resources.

#### Arizona

All of our Arizona claims and state leases were previously the subject of exploration drilling for the incidence of uranium by companies such as Noranda, Inc., Uranerz Energy Corp., Homestake Mining Co., Occidental Minerals and Oklahoma Public Services. We have acquired a 1979 Oklahoma Public Services ("OPS") geologic report contiguous to our claims (Artillery Peak) that indicates the possibility of incidence of uranium. OPS drilling continued on to our claims as evidenced by drill holes verified on the ground, and such drill cuttings were found to be radioactive. Close spaced developmental drilling is indicated on our claims located at Artillery Peak.

---

Other claims staked by us (Dry Mountain) in Arizona were staked on known uranium occurrences as shown on Arizona State publication, "Occurrences of Uranium in Miscellaneous Sedimentary Formations, Diatremes and Pipes and Veins". Additionally, these claims were previously drilled by companies including Homestake Mining Co., Uranerz Energy Corp. and Noranda, Inc. in the 1970's uranium boom. Our management has confirmed prior claim ownership as verified with the US Department of Interior - BLM. In addition, ground surveys completed by us have located various previous drill locations and radioactive anomalies as evidenced in ground and drill cuttings.

Edgar Filing: URANIUM ENERGY CORP - Form 10-K

On November 1, 2007 we entered into a binding letter Agreement to Purchase Assets with Melvin O. Stairs, Jr. ("Mr. Stairs"), for a mineral exploration claim and related database information located in Maricopa County, Arizona. Under the terms of the agreement, the Company will pay total consideration of \$1,200,000 including i) a \$10,000 deposit upon execution (paid), ii) installments of \$95,000 cash on January 10, 2008 (paid) and August 15, 2008, and iii) installments totaling \$100,000 on January 10 and August 15 of each year for the period from January 10, 2009 through August 15, 2013. Additionally, the Company has granted the seller security interest on the acquired assets until the agreement is paid in full. On August 25, 2008 we entered into an amendment agreement pursuant to which the total consideration payable was reduced to \$300,000 as follows: i) a \$10,000 deposit upon execution (paid), ii) installments of \$95,000 cash on January 10, 2008 (paid) and \$57,000 cash (paid) and \$38,000 by way of issuance of 19,000 restricted common shares of the Company at a deemed price of \$2.00 per share (pending regulatory approval) on August 15, 2008, and a final payment of \$50,000 by way of cash, plus \$50,000 by way of restricted common shares of the Company at a deemed price based on the average closing price of the shares on the 5 previous days preceding the payment due date of October 31, 2009.

We confirm that as of this date our Arizona located claims and leases contain no uranium reserves and require extensive exploration by us.

The following provides information relating to such claims:

Property	Number of Claims or Leases Held	Gross Acres	Net Acres
Artillery Peak 1	19 claims	392.54	392.54
Artillery Peak 2	31 claims	640.46	640.46
C o y o t e Ranch	2 leases	1,120.00	1,120.00
D r y Mountain	28 claims	578.48	578.48
N e w River	1 lease	640.00	640.00

Colorado

Claims and leases acquired by us in Colorado have historical production tonnages and grades published in the Colorado Geological Survey, Bulletin 40 - "Radioactive Mineral Occurrences of Colorado". Also, our geological staff has evaluated a portion of the claims currently owned by us. We confirm that at the current date, our Colorado located claims contain no uranium reserves and require extensive exploration by us.

The following provides information relating to such claims:

34

---

Property	Number of Claims or Leases Held	Gross Acres	Net Acres
Bull Canyon	23 claims	383.00	383.00
Carnotite	18 claims	371.88	371.88
Paradox	4 claims	40.00	40.00
Raven Mine	22 claims	454.52	454.52
Squaw Point	1 lease	288.91	288.91
Taco	34 claims	702.44	702.44
Triangulation Mine	12 claims	247.92	247.92

#### New Mexico

The West Ranch Project consists of approximately 7,000 acres made up of lode mining claims and private leases in northwestern New Mexico, on the northwest end of the historically uraniumiferous Ambrosia Lake trend of the Grants Uranium District. The property was drilled by United Nuclear Corporation and, more recently, by Kerr McGee. Historical wide-spaced drilling across the property indicates the presence of several northwest-southeast trending uranium mineralized zones within the Morrison Formation at average depths of 800 feet.

Our Laguna Trend Project consists of approximately 800 acres of lode claims on Bureau of Land Management land in northwestern New Mexico. The claim block is on-trend and several miles northeast of the historically-producing St. Anthony, Jackpile Paguante, and L-Bar uranium deposits, mined by Anaconda Minerals and Sohio. Northeast of the Company's claim block is Kerr McGee's (now Anadarko Petroleum's) uranium deposit, Rio Puerco, and Conoco's Bernabe uranium deposit. Both of these deposits are yet to be developed.

Acquisition of the Laguna Trend claim block by Uranium Energy was driven by intense analysis of the Morrison Nuclear database, which includes drilling data indicating significant uranium mineralization in the Westwater Canyon Member of the Morrison Formation. This property was most recently held by Kerr-McGee.

San Mateo Mesa is a project adjacent to the San Mateo mine owned by Rio Grande Resources and the Roca Honda project operated by Strathmore Resources.

Red Basin consists of claims in the Datil Basin of Catron County. The project area was previously staked by Kerr-McGee with the Cretaceous de Baca Formation as the target. This project is currently under option by Strategic Resources of Canada.

Grants Ridge is a Todilto Formation target in the Grants Uranium District and is currently under option by Uran Ltd. of Perth, Australia.

We confirm that at the current date, our New Mexico located claims contain no uranium reserves and require extensive exploration by us.

35

---

Property	Number of Claims or Leases Held	Gross Acres	Net Acres
Cebolleta	1 federal grant	6,717.00	3,291.33
Grants Ridge	1 lease	320.00	320.00
Laguna Trend	40 claims	826.40	826.40
Red Basin	20 claims	413.20	413.20
San Mateo Mesa	66 claims	1,363.56	1,363.56
Todilto	234 claims	4,451.50	4,451.50
West Ranch	62 claims, 33 leases	7,040.92	3,781.25

and 6  
mineral  
deeds

## Texas

We currently own nine leases located in a South Texas uranium trend that have been the subject of substantial historical exploration by Wold Nuclear Corporation ("Wold Nuclear") in the 1970s and 1980s, and constitute some of our most prospective exploration targets. Wold Nuclear was a private uranium exploration company based in Casper, Wyoming, and owned by former Wyoming U.S. Congressman, John S. Wold. Wold Nuclear discovered a number of large uranium deposits in Wyoming which were later acquired and put into production by major uranium production companies. Wold Nuclear's Texas operations were a joint exploration venture with Cotter Corporation. Our Chief Geologist was employed by Wold Nuclear as district and chief geologist of its Texas based operations.

Wold Nuclear's previous work conducted on and around our exploration targets located in South Texas (Zavala County) is in a certain formation that was not the focus of uranium exploration in previous uranium booms (the "New Formation"). The New Formation represents a new "out of traditional trend" host rock for possible uranium mineralization. We have acquired a number of drill hole gamma logs, as well as one drill core, whose chemical analysis supports the indication of uranium, along with lease and drill hole location maps. Insufficient drilling in past exploration programs did not quantify any reserves for Wold Nuclear.

The expected mineralized area comprising the New Formation has been defined in the geological area by our own work product. The New Formation host rock is up to 250 feet thick and has the potential for uranium mineralization similar to Wyoming's Powder River Basin. As of this date we have acquired two leases (473.06 gross acres) in an area where previous drilling and coring indicated uranium mineralization.

The following provides information relating to all of our leased properties in the South Texas Uranium Trend in addition to the nine leases previously held by Wold Nuclear Corporation as described above:

36

---

Property	Number of Claims or Leases Held	Gross Acres	Net Acres
Carrizo	14 leases	1,482.67	1,253.09
Devillier	18 leases	654.85	402.08
Goebel	1 lease	545.80	497.78
Goliad		2,606.96	2,302.76

22  
leases

Maetze	3 leases	166.83	158.47
Martella	3 leases	124.25	124.25
Martin	1 lease	3,180.00	3,180.00
Nichols	8 leases	1,040.70	1,040.69

#### Utah

Our Utah properties (Crain Lease) were the subject of prior exploration drilling conducted by Pioneer-Uravan, Inc. and Truchas Limited in the 1970s to search for uranium indications. We have acquired gamma drill log interpretation worksheets from work previously conducted by Pioneer-Uravan, Inc. In addition, drill hole location maps have been obtained from work conducted for Pioneer-Uravan, Inc. and Truchas Limited. Further assay reports on core samples from exploration drilling previously conducted by Pioneer-Uravan, Inc., as verified by that company's commissioned assay report, have also been obtained, as well as certain drill indicated uranium findings that provide the basis for preliminary mineralization information as previously conducted and defined in a Truchas Limited summary and report (1979). As at this date our Utah located claims contain no uranium reserves that we have independently verified, and require extensive exploration by us.

The following provides information relating to such claims and leases:

Property	Number of Claims or Leases Held	Gross Acres	Net Acres
Crain	1 lease	640.00	640.00
Montezuma Canyon	21 claims and 2 leases	5,002.23	5,002.23

#### Wyoming

Our five Wyoming uranium mineral property areas total 4,315.37 acres. Wyoming led the nation's uranium production in 2006 with 4,100,000 pounds of U<sub>3</sub>O<sub>8</sub>.

The Granite Mountain Thrust ("GMT") property includes 610.80 acres of mining claims north of, and adjacent to, the Rio Tinto (Kennecott) uranium property, which has been drilled extensively since the 1960s by several entities. Our GMT property geology host rock is 2,000 to 3,000 feet thick in the early Eocene Age Battle Springs Formation -



partly equivalent to the Wasatch and Wind River formations in other Wyoming Basins. We have assessed previous seismic exploration shot line data and confirmed Battle Springs Formation projections to the GMT area. The property is situated approximately eight miles east of the Crooks Gap uranium mining district, which produced about 10,000,000 pounds of U

308 from 1953 through 1982 by open pit mining.

The Burnt Wagon project, located 35 miles west of Casper, Wyoming, was acquired from NAMMCO (Kirkwood) in 2006. Previous operations defined shallow uranium mineralization in the Wind River formation of early Eocene age, at 50 to 200 foot depths, from 500 drill holes and 16,000 feet of electric logging data.

Situated in the Lower Eocene Wasatch formation of the southwest Powder River Basin, our Powder River Basin LO-Herma uranium property exploration data was acquired from H. Brenniman as a part of the Pioneer Nuclear, Inc., package in 2006. The 29 mining claims total 591.57 acres and are contiguous to the Uranium One (formerly Energy Metals Corp.) property.

Our DL, 1,275.00 acre, property is being reassessed by using Pioneer Nuclear, Inc., 1970 uranium exploration data from the H. Brenniman database.

We confirm that at the current date, our Wyoming located claims contain no uranium reserves and require extensive exploration by us.

	Number of Claims or Leases Held	Gross Acres	Net Acres
Wyoming Property			
Burnt Wagon	30 claims and 3 leases	1,038.00	1,038.00
DL Prospect	1 lease	1,275.00	1,275.00
East Poison Spyder	5 leases	800.00	800.00
Granite Mountain	30 claims	610.80	610.80
LO-Herma	29 claims	591.57	591.57

#### Exploration Work Programs

Our Vice President of Exploration, Clyde Yancey, a Certified Professional Geologist, based on historical data previously outlined and our own work product, has developed exploration programs unique to each state and claim block with the intent of proving or disproving the existence of uranium on these prospects. In order to carry out these

exploration programs, approximately \$2,000,000 over the next twelve months will be required, according to the exploration budget and schedule recommended by our Vice President of Exploration. The exploration programs will be conducted in two separate phases as described below. Additional capital for possible future uranium exploration property related acquisitions will be funded through additional offerings of debt and equity on an as required basis.

The total cost of expected Phase II exploration on all mineral properties contemplated at this time is equal to \$2,000,000 inclusive of a contingency cost allowance. Additional costs for Phase II exploration work and for further lease and land acquisitions are expected to be funded by future financings from debt and equity sources.

#### Phase I Work Programs -New Mexico, Utah, Arizona and Colorado

The Phase I work program that was proposed, was completed during 2007 through the first quarter of 2008, and formal exploration permits have been submitted in New Mexico (1), Utah (1) and Colorado (2). Also, drilling budgets have been developed and are on hold pending improvement of market conditions. The submittal of the exploration permits were based on intensive analysis of our company's claim blocks in the four states noted above.

During Phase I work programs on these particular mineral claims we reviewed and analyzed all historical exploration data available to us in our current possession, acquire additional acreage as available, obtain exploration permits through state and federal agencies and to probe existing drill holes with gamma probes, with a strategy that attempts to confirm historical drill results. Costs have been estimated at \$14,500 per claim block.

#### Phase I Work Programs - South Texas Leases

Based on exploration databases acquired during 2006 and 2007 and regional geologic studies, we were able to establish six separate lease positions within the South Texas uranium trend. Four of these lease positions are within Goliad County and would complement our existing Goliad project. One of the positions was heavily drilled by Mobil Oil during the 1970s and 1980s. The three remaining Goliad County lease positions are highly encouraging prospects that we plan to acquire during 2008. The fifth lease position is within Duval County and falls within the Catahoula Formation, an historic uranium host formation of South Texas. The sixth lease position is with Karnes County and covers a property heavily drilled by Conoco Petroleum in the 1970s. As previously stated, these lease position were developed by the Company during 2006 from historic databases and regional studies.

The exploration databases used to develop the lease positions described above were obtained during the acquisition of the Moore Energy information, the acquisition of the Knupke database, and the Kerr McGee database in Q1 of 2008. These databases consist primarily of numerous geophysical logs with corresponding maps, field reports and regional maps. The Moore Energy database was developed over a period of approximately 10 years and consists of a compilation of their exploration projects and prospects and is quite reliable. This database will be used to guide in the development of the Goliad Project and to develop additional projects and prospects. It is exclusively used by the Company. The Knupke database was developed by an individual over a period of approximately 20 years and consists of past project information, map and logs and potential prospects developed through analysis of regional geology. This database was used exclusively by the Company during 2006. The Kerr McGee database consists of geologic data specifically related to uranium exploration throughout the US, Canada and Australia. This database was developed over a period of nearly 30 years and is quite extensive.

During the Phase I work program geologic information pertinent to the six lease positions noted above will be gathered and analyzed by Company geologists in order to develop additional lease plays, setup drilling programs and develop exploration drilling permits.

#### Phase II Work Programs

The purpose of Phase I exploration work in the Colorado Plateau, Uravan mining district in Colorado and Utah, as well as the Grants uranium district in New Mexico, and the South Texas trend, on both claim blocks and leases, is chiefly to determine which areas require new drilling. The Phase II work programs will consist of focused exploratory drilling programs.

The total cost of Phase II exploration on all mineral properties over the next 12 months has not been definitively determined, however exploration activities on some of our properties are anticipated to be carried out and funded by third parties pursuant to option and joint venture agreements. Additional costs for Phase II exploration work and for further lease and land acquisitions are expected to be funded by future financings from debt and equity sources if required. We expect minimal effect on our ability to proceed with Phase II exploration should they be required in conjunction with further lease and land acquisitions as the amounts projected for Phase II exploration costs are not envisioned to be substantial in relation to budgeted total annual capital and operating expense expenditures. If, however, additional land and lease expenditures during the next twelve months create a lack of capital for Phase II exploration costs beyond that anticipated in relation to available capital, we may not be in a financial position to conduct Phase II exploration if required.

In all cases, results from Phase I of exploration on our properties will determine whether we proceed to Phase II of the exploration program or discontinue exploration on a particular property. Phase II costs, if any, will be incurred in the subsequent 12-month period, and would require additional financing.

We have acquired two dual wheel trucks on which we have installed PFN logging equipment. A PFN logging truck now enables Company geologists to directly read uranium values in a borehole under "real time" conditions. A standard logging truck, running a gamma ray probe, reads all radioactive emitting elements in the hole and does not discriminate uranium. In the past a core sample would need to be collected and sent to a laboratory for analysis of uranium before a geologist would know the exact uranium concentration in a bore hole. A PFN logging truck provides this information in the field and saves considerable time and money.

39

---

Our operational business plan calls for the acquisition of further uranium exploration properties in Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Texas, Utah and Wyoming. We have developed detailed exploration programs for each claim block area of interest based on historical data derived from past uranium exploration by other companies with a mandate to prove or disprove the existence of uranium resources.

### Competition

We operate in a highly competitive industry, competing with other mining and exploration companies, and institutional and individual investors, which are actively seeking uranium minerals exploration properties throughout the world together with the equipment, labor and materials required to exploit such properties. Many of our competitors have financial resources, staff and facilities substantially greater than ours. The principal area of competition is encountered in the financial ability to cost effectively acquire prime minerals exploration prospects and then exploit such prospects. Competition for the acquisition of uranium minerals exploration properties is intense, with many properties available in a competitive bidding process in which we may lack technological information or expertise available to other bidders. Therefore, we may not be successful in acquiring, exploring and developing profitable properties in the face of this competition. No assurance can be given that a sufficient number of suitable uranium minerals exploration properties will be available for acquisition, exploration and development.

### Minerals Exploration Regulation

Our minerals exploration activities are, or will be, subject to extensive laws and regulations governing prospecting, development, production, exports, taxes, labor standards, occupational health, waste disposal, protection and

remediation of the environment, protection of endangered and protected species, mine safety, toxic substances and other matters. Minerals exploration is also subject to risks and liabilities associated with pollution of the environment and disposal of waste products occurring as a result of mineral exploration and production.

Compliance with these laws and regulations may impose substantial costs on us and will subject us to significant potential liabilities. Changes in these regulations could require us to expend significant resources to comply with new laws or regulations or changes to current requirements and could have a material adverse effect on our business operations.

Exploration and production activities are subject to certain environmental regulations which may prevent or delay the commencement or continuance of our operations. In general, our exploration and production activities are subject to certain federal, state and local laws and regulations relating to environmental quality and pollution control. Such laws and regulations increase the costs of these activities and may prevent or delay the commencement or continuance of a given operation. Compliance with these laws and regulations has not had a material effect on our operations or financial condition to date. Specifically, we are subject to legislation regarding emissions into the environment, water discharges and storage and disposition of hazardous wastes. In addition, legislation has been enacted which requires well and facility sites to be abandoned and reclaimed to the satisfaction of state authorities. However, such laws and regulations are frequently changed and we are unable to predict the ultimate cost of compliance. Generally, environmental requirements do not appear to affect us any differently or to any greater or lesser extent than other companies in the industry and our current operations have not expanded to a point where either compliance or cost of compliance with environmental regulation is a significant issue for us. Costs have been incurred to date with respect to compliance with environmental laws, primarily relating to the posting of a performance bond, and costs are only expected to increase with the increasing scale and scope of exploration operations, especially with the advent of Phase II exploration costs.

Minerals exploration operations are subject to comprehensive regulation which may cause substantial delays or require capital outlays in excess of those anticipated causing an adverse effect on our business operations. Minerals 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. Minerals 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 drilling methods and equipment. Various permits from government bodies are required for drilling operations to be conducted; no assurance can be given that such permits will be received. Environmental standards imposed by federal, state, or local authorities may be changed and any such changes may 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 us. Additionally, we may be subject to liability for pollution or other environmental damages which we may elect not to insure against due to prohibitive premium costs and other reasons. As of the date of this annual report, other than with respect to the posting of a performance bond, we have not been required to spend material amounts on compliance with environmental regulations. However, we may be required to do so in future and this may affect our ability to expand or maintain our operations. Environmental regulation is discussed in further detail in the following section.

#### Environmental Regulation

Our activities will be subject to existing federal, state and local laws and regulations governing environmental quality and pollution control. Our operations will be subject to stringent environmental regulation by state and federal authorities including the Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA"). Such regulation can increase the cost of such activities. In most instances, the regulatory requirements relate to water and air pollution control measures.

## Waste Disposal

The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act ("RCRA"), and comparable state statutes, affect minerals exploration and production activities by imposing regulations on the generation, transportation, treatment, storage, disposal and cleanup of "hazardous wastes" and on the disposal of non-hazardous wastes. Under the auspices of the EPA, the individual states administer some or all of the provisions of RCRA, sometimes in conjunction with their own, more stringent requirements.

## CERCLA

The federal Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act ("CERCLA") imposes joint and several liability for costs of investigation and remediation and for natural resource damages, without regard to fault or the legality of the original conduct, on certain classes of persons with respect to the release into the environment of substances designated under CERCLA as hazardous substances ("Hazardous Substances"). These classes of persons or potentially responsible parties include the current and certain past owners and operators of a facility or property where there is or has been a release or threat of release of a Hazardous Substance and persons who disposed of or arranged for the disposal of the Hazardous Substances found at such a facility. CERCLA also authorizes the EPA and, in some cases, third parties to take actions in response to threats to the public health or the environment and to seek to recover the costs of such action. We may also in the future become an owner of facilities on which Hazardous Substances have been released by previous owners or operators. We may in the future be responsible under CERCLA for all or part of the costs to clean up facilities or property at which such substances have been released and for natural resource damages.

## Air Emissions

Our operations are subject to local, state and federal regulations for the control of emissions of air pollution. Major sources of air pollutants are subject to more stringent, federally imposed permitting requirements. Administrative enforcement actions for failure to comply strictly with air pollution regulations or permits are generally resolved by payment of monetary fines and correction of any identified deficiencies. Alternatively, regulatory agencies could require us to forego construction, modification or operation of certain air emission sources.

## Clean Water Act

The Clean Water Act ("CWA") imposes restrictions and strict controls regarding the discharge of wastes, including mineral processing wastes, into waters of the United States, a term broadly defined. Permits must be obtained to discharge pollutants into federal waters. The CWA provides for civil, criminal and administrative penalties for unauthorized discharges of hazardous substances and other pollutants. It imposes substantial potential liability for the costs of removal or remediation associated with discharges of oil or hazardous substances. State laws governing discharges to water also provide varying civil, criminal and administrative penalties and impose liabilities in the case of a discharge of petroleum or its derivatives, or other hazardous substances, into state waters. In addition, the EPA

---

has promulgated regulations that may require us to obtain permits to discharge storm water runoff. In the event of an unauthorized discharge of wastes, we may be liable for penalties and costs. Management believes that we are in substantial compliance with current applicable environmental laws and regulations.

## Research and Development Activities

No research and development expenditures have been incurred, either on our account or sponsored by customers for the past three years.

## Employees

Amir Adnani is our President and Chief Executive Officer, Harry Anthony is our Chief Operating Officer and Pat Obara is our Chief Financial Officer. These individuals are primarily responsible for all our day-to-day operations. Other services are provided by outsourcing and consultant and special purpose contracts. We currently employ approximately 20 persons on a full time basis and contract with approximately 8 individuals on a full time basis for ongoing services provided to the Company.

## ITEM 1A. RISK FACTORS

An investment in our common stock involves a number of very significant risks. You should carefully consider the following risks and uncertainties in addition to other information in this annual report in evaluating our company and its business before purchasing shares of our common stock. Our business, operating results and financial condition could be seriously harmed due to any of the following risks. The risks described below may not be all of the risks facing our company. Additional risks not presently known to us or that we currently consider immaterial may also impair our business operations. You could lose all or part of your investment due to any of these risks.

### Risks Related to Our Business

We will require significant additional financing in order to continue our exploration activities and our assessment of the commercial viability of our mineral properties.

We will need to raise additional financing to complete further exploration of our mineral properties. Furthermore, if the costs of our planned exploration programs are greater than anticipated, we may have to seek additional funds through public or private share offerings or arrangements with corporate partners. There can be no assurance that we will be successful in our efforts to raise these require funds, or on terms satisfactory to us. The continued exploration of our mineral properties and the development of our business will depend upon our ability to establish the commercial viability of our mineral properties and to ultimately develop cash flow from operations and reach profitable operations. We currently are in the exploration stage and we have no revenue from operations and we are experiencing significant negative cash flow. Accordingly, the only other sources of funds presently available to us are through the sale of equity. We presently believe that debt financing will not be an alternative to us as all of our properties are in the exploration stage. Alternatively, we may finance our business by offering an interest in our mineral properties to be earned by another party or parties carrying out further exploration thereof or to obtain project or operating financing from financial institutions, neither of which is presently intended. If we are unable to obtain this additional financing, we will not be able to continue our exploration activities and our assessment of the commercial viability of our mineral properties.

As our mineral properties do not contain any reserves or any known body of economic mineralization, we may not discover commercially exploitable quantities of ore on our mineral properties that would enable us to enter into commercial production, achieve revenues and recover the money we spends on exploration.

Our properties do not contain reserves in accordance with the definitions adopted by the SEC and there is no assurance that any exploration programs that we carry out will establish reserves. All of our mineral properties are in the exploration stage as opposed to the development stage and have no known body of economic mineralization. The known mineralization at these projects has not yet been determined to be economic ore, and may never be

---

determined to be economic. We plan to conduct further exploration activities on our mineral properties, which future exploration may include the completion of feasibility studies necessary to evaluate whether a commercial mineable orebody exists on any of our mineral properties. There is a substantial risk that these exploration activities will not

result in discoveries of commercially recoverable quantities of ore. Any determination that our properties contain commercially recoverable quantities of ore may not be reached until such time that final comprehensive feasibility studies have been concluded that establish that a potential mine is likely to be economic. There is a substantial risk that any preliminary or final feasibility studies carried out by us will not result in a positive determination that our mineral properties can be commercially developed.

Our exploration activities on our mineral properties may not be successful, which could lead us to abandon our plans to develop the property and its investments in exploration.

We are an exploration stage company and have not as yet established any reserves on our properties. Our long-term success depends on our ability to establish commercially recoverable quantities of ore on our mineral properties that can then be developed into commercially viable mining operations. Mineral exploration is highly speculative in nature, involves many risks and is frequently non-productive. These risks include unusual or unexpected geologic formations, and the inability to obtain suitable or adequate machinery, equipment or labor. The success of uranium exploration is determined in part by the following factors:

- ◆ identification of potential uranium mineralization based on superficial analysis;
- ◆ availability of government-granted exploration permits;
- ◆ the quality of management and geological and technical expertise; and
- ◆ the capital available for exploration.

Substantial expenditures are required to establish proven and probable reserves through drilling and analysis, to develop metallurgical processes to extract metal, and to develop the mining and processing facilities and infrastructure at any site chosen for mining. Whether a mineral deposit will be established or determined to be commercially viable depends on a number of factors, which include, without limitation, the particular attributes of the deposit, such as size, grade and proximity to infrastructure; metal prices, which fluctuate widely; and government regulations, including, without limitation, regulations relating to prices, taxes, royalties, land tenure, land use, importing and exporting of minerals and environmental protection. We may invest significant capital and resources in exploration activities and abandon such investments if we are unable to identify commercially exploitable mineral reserves. The decision to abandon a project may reduce the trading price of our common stock and impair our ability to raise future financing. We cannot provide any assurance to investors that we will discover any mineralized material in sufficient quantities on any of our properties to justify commercial operations. Further, we will not be able to recover the funds that we spend on exploration if we are not able to establish commercially recoverable quantities of ore on our mineral properties.

Our business is difficult to evaluate because we have a limited operating history.

In considering whether to invest in our common stock, you should consider that our inception was May 16, 2003 and, as a result, there is only limited historical financial and operating information available on which to base your evaluation of our performance.

We have a history of operating losses and there can be no assurances we will be profitable in the future.

We have a history of operating losses, expect to continue to incur losses, and may never be profitable, and we must be considered to be in the exploration stage. Further, we have been dependent on sales of our equity securities and debt financing to meet our cash requirements. We have incurred losses totaling \$53,903,464 from May 16, 2003 (inception) to July 31, 2009. We incurred net losses totaling \$13,503,576 in the year ended July 31, 2009, \$19,236,124 in the year ended July 31, 2008, and \$8,044,743 during the seven months ended July 31, 2007. Further, we do not

expect positive cash flow from operations in the near term. There is no assurance that actual cash

---

requirements will not exceed our estimates. In particular, additional capital may be required in the event that: (i) the costs to acquire additional uranium exploration claims are more than we currently anticipate; (ii) exploration costs for additional claims increase beyond our expectations; or (iii) we encounter greater costs associated with general and administrative expenses or offering costs.

Our participation in an increasingly larger number of uranium minerals exploration prospects has required and will continue to require substantial capital expenditures. The uncertainty and factors described throughout this section may impede our ability to economically discover uranium prospects. As a result, we may not be able to achieve or sustain profitability or positive cash flows from operating activities in the future.

We will require additional funding in the future.

Based upon our historical losses from operations, we will require additional funding in the future. If we cannot obtain capital through financings or otherwise, our ability to execute our exploration programs will be greatly limited. Our current plans require us to make capital expenditures for the exploration of our minerals exploration properties. Historically, we have funded our operations through the issuance of equity and short-term debt financing arrangements. We may not be able to obtain additional financing on favorable terms, if at all. Our future cash flows and the availability of financing will be subject to a number of variables, including the market prices of uranium. Further, debt financing could lead to a diversion of cash flow to satisfy debt-servicing obligations and create restrictions on business operations. If we are unable to raise additional funds, it would have a material adverse effect upon our operations.

As part of our growth strategy, we intend to acquire additional mineral exploration properties.

Such acquisitions may pose substantial risks to our business, financial condition, and results of operations. In pursuing acquisitions, we will compete with other companies, many of which have greater financial and other resources to acquire attractive properties. Even if we are successful in acquiring additional properties, some of the properties may not produce positive results of exploration, or we may not complete exploration of such prospects within specified time periods may cause the forfeiture of the lease in that prospect. There can be no assurance that we will be able to successfully integrate acquired properties, which could result in substantial costs and delays or other operational, technical, or financial problems. Further, acquisitions could disrupt ongoing business operations. If any of these events occur, it would have a material adverse effect upon our operations and results from operations.

We are a new entrant into the uranium mineral exploration industry without profitable operating history.

Since inception, our activities have been limited to organizational efforts, obtaining working capital and acquiring and exploring a very limited number of properties. As a result, there is limited information upon which to base our future success.

The business of minerals exploration is subject to many risks and uncertainties, including those described in this section, and if uranium is found in economic quantities, the profitability of future uranium mining ventures depends upon factors beyond our control. The profitability of mining uranium properties if economic quantities of Uranium are found is dependent upon many factors and risks beyond our control, including, but not limited to: (i) unanticipated ground and water conditions and adverse claims to water rights; (ii) geological problems; (iii) metallurgical and other processing problems; (iv) the occurrence of unusual weather or operating conditions and other force majeure events; (v) lower than expected ore grades; (vi) accidents; (vii) delays in the receipt of or failure to receive necessary government permits; (viii) delays in transportation; (ix) labor disputes; (x) government permit restrictions and



regulation restrictions; (xi) unavailability of materials and equipment; and (xii) the failure of equipment or processes to operate in accordance with specifications or expectations.

44

---

The risks associated with exploration and, if applicable, mining could cause personal injury or death, environmental damage, delays in mining, monetary losses and possible legal liability.

We are not currently engaged in mining operations because we are in the exploration phase and have not yet any proved uranium reserves. We carry some property and liability insurance. Cost effective insurance contains exclusions and limitations on coverage and may be unavailable in some circumstances.

The uranium exploration industry is highly competitive and there is no assurance that we will be successful in acquiring the leases.

The uranium exploration industry is intensely competitive, and we compete with other companies that have greater resources. Many of these companies not only explore for and produce uranium, but also market uranium and other products on a regional, national or worldwide basis. These companies may be able to pay more for productive uranium properties and exploratory prospects or define, evaluate, bid for and purchase a greater number of properties and prospects than our financial or human resources permit. In addition, these companies may have a greater ability to continue exploration activities during periods of low uranium market prices. Our larger competitors may be able to absorb the burden of present and future federal, state, local and other laws and regulations more easily than we can, which would adversely affect our competitive position. Our ability to acquire additional properties and to explore them in the future will be dependent upon our ability to evaluate and select suitable properties and to consummate transactions in a highly competitive environment. In addition, because we have fewer financial and human resources than many companies in our industry, we may be at a disadvantage in bidding for exploratory prospects.

The marketability of natural resources will be affected by numerous factors beyond our control which may result in us not receiving an adequate return on invested capital to be profitable or viable.

The marketability of natural resources which may be acquired or discovered by us will be affected by numerous factors beyond our control. These factors include macroeconomic factors, market fluctuations in commodity pricing and demand, the proximity and capacity of natural resource markets and processing equipment, governmental regulations, land tenure, land use, regulation concerning the importing and exporting of uranium and environmental protection regulations. The exact effect of these factors cannot be accurately predicted, but the combination of these factors may result in us not receiving an adequate return on invested capital to be profitable or viable.

Uranium mining operations are subject to comprehensive regulation, which may cause substantial delays or require capital outlays in excess of those anticipated, causing an adverse effect on our business operations.

If economic quantities of uranium are found on any lease owned by us in sufficient quantities to warrant uranium mining operations, such mining 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. Uranium mining 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 mining methods and equipment. Various permits from government bodies are required for mining operations to be conducted; no assurance can be given that such permits will be received. Environmental standards imposed by federal, provincial, or local authorities may be changed and any such changes may 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 resulting in an adverse effect on us. Additionally, we may be subject to liability for pollution or other environmental damages which we may elect not to insure against due to prohibitive premium costs and other reasons. To date we

have not been required to spend material amounts on compliance with environmental regulations. However, we may be required to do so in future and this may affect our ability to expand or maintain our operations.

45

---

Uranium minerals exploration and development and mining activities are subject to certain environmental regulations, which may prevent or delay the commencement or continuance of our operations.

Uranium minerals exploration and development and future potential uranium mining operations are or will be subject to stringent federal, state, provincial, and local laws and regulations relating to improving or maintaining environmental quality. Environmental laws often require parties to pay for remedial action or to pay damages regardless of fault. Environmental laws also often impose liability with respect to divested or terminated operations, even if the operations were terminated or divested of many years ago.

Future potential uranium mining operations and current exploration activities are or will be subject to extensive laws and regulations governing prospecting, development, production, exports, taxes, labor standards, occupational health, waste disposal, protection and remediation of the environment, protection of endangered and protected species, mine safety, toxic substances and other matters. Uranium mining is also subject to risks and liabilities associated with pollution of the environment and disposal of waste products occurring as a result of mineral exploration and production. Compliance with these laws and regulations will impose substantial costs on us and will subject us to significant potential liabilities.

Costs associated with environmental liabilities and compliance are expected to increase with the increasing scale and scope of operations and we expect these costs may increase in the future.

We believe that our operations comply, in all material respects, with all applicable environmental regulations. However, we are not fully insured at the current date against possible environmental risks.

Any change in government regulation/administrative practices may have a negative impact on our ability to operate and our profitability.

The laws, regulations, policies or current administrative practices of any government body, organization or regulatory agency in the United States or any other applicable jurisdiction, may be changed, applied or interpreted in a manner which will fundamentally alter our ability to carry on business. The actions, policies or regulations, or changes thereto, of any government body or regulatory agency, or other special interest groups, may have a detrimental effect on us. Any or all of these situations may have a negative impact on our ability to operate and/or our profitability.

We may be unable to retain key employees or consultants or recruit additional qualified personnel.

Our extremely limited personnel means that we would be required to spend significant sums of money to locate and train new employees in the event any of our employees resign or terminate their employment with us for any reason. Due to our limited operating history and financial resources, we are entirely dependent on the continued service of Amir Adnani, our President, Chief Executive Officer, Principal Executive Officer and a director, and Harry Anthony, our Chief Operating Officer and a director. Further, we do not have key man life insurance on any of these individuals. We may not have the financial resources to hire a replacement if any of our officers were to die. The loss of service of any of these employees could therefore significantly and adversely affect our operations.

Our officers and directors may be subject to conflicts of interest.

Some of our officers and directors serve only part time and may be subject to conflicts of interest. Each may devote part of his working time to other business endeavors, including consulting relationships with other corporate entities,

and may have responsibilities to these other entities. Such conflicts may include deciding how much time to devote to our affairs, as well as what business opportunities should be presented to us. Because of these relationships, some of our officers and directors may be subject to conflicts of interest.

Nevada law and our articles of incorporation may protect our directors from certain types of lawsuits.

Nevada law provides that our officers and directors will not be liable to us or our stockholders for monetary damages for all but certain types of conduct as officers and directors. Our Bylaws permit us broad indemnification

powers to all persons against all damages incurred in connection with our business to the fullest extent provided or allowed by law. The exculpation provisions may have the effect of preventing stockholders from recovering damages against our officers and directors caused by their negligence, poor judgment or other circumstances. The indemnification provisions may require us to use our limited assets to defend our officers and directors against claims, including claims arising out of their negligence, poor judgment, or other circumstances.

#### Risks Related to Our Common Stock

Sales of a substantial number of shares of our common stock into the public market by certain stockholders may result in significant downward pressure on the price of our common stock and could affect your ability to realize the current trading price of our common stock.

Sales of a substantial number of shares of our common stock in the public market by certain stockholders could cause a reduction in the market price of our common stock. As of the date of this annual report, we have 56,725,516 shares of common stock issued and outstanding, of which

20,198,431 shares are restricted securities as that term is defined in Rule 144 under the Securities Act. Although the Securities Act and Rule 144 place certain prohibitions on the sale of restricted securities, restricted securities may be sold into the public market under certain conditions. Further, as of the date of this annual report, there are an aggregate of 7,176,500 stock options outstanding and an aggregate of 8,338,375 share purchase warrants outstanding.

The sale of a substantial number of shares into the public market of previously restricted shares, or upon exercise of stock options or warrants, could place downward pressure on the price of our common stock.

The trading price of our common stock on the American Stock Exchange and previously on the OTC Bulletin Board has been and may continue to fluctuate significantly and stockholders may have difficulty reselling their shares.

Our common stock commenced trading on the American Stock Exchange on September 28, 2007, and previously traded on the OTCBB exchange, and the trading price has fluctuated. In addition to volatility associated with securities in general, the value of your investment could decline due to the impact of any of the following factors upon the market price of our common stock: (i) disappointing results from our discovery or development efforts; (ii) failure to meet our revenue or profit goals or operating budget; (iii) decline in demand for our common stock; (iv) downward revisions in securities analysts' estimates or changes in general market conditions; (v) technological innovations by competitors or in competing technologies; (vi) lack of funding generated for operations; (vii) investor perception of our industry or our prospects; and (viii) general economic trends.

In addition, stock markets have experienced price and volume fluctuations and the market prices of securities have been highly volatile. These fluctuations are often unrelated to operating performance and may adversely affect the market price of our common stock. As a result, investors may be unable to sell their shares at a fair price and you may lose all or part of your investment.

Additional issuances of equity securities may result in dilution to our existing stockholders. Our Articles of Incorporation authorize the issuance of 750,000,000 shares of common stock.

The Board of Directors has the authority to issue additional shares of our capital stock to provide additional financing in the future and the issuance of any such shares may result in a reduction of the book value or market price of the outstanding shares of our common stock. If we do issue any such additional shares, such issuance also will cause a reduction in the proportionate ownership and voting power of all other stockholders. As a result of such dilution, if you acquire shares of our common stock, your proportionate ownership interest and voting power could be decreased. Further, any such issuances could result in a change of control.

Our common stock is classified as a "penny stock" under SEC rules which limits the market for our common stock.

Because the market price of the common stock has fluctuated and may trade at times at less than \$5 per share, the common stock may be classified as a "penny stock." SEC Rule 15c-9 under the Exchange Act imposes additional sales practice requirements on broker-dealers that recommend the purchase or sale of penny stocks to persons other than those who qualify as an "established customer" or an "accredited investor." This includes the requirement that a broker-dealer must make a determination that investments in penny stocks are suitable for the customer and must make special disclosures to the customers concerning the risk of penny stocks. Many broker-dealers decline to participate in penny stock transactions because of the extra requirements imposed on penny stock transactions. Application of the penny stock rules to our common stock reduces the market liquidity of our shares, which in turn affects the ability of holders of our common stock to resell the shares they purchase, and they may not be able to resell at prices at or above the prices they paid.

A decline in the price of our common stock could affect our ability to raise further working capital and adversely impact our operations.

A decline in the price of our common stock could result in a reduction in the liquidity of our common stock and a reduction in our ability to raise additional capital for our operations. Because our operations to date have been principally financed through the sale of equity securities, a decline in the price of our common stock could have an adverse effect upon our liquidity and our continued operations. A reduction in our ability to raise equity capital in the future would have a material adverse effect upon our business plan and operations, including our ability to continue our current operations. If our stock price declines, we may not be able to raise additional capital or generate funds from operations sufficient to meet our obligations.

A majority of our directors and officers are outside the United States, with the result that it may be difficult for investors to enforce within the United States any judgments obtained against us or any of our directors or officers.

A majority of our directors and officers are nationals and/or residents of countries other than the United States, and all or a substantial portion of such persons' assets are located outside the United States. As a result, it may be difficult for investors to effect service of process on our directors or officers, or enforce within the United States or Canada any judgments obtained against us or our officers or directors, including judgments predicated upon the civil liability provisions of the securities laws of the United States or any state thereof. Consequently, you may be effectively prevented from pursuing remedies under U.S. federal securities laws against them. In addition, investors may not be able to commence an action in a Canadian court predicated upon the civil liability provisions of the securities laws of the United States. The foregoing risks also apply to those experts identified in this annual report that are not residents of the United States.

ITEM 1B. UNRESOLVED STAFF COMMENTS

None.

## ITEM 2. PROPERTIES

We own 32.19 acres of real estate located in Goliad County, Texas. The Golidad property and our other mineral property interests are described in detail in Item 1 "Description of Business" above.

Our registered office is located at 9801 Anderson Mill Road, Suite 230, Austin Texas 78750. We have entered into office rental and service agreements as follows:

(a) we currently have a month to month lease at \$1,370 per month for our Texas corporate office at 9801 Anderson Mill Road, Suite 230, Austin, Texas 78750. There is no lease commitment and rent and expenses are paid on a month to month basis;

48

---

(b) we currently have a month to month lease at \$795 per month for our Goliad project office at 138 South Market Street, Goliad, Texas 77963;

(c) we currently have a month to month lease at \$740 per month for our Texas exploration office at 100 East Kleberg Street, Suite 310, Kingsville, Texas 78364. There is no lease commitment and rent and expenses are paid on a month to month basis;

(d) we have a two year lease at \$4,026 per month for our New Mexico exploration office at 6100 Indian School NE, Suite 225, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87110, which expires on March 1, 2010;

(e) we currently have a month to month lease at \$1,561 per month for our Texas district office at 400 Mann Street, Suite 900, Corpus Christi, Texas 78401. There is no lease commitment and rent and expenses are paid on a month to month basis; and

(f) we rent office space at 1111 West Hasting Street, Suite 320, Vancouver, B.C., Canada V6E 2J3, for our corporate administration office. There is no lease commitment and rent and expenses are paid on a month to month basis.

## ITEM 3. LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

We are not a party to any material legal proceedings nor are we aware of any legal proceedings pending or threatened against us or our properties, except as follows:

### Goliad County Notice

As disclosed in our Current Report on Form 8-K filed on March 20, 2008 with the SEC, a lawsuit has been filed in U.S. District Court by Goliad County, Texas and an individual landowner alleging infractions of the United States Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974 in connection with our exploration activities in Goliad County. We believe this claim regarding our exploration activities to be completely without merit and will be vigorously defended by us. The responsible state agency with sole jurisdiction over our exploration activities previously thoroughly investigated a similar claim by the County and found us to be in compliance with all applicable regulatory and environmental requirements.

Specifically, as the agency noted in an April 2007 letter to the County's attorney, the state agency hydrologist "concluded from the available information that no ground-water contamination has occurred as a result of the drilling activities." The state agency concluded its letter by noting that "[t]o date, the Commission's investigation of your

complaint has not revealed any practice or activity within the approved permit area that has adversely affected the wells identified in your complaint or the related aquifer, or is out of compliance with the Texas Uranium Mining Regulations...". Later in a September 2007 letter to the Goliad groundwater district, the agency reiterated its findings stating the agency's "investigation of your complaint has not revealed any practice or activity at UEC's Uranium Exploration Permit No. 123 that is out of compliance... We consider this investigation to be closed."

Our Goliad Project has been inspected on a monthly basis since the close of the investigation, and no violations have been noted. In fact, an inspection report from November of 2007 observed that "prompt attention" to site restoration during exploration was apparent and "the area inspected looked very good". We are dedicated to full compliance with all aspects of the state regulatory process and will continue to focus our attention and efforts on obtaining all necessary authorizations for our Goliad Project.

The lawsuit, which was commenced by the filing of the plaintiffs' Original Complaint on or about March 17, 2008, follows on a notice of intent to file litigation issued by counsel for Goliad County which was disclosed in the Company's current report filed with the SEC on Form 8-K on March 3, 2008. The plaintiffs have requested that the Court grant the following relief: (a) that the Court exercise jurisdiction over the lawsuit; (b) an order enjoining the Company from further exploration activities in the Weesatche Project in Goliad County; (c) an order requiring the Company to clean up the alleged contamination of the aquifer; (d) an order enjoining initiation of the aquifer exemption process until the Company has cleaned up the alleged contamination; (e) an order prohibiting the

---

Company from using any water quality data for purposes of establishing baseline water quality if such data was collected after initiation of mining activity (although the Company has not commenced any mining activity); (f) an order granting Goliad County payment of its expert fees incurred in the prosecution of the lawsuit; (g) an order granting Goliad County payment of its attorney fees; and (h) such additional relief as the Court may deem just, proper and equitable, including an award of reasonable attorneys' fees, expenses and costs.

On June 5, 2009, the United States District Court issued an order dismissing the lawsuit filed by Goliad County commissioners against the Company. The lawsuit alleged infractions of the Safe Drinking Water Act ("SDWA") nearby to areas where the Company has conducted exploration activities. In his June 5, 2009 order dismissing the case, the Judge stated that the County's case failed to pass the threshold jurisdictional requirements, even when considered in the light most favorable to the County. As the Judge noted, the Texas Railroad Commission stated in an April 2007 letter to the County's attorney that an agency hydrologist "...concluded from the available information that no ground-water contamination has occurred as a result of the drilling activities." The Judge concluded that "...the touchstone of Goliad County's SDWA claim is its allegation that UEC 'converted' the exploratory boreholes into 'injection wells' and/or an 'injection activity,'...the Court has concluded that no such conversion or injection activity took place..."

#### ITEM 4. SUBMISSION OF MATTERS TO A VOTE OF SECURITY HOLDERS

We held our annual meeting of shareholders on July 23, 2009. At the meeting, our six directors were re-elected to our board of directors, the selection of Ernst & Young LLP as our independent auditors was ratified and our 2009 Stock Incentive Plan was approved.

The votes cast by shareholders at the meeting as to the election of directors were as follows:

	Votes	Abstentions and Broker Non-Votes
Votes For	Withheld	

Amir Adnani	23,575,250	361,667	-
Alan P. Lindsay	23,602,440	334,477	-
Harry L. Anthony	23,603,650	333,267	-
Erik Essiger	23,510,508	426,409	-
Ivan Obolensky	23,491,657	445,260	-
Vincent Della Volpe	23,509,956	426,961	-
Mark Katsumata	23,661,765	275,152	-

The votes cast by shareholders at the meeting as to the approval of our 2009 Stock Incentive Plan were as follows:

	Votes For	Votes Withheld	Abstentions and Broker Non-Votes
2 0 0 9 S t o c k Incentive Plan	10,531,625	1,153,812	239,520

The votes cast by shareholders at the meeting as to the ratification of the selection of our auditors were as follows:

50

---

	Votes For	Votes Withheld	Abstentions and Broker Non-Votes
Auditors	23,555,082	321,392	60,443

ITEM 5. MARKET FOR REGISTRANT'S COMMON EQUITY AND RELATED STOCKHOLDER MATTERS

Market for Common Equity

Shares of our common stock commenced trading on the OTC Bulletin Board under the symbol "URME" on December 5, 2005. On September 28, 2007, shares of our common stock commenced trading on the American Stock Exchange under the symbol "UEC". The market for our common stock is limited, and can be volatile. The following table sets forth the high and low bid prices relating to our common stock on the OTCBB on a quarterly basis for the periods indicated as quoted by the NASDAQ stock market. These quotations reflect inter-dealer prices without retail mark-up, mark-down, or commissions, and may not reflect actual transactions. In addition, we have set forth the high and low bid price of our shares of common stock on Amex, for the periods indicated.

The last reported sales price for our shares on Amex on October 9, 2009 was \$3.26 per share. As of October 9, 2009, we had 125 shareholders of record.

#### Dividend Policy

No dividends have been declared or paid on our common stock. We have incurred recurring losses and do not currently intend to pay any cash dividends in the foreseeable future.

#### Securities Authorized For Issuance Under Compensation Plans

We have two equity compensation plans, the Uranium Energy Corp. 2006 Stock Incentive Plan (the "2006 Plan") and



the Uranium Energy Corp. 2009 Stock Incentive Plan (the "2009 Plan"). The table set forth below presents information relating to our equity compensation plans as of the date of this annual report:

51

Plan Category	Number of Securities to be Issued Upon Exercise of Outstanding Options, Warrants and Rights (a)	Weighted-Average Exercise Price of Outstanding Options, Warrants and Rights (b)	Number of Securities Remaining Available for Future Issuance Under Equity Compensation Plans (excluding column (a))
Equity Compensation Plans to be Approved by Security Holders (2006 and 2009 Stock Incentive Plans)	7,176,500	\$1.15	2,697,500
Equity Compensation Plans Not Approved by Security Holders	500,000 <sup>(1)</sup>	\$1.00	Nil

(1) Represents shares of our common stock to be issued upon the exercise of warrants issued pursuant to consulting services agreements.

#### 2006 Stock Incentive Plan

On December 19, 2005, our Board of Directors authorized and approved the adoption of the 2005 stock option plan effective December 19, 2005. On October 10, 2006, we adopted the 2006 Stock Incentive Plan in place of the 2005 Stock Option Plan, under which an aggregate of 10,000,000 of our shares may be issued. All securities issued under the 2005 Stock Option Plan are covered by the 2006 Stock Incentive Plan. We have registered the shares underlying the 2006 Stock Incentive Plan pursuant to a registration statement on Form S-8 with the SEC.

The purpose of the 2006 Stock Incentive Plan is to enhance our long-term stockholder value by offering opportunities to our directors, officers, employees and eligible consultants to acquire and maintain stock ownership in order to give these persons the opportunity to participate in our growth and success, and to encourage them to remain in our service.

The 2006 Stock Incentive Plan is to be administered by our Board of Directors or a committee appointed by and consisting of two or more members of the Board of Directors, which shall determine, among other things, (i) the persons to be granted awards under the 2006 Plan; (ii) the number of shares or amount of other awards to be granted; and (iii) the terms and conditions of the awards granted. The Company may issue restricted shares, options, stock appreciation rights, deferred stock rights, dividend equivalent rights, among others, under the 2006 Plan. An aggregate of 10,000,000 of our shares may be issued pursuant to the grant of awards under the 2006 Plan.

An award may not be exercised after the termination date of the award and may be exercised following the termination of an eligible participant's continuous service only to the extent provided by the administrator under the 2006 Stock Incentive Plan. If the administrator under the 2006 Stock Incentive Plan permits a participant to exercise an award following the termination of continuous service for a specified period, the award terminates to the extent not exercised on the last day of the specified period or the last day of the original term of the award, whichever occurs first. In the event an eligible participant's service has been terminated for "cause", he or she shall immediately forfeit all rights to any of the awards outstanding.

The foregoing summary of the 2006 Stock Incentive Plan is not complete and is qualified in its entirety by reference to the 2006 Stock Incentive Plan, a copy of which has been filed with the SEC.

#### 2009 Stock Incentive Plan

On July 23, 2009, our shareholders approved the adoption of our 2009 Stock Incentive Plan in the amount of 5,000,000 shares.

As of the date of this annual report, there are an aggregate of 7,176,500 stock options granted and outstanding.

#### Common Stock Purchase Warrants

As of the date of this annual report, there are an aggregate of 8,338,375 common stock purchase warrants issued and outstanding.

#### Recent Sales of Unregistered Securities

Previously disclosed in filings with the SEC.

#### ITEM 6. SELECTED FINANCIAL DATA

The following selected financial data has been derived from and should be read in conjunction with (i) our audited financial statements as at and for the years ended July 31, 2009 and 2008, as at and for the seven months ended July 31, 2007, and as at and for the years ended December 31, 2006, 2005 and 2004, together with the notes to these financial statements, and (ii) the sections of this annual report entitled "Description of Business" and "Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations".

On June 29, 2007, our board of directors approved the change of our fiscal year end from December 31 to July 31. On October 29, 2007, we filed a Transition Report on Form 10-KSB for the fiscal period ended July 31, 2007, as subsequently amended, with the SEC and commenced a new reporting period.

We were incorporated under the laws of the State of Nevada on May 16, 2003. During 2004, we changed our business operations focus from precious metals exploration in the State of Nevada to the exploration for economic reserves of uranium throughout the United States. Since then, we have been acquiring mineral property interests in the United

Edgar Filing: URANIUM ENERGY CORP - Form 10-K

States. In addition, we restated our audited financial statements for the fiscal period ended July 31, 2007 to include the re-evaluation of impairment analysis performed at each respective period. Accordingly, the financial information presented below may not be comparable from period to period.

Balance Sheet Data

	As at July 31,			As at December 31,		
	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005	2004
Cash and cash equivalents	\$24,265,643	\$13,137,318	\$9,083,453	\$13,581,377	\$107,160	\$406,270
Working capital (deficiency)	23,734,674	12,749,800	9,593,649	13,460,648	(215,828)	371,469
Total assets	38,611,555	29,131,183	22,525,727	18,048,453	748,035	427,085
Total liabilities	761,800	865,390	379,157	532,043	323,288	36,414
Total stockholders' equity	37,849,755	28,265,793	22,146,570	17,516,410	424,747	390,671

Statement of Operations Data

	Fiscal Years Ended July 31,		Seven Months Ended July 31,	Fiscal Years Ended December 31,		
	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005	2004
Revenues	\$Nil	\$Nil	\$Nil	\$Nil	\$Nil	\$Nil
Expenses	13,568,334	19,268,668	8,571,200	12,078,099	1,377,432	109,322
Loss from operations	(13,568,334)	(19,268,668)	(8,571,200)	(12,078,099)	(1,377,432)	(109,322)
Net loss	(13,503,576)	(19,236,124)	(8,044,743)	(11,608,135)	(1,377,432)	(109,322)
	(0.29)	(0.49)	(0.22)	(0.44)	(0.08)	(0.10)

Basic and  
diluted  
loss per  
share

53

---

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

The following discussion should be read in conjunction with (i) our audited financial statements as at and for the years ended July 31, 2009 and 2008, and as at and for the seven months ended July 31, 2007 and the related notes; and (ii) the section of this annual report entitled "Description of Business" that appear elsewhere in this annual report. The following discussion contains forward-looking statements that reflect our plans, estimates and beliefs. Our actual results could differ materially from those discussed in the forward looking statements. Factors that could cause or contribute to such differences include, but are not limited to, those discussed below and elsewhere in this annual report, particularly in the section entitled "Risk Factors". Our financial statements are stated in United States Dollars and are prepared in accordance with United States Generally Accepted Accounting Principles.

In June 2007, we determined to change our fiscal year end from December 31 to July 31. Accordingly, on October 29, 2007, we filed a Transition Report on Form 10-KSB for the period year ended July 31, 2007, as subsequently amended, with the SEC and commenced a new reporting period.

We were incorporated under the laws of the State of Nevada on May 16, 2003. During 2004, we changed our business operations focus from precious metals exploration in the State of Nevada to the exploration for economic reserves of uranium throughout the United States. Since then, we have been acquiring mineral property interests in the United States. In addition, we restated our audited financial statements for the fiscal period ended July 31, 2007 and fiscal year ended December 31, 2006 to account for the re-evaluation of impairment analysis performed at each respective period and to correct for errors in recording database related transactions. Accordingly, the financial information presented below may not be comparable from period to period.

**Plan of Operations**

Our plan of operations for the next twelve months is to continue with the exploration of our mineral properties. Our planned geological exploration programs are described in detail in this annual report under "Description of Business and Properties".

Our planned exploration expenditures for the next twelve months on our mineral properties, together with amounts due to maintain our interest in these claims, are summarized as follows:

Name of Property	Planned Exploration Expenditures	Amounts of Claims Maintenance Due	Amount of Property Payment Due
Goliad	\$Nil	\$11,698	\$Nil

The following sets forth information relating to all fees and other payments required to be made by us in the next twelve months:

Mining Claims	Lease Maintenance Payments	Access Agreement Fees	Mining Development Programs
\$Nil (Cibola JV Payment)	\$245,000 (Cibola JV Advance Royalty Payment)	\$14,700 (Cibola JV Scholarship Contribution)	\$800,000

In addition, we will incur general and administrative expenses throughout the year that we anticipate will consist primarily of professional fees for the audit and legal work relating to our regulatory filings throughout the year, as well as transfer agent fees, management fees, investor relations and general office expenses.

We had cash in the amount of \$24,265,643 and a working capital surplus in the amount of \$23,734,674 as of July 31, 2009. We anticipate that existing cash resources will be sufficient to carry out our exploration programs and current plan of operations for the next twelve months. In the event we require additional financing to pursue our plan of operations for the next 12 months, there can be no assurance that such financing will be available on terms favorable to us or at all.

Beyond the next twelve months, we may be required to obtain additional financing in order to continue our plan of operations as we anticipate that we will not earn any revenues in the foreseeable future. We believe that debt financing will not be an alternative for funding additional phases of exploration as we do not have tangible assets to secure any debt financing. We anticipate that additional funding will be in the form of equity financing from the sale of our common stock. We do not have any financing arranged and we cannot provide investors with any assurance that we will be able to raise sufficient funding from the sale of our common stock to fund our exploration programs. In the absence of such financing, we will not be able to continue exploration of our mineral claims. Even if we are successful in obtaining equity financing to fund our exploration programs, there is no assurance that we will obtain the funding necessary to pursue any advanced exploration of our mineral claims following the completion of preliminary exploration. If we do not continue to obtain additional financing, we may be forced to abandon our properties and our plan of operations.

We may consider entering into a joint venture arrangement to provide the required funding to pursue drilling and advanced exploration of our mineral claims. Even if we determined to pursue a joint venture partner, there is no assurance that any third party would enter into a joint venture agreement with us in order to fund exploration of our mineral claims. If we entered into a joint venture arrangement, we would likely have to assign a percentage of our interest in our mineral claims to the joint venture partner.

Our exploration plans will be continually evaluated and modified as exploration results become available. Modifications to our plans will be based on many factors, including: results of exploration, assessment of data, weather conditions, exploration costs, the price of uranium and available capital. Further, the extent of our exploration programs that we undertake will be dependent upon the amount of financing available to us.

#### Results of Operations

We are an exploration stage company and have not generated any revenue to date. The following table sets forth selected financial information relating to our company for the periods indicated:

Fiscal Years Ended July 31,	Seven Months Ended July	Fiscal Year Ended December 31,
-----------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------

Edgar Filing: URANIUM ENERGY CORP - Form 10-K

	2009	2008	2007	2006
			31,	
Consulting fees	\$220,332	\$522,718	\$253,026	\$708,555
Consulting fees - stock based	810,823	463,125	704,058	4,665,967
Depreciation and amortization	526,251	372,886	84,140	56,872
General and administrative	3,768,042	5,726,145	2,246,054	2,496,900
Impairment loss on mineral properties	1,223,038	247,830	51,390	-
Interest and finance charges	-	55,334	116,396	-
Management fees	744,684	791,695	302,697	647,248
Management fees - stock based	262,500	2,019,250	1,774,500	923,253
Mineral property expenditures	4,666,272	7,003,437	2,485,501	1,832,662
Professional fees	680,111	739,853	317,225	315,564
Wages and benefits - stock based	666,281	1,326,395	236,213	431,078
Operating loss	(13,568,334)	(19,268,668)	(8,571,200)	(12,078,099)

Net loss                    \$(13,503,576)    \$(19,236,124)    \$(8,044,743)    \$(11,608,135)

We have been funding our initial operations by way of private placements. We expect we will require additional capital to meet our long term operating requirements. We expect to raise additional capital through, among other things, the sale of equity or debt securities.

55

Year Ended July 31, 2009 Compared to Year Ended July 31, 2008

We are an exploration stage company and net production revenues during the years ended July 31, 2009 and 2008 were \$Nil. Our net loss for the year ended July 31, 2009 was \$13,503,576 compared to a net loss of \$19,236,124 during the year ended July 31, 2008.

Operating expenses incurred during the year ended July 31, 2009 decreased to \$13,568,334 from \$19,268,668 over the year ended July 31, 2008. The decrease is primarily due to a reduction in some of our exploration activities, operations and personnel, including salary reductions, over the prior period as we implemented a cost reduction program during difficult economic conditions. Significant expenditures and changes are outlined as follows:

- Consulting fees decreased to \$220,332 during the year ended July 31, 2009 from \$522,718 during the year ended July 31, 2008 due primarily to a reduction in the reliance on third party service providers as we reduced some of our operations during difficult economic conditions.
- Consulting fees - stock based increased to \$810,823 during the year ended July 31, 2009 from \$463,125 during the year ended July 31, 2008. The current and prior period expense consists of the fair value of option and stock grants earned during the period. Additionally, the current period expense includes the incremental expense incurred from option grants issued to consultants that were repriced during the year.
- Depreciation and amortization increased to \$526,251 during the year ended July 31, 2009 from \$372,886 during the year ended July 31, 2008 due to significant investments in property and equipment and databases during prior periods that were not subject to amortization throughout the comparable period.
- General and administrative costs decreased to \$3,768,042 during the year ended July 31, 2009 from \$5,726,145 during the year ended July 31, 2008 due to the general reduction in some of our operations and personnel, including salary reductions, in the current period as compared to the prior period.
- Impairment loss on mineral properties increased to \$1,223,038 during the year ended July 31, 2009 from \$247,830 during the year ended July 31, 2008. During the year, we opted not to renew certain mineral claims and leases in the States of Arizona, New Mexico and Texas, and decided to terminate the Holley Option. Accordingly, an impairment loss was recorded to reflect the changes in valuation.
- Interest and finance charges decreased to \$Nil during the year ended July 31, 2009 from \$55,334 during the year ended July 31, 2008. Interest and finance charges consist of the fair value of warrant issuances, resulting from delays in S-1 Registration Statements becoming effective during the prior period.
- Management fees decreased to \$744,684 during the year ended July 31, 2009 from \$791,695 during the year ended July 31, 2008 due to a 20% reduction in executive compensation applicable to all officers and directors during a portion of the current period.

- Management fees - stock based decreased to \$262,500 during the year ended July 31, 2009 from \$2,019,250 during the year ended July 31, 2008. The current and prior period expense consists of the fair value of option grants earned during the period. Additionally, the current period expense includes the incremental expense incurred from option grants issued to management that were repriced during the year.
- Mineral property expenditures decreased to \$4,666,272 during the year ended July 31, 2009 from \$7,003,437 during the year ended July 31, 2008 due to the reduction in some of our exploration activities over the prior period during difficult economic conditions.
- Professional fees decreased to \$680,111 during the year ended July 31, 2009 from \$739,853 during the year ended July 31, 2008 due primarily to variations in audit, review and counsel fees over the prior period based on the volume of business operations and development.

56

---

- Wages and benefits - stock based decreased to \$666,281 during the year ended July 31, 2009 from \$1,326,395 during the year ended July 31, 2008. The current and prior year expense consists of the fair value of option grants earned during the period. Additionally, the current period expense includes the incremental expense incurred from option grants issued to employees that were repriced during the year.

Interest and other income decreased to \$54,600 during the year ended July 31, 2009 from \$169,812 during the year ended July 31, 2008 due to significantly lower investment rates during the current period. A \$47,548 gain on the sale of marketable securities was realized during the year ended July 31, 2008 from the sale of investments. There were no investment related transactions during the current period. A \$14,370 loss on sale of assets was recorded during the current year from a charge realized on the disposal of property and equipment.

Deferred tax expense decreased to \$Nil during the year ended July 31, 2009 from \$195,171 during the fiscal year ended July 31, 2008. The deferred tax expense was calculated on the estimated unrealized gain on available-for-sale securities in prior fiscal periods which was reflected in other comprehensive income.

Our net loss during the year ended July 31, 2009 was \$13,503,576 or (\$0.29) per share, compared to a net loss of \$19,236,124 or (\$0.49) per share during the year ended July 31, 2008. The weighted average number of shares outstanding was 47,358,056 for the year ended July 31, 2009 compared to 39,397,704 for the year ended July 31, 2008.

#### Year Ended July 31, 2008 Compared to Seven Months Ended July 31, 2007

We are an exploration stage company and net production revenues during the year ended July 31, 2008 and seven months ended July 31, 2007 were \$Nil. Our net loss for the year ended July 31, 2008 was \$19,236,124 compared to a net loss of \$8,044,743 during the seven months ended July 31, 2007.

Operating expenses incurred during the year ended July 31, 2008 increased to \$19,268,668 from \$8,571,200 over the seven months ended July 31, 2007. The increase is primarily due to the expansion of current operations and the corresponding change in administration and exploration costs associated with the increased acquisition and development of our uranium properties and related infrastructure. Significant expenditures and changes are outlined as follows:

- Consulting fees increased to \$522,718 during the year ended July 31, 2008 from \$253,026 during the seven months ended July 31, 2007 due primarily to the longer reporting period, and an increased reliance on third party service providers as we expand our operations.



- Consulting fees - stock based decreased to \$463,125 during the year ended July 31, 2008 from \$704,058 during the seven months ended July 31, 2007. The current and prior period expense consists of the fair value of option and stock grants earned during the period.
- Depreciation and amortization increased to \$372,886 during the year ended July 31, 2008 from \$84,140 during the seven months ended July 31, 2007 due to the longer reporting period, and significant investments in property and equipment and databases during the current and prior periods.
- General and administrative costs increased to \$5,726,145 during the year ended July 31, 2008 from \$2,246,054 during the seven months ended July 31, 2007 due to the longer reporting period, and a general expansion of operations and personnel in the current period as compared to the prior period, and more significant marketing activities in the current period.
- Impairment loss on mineral properties increased to \$247,830 during the year ended July 31, 2008 from \$51,390 during the seven months ended July 31, 2007. In August 2008 we opted not to renew certain mineral claims with the Bureau of Land Management in the States of New Mexico and Wyoming. Accordingly, an impairment loss was recorded as of July 31, 2008 to reflect the change in valuation based on subsequent events. In the prior fiscal period, an impairment loss was recorded on the Jebsen AB project following unfavorable results from the exploration.

57

---

- Interest and finance charges decreased to \$55,334 during the year ended July 31, 2008 from \$116,396 during the seven months ended July 31, 2007. Interest and finance charges consist of the fair value of warrant issuances, resulting from delays in S-1 Registration Statements becoming effective.
- Management fees increased to \$791,695 during the year ended July 31, 2008 from \$302,697 during the seven months ended July 31, 2007 due primarily to the longer reporting period, and increases in executive compensation over the prior year.
- Management fees - stock based increased to \$2,019,250 during the year ended July 31, 2008 from \$1,774,500 during the seven months ended July 31, 2007. The current and prior period expense consists of the fair value of option grants earned during the period.
- Mineral property expenditures increased to \$7,003,437 during the year ended July 31, 2008 from \$2,485,501 during the seven months ended July 31, 2007 due to the longer reporting period, and the expansion of exploration activities over the prior period, primarily in the Goliad project.
- Professional fees increased to \$739,853 during the year ended July 31, 2008 from \$317,225 during the seven months ended July 31, 2007 due primarily to the longer reporting period, and increases in audit and review costs in addition to increases in counsel fees associated with the growth in our operations.
- Wages and benefits - stock based increased to \$1,326,395 during the year ended July 31, 2008 from \$236,213 during the seven months ended July 31, 2007. The current and prior year expense consists of the fair value of option grants earned during the period.

Interest and other income decreased to \$169,812 during the year ended July 31, 2008 from \$319,824 during the seven months ended July 31, 2007 due to higher cash balances maintained during the prior period. A \$47,548 gain on the sale of marketable securities was realized during the year ended July 31, 2008 from the sale of investments. There were no investment related transactions during the prior period.

Deferred tax expense increased to \$195,171 during the year ended July 31, 2008 from a deferred tax benefit of \$195,171 during the seven months ended July 31, 2007. The deferred tax benefit was calculated on the estimated unrealized gain on available-for-sale securities in the prior fiscal period which was reflected in other comprehensive income.

Our net loss during the year ended July 31, 2008 was \$19,236,124 or (\$0.49) per share, compared to a net loss of \$8,044,743 or (\$0.22) per share during the seven months ended July 31, 2007. The weighted average number of shares outstanding was 39,397,704 for the year ended July 31, 2008 compared to 36,389,384 for the seven months ended July 31, 2007.

#### Seven Months Ended July 31, 2007 Compared to Fiscal Year Ended December 31, 2006

We are an exploration stage company and net production revenues during the seven months ended July 31, 2007, and fiscal year ended December 31, 2006, were \$Nil. Our net loss for the seven months ended July 31, 2007, was \$8,044,743 compared to a net loss of \$11,608,135 during fiscal year ended December 31, 2006.

Operating expenses incurred during the seven months ended July 31, 2007, decreased to \$8,571,200 from \$12,078,099 incurred during the fiscal year ended December 31, 2006. The decrease is primarily due to reduced consulting fees including stock based consulting charges, which is partially offset by the expansion of current operations and the corresponding change in exploration costs associated with the development of our uranium properties and related infrastructure. Significant expenditures and changes are outlined as follows:

58

---

- Consulting fees decreased to \$253,026 during the seven months ended July 31, 2007, from \$708,555 during the fiscal year ended December 31, 2006, due primarily to the shorter reporting period and decreases in costs relating to investor relations from unrelated service providers;
- Consulting fees - stock-based decreased to \$704,058 during the seven months ended July 31, 2007, from \$4,665,967 during the fiscal year ended December 31, 2006, due primarily to a reduction in the number of stock options issued as compensation to consultants during the current period;
- Depreciation and amortization increased to \$84,140 during the seven months ended July 31, 2007, from \$56,872 during the fiscal year ended December 31, 2006, due to significant investments in property and equipment during the current fiscal period and the last half of the prior fiscal year;
- General and administrative costs decreased to \$2,246,054 during the seven months ended July 31, 2007, from \$2,496,900 during the fiscal year ended December 31, 2006, due to the expansion in operations and personnel during the current fiscal period which is offset by the shorter reporting period;
- Impairment loss on mineral properties increased to \$51,390 during the seven months ended July 31, 2007, from \$Nil during the fiscal year ended December 31, 2006. In the current period, acquisition costs for our Jepsen AB project were written down to \$Nil following unfavorable results from the exploration program;
- Interest and finance charges increased to \$116,396 during the seven months ended July 31, 2007, from \$Nil during the fiscal year ended December 31, 2006, due to a current period expense realized on the issuance of warrants resulting from delays in an SB-2 Registration Statement becoming effective;
- Management fees decreased to \$302,697 during the seven months ended July 31, 2007, from \$647,248 during the fiscal year ended December 31, 2006, due primarily to bonuses paid in the prior year and the shorter

reporting period;

- Management fees - stock-based increased to \$1,774,500 during the seven months ended July 31, 2007, from \$923,253 during the fiscal year ended December 31, 2006, due to the higher valuation of options issued as compensation to management during the current period;
- Mineral property expenditures increased to \$2,485,501 during the seven months ended July 31, 2007, from \$1,832,662 during the fiscal year ended December 31, 2006, due to the expansion of exploration activities over the prior period, where exploration was carried out primarily in the later stages of the year;
- Professional fees increased to \$317,225 during the seven months ended July 31, 2007, from \$315,564 during the fiscal year ended December 31, 2006, due primarily to increases in audit and review costs in addition to increases in counsel fees associated with the growth in the Company's operations, which are offset by the shorter reporting period; and
- Wages and benefits - stock-based decreased to \$236,213 during the seven months ended July 31, 2007, from \$431,078 during the fiscal year ended December 31, 2006, due primarily to a reduction in the number of options issued as compensation to employees during the current period.

Of the \$8,571,200 incurred as operating expenses during the seven months ended July 31, 2007, an aggregate of \$302,697 was incurred payable to certain officers and directors in management and consulting fees. Of the \$302,697: (i) we incurred to our President and Chief Executive Officer an aggregate of \$88,750 in connection with performance of managerial, administrative and business development services; (ii) we incurred to our Chief Operating Officer an aggregate of \$93,750 in connection with performance of managerial and operational services; and (iii) we incurred to our Chief Financial Officer an aggregate of \$51,707 in connection with performance of administrative and financial services. As of the date of this Annual Report there were no amounts due and owing to our directors and officers. We also paid \$20,745 in consulting fees and \$11,980 in media and website development and hosting fees to private companies controlled by direct family members of two directors.

59

Interest and other income increased to \$331,286 during the seven months ended July 31, 2007, from \$106,207 during the fiscal year ended December 31, 2006, due to significantly higher cash balances maintained throughout the current period. During the fiscal year ended December 31, 2006, we recorded a \$363,757 gain on the sale of the Cadena database.

Deferred tax benefit increased to \$195,171 during the seven months ended July 31, 2007 from \$Nil during the fiscal year ended December 31, 2006. The deferred tax benefit is calculated on the estimated unrealized gain on available-for-sale securities in the current fiscal period which is reflected in other comprehensive income.

Our net loss during the seven months ended July 31, 2007, was \$8,044,743 or (\$0.22) per share, compared to a net loss of \$11,608,135 or (\$0.44) per share during the fiscal year ended December 31, 2006. The weighted average number of shares outstanding was 36,389,384 for the seven months ended July 31, 2007, compared to 26,342,512 for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2006.

#### Liquidity and Capital Resources

As at July 31,

2009	2008	2007
------	------	------

Cash and cash equivalents	\$24,265,643	\$13,137,318	\$9,083,453
Working capital	23,734,674	12,749,800	9,593,649
Total assets	38,611,555	29,131,183	22,525,727
Total liabilities	761,800	865,390	379,157
Stockholders' equity	37,849,755	28,265,793	22,146,570

#### Cash Flows from Operating Activities

We have not generated positive cash flows from operating activities. Net cash used in operating activities during the year ended July 31, 2009 was \$10,001,218 compared to \$14,259,956 during the year ended July 31, 2008. Significant operating expenditures during the current period included mineral property expenditures, and general and administrative costs.

Net cash used in operating activities during the year ended July 31, 2008 was \$14,259,956 compared to \$5,328,362 during the seven months ended July 31, 2007. Significant operating expenditures during the current period included mineral property expenditures, and general and administrative costs.

For the seven months ended July 31, 2007, net cash flows used in operating activities were \$5,328,362, compared to \$5,603,482 in the year ended December 31, 2006. Net cash flows used in operating activities were adjusted by \$2,714,771 to reconcile the non-cash expense of stock based compensation.

#### Cash Flows from Investing Activities

Net cash provided by investing activities during the year ended July 31, 2009 was \$44,226 compared to net cash used in investing activities of \$3,432,556 in the year ended July 31, 2008. Significant investing expenditures during the prior period included mineral property acquisitions, including a \$980,000 payment related to the Cibola Resources LLC agreement, a \$500,000 payment for the Tronox database acquisition, payments totaling \$200,000 relating to the F-33 agreement, and \$779,149 in purchases of equipment.

Net cash used in investing activities during the year ended July 31, 2008 was \$3,432,556 compared to \$2,882,481 in the seven months ended July 31, 2007. Significant investing expenditures during the current period included mineral property acquisitions, including a \$980,000 payment related to the Cibola Resources LLC agreement, a \$500,000 payment for the Tronox database acquisition, payments totaling \$200,000 relating to the F-33 agreement, and \$779,149 in purchases of equipment.

---

For the seven months ended July 31, 2007, net cash flows used in investing activities were \$2,882,481, compared to \$835,050 for the year ended December 31, 2006, consisting primarily of the acquisition of mineral rights and

properties.

#### Cash Flows from Financing Activities

Net cash provided by financing activities during the year ended July 31, 2009 was \$21,085,317 compared to \$21,746,377 during the year ended July 31, 2008. During the current period, we received net proceeds of \$21,035,379 primarily from the sale our common stock pursuant to private placements.

Net cash provided by financing activities during the year ended July 31, 2008 was \$21,746,377 compared to \$3,712,919 during the seven months ended July 31, 2007. During the current period, we received net proceeds of \$21,637,396 primarily from the sale our common stock pursuant to private placements.

For the seven months ended July 31, 2007, net cash flows from financing activities were \$3,712,919, compared to \$19,912,749 in the year ended December 31, 2006, pertaining primarily to proceeds received from the sale of our common stock.

We expect that working capital requirements will continue to be funded through a combination of our existing funds and further issuances of securities. Our working capital requirements are expected to increase in line with the growth of our business.

#### Plan of Operation and Funding

Our existing working capital is expected to be adequate to fund our operations over the next twelve months. We have no lines of credit or other bank financing arrangements. Generally, we have financed operations to date through the proceeds of the private placement of equity and debt instruments. In connection with our business plan, management anticipates additional increases in operating expenses and capital expenditures relating to: (i) uranium exploration operating activities; (ii) possible future reserve definition; (iii) possible future mining initiatives on current and future properties; and (iv) possible future property acquisitions. We intend to finance these expenses with further issuances of securities, and debt issuances. We expect we will need to raise additional capital to meet long-term operating requirements. Additional issuances of equity or convertible debt securities will result in dilution to our current shareholders. Further, such securities might have rights, preferences or privileges senior to our common stock. Additional financing may not be available upon acceptable terms, or at all. If adequate funds are not available or are not available on acceptable terms, we may not be able to take advantage of prospective new business endeavors or opportunities, which could significantly and materially restrict our business operations.

#### Going Concern

We commenced operations on May 16, 2003 and have not realized any significant revenues since inception. As at July 31, 2009 we have working capital of \$23,734,674 and an accumulated deficit of \$53,903,464. Although existing cash resources are currently expected to provide sufficient funds through the upcoming year, the capital expenditures required to achieve planned principal operations may be substantial. Our continuation as a going concern for a period of longer than the upcoming year is dependent upon our ability to obtain necessary financing to continue operations. We are in the exploration stage of our mineral property development and to date have not yet established any proven mineral reserves on our existing properties. Our continued operations and the recoverability of the carrying value of our assets is ultimately dependent upon our ability to achieve profitable operations. To date, we have completed private placements and received funding through the exercise of stock options and share purchase warrants for net proceeds of \$67,477,971 from the issuance of shares of our common stock.

#### Material Commitments

On April 27, 2007, we entered into a joint venture (the "Joint Venture") with Neutron Energy Inc., a Wyoming corporation ("NEI") in connection with exploration of property covering 6,717 acres located in Cibola County, New Mexico (the "Property") for uranium resources. In connection with the Joint Venture, Cibola Resources LLC, a

61

---

Delaware limited liability company ("Cibola"), was formed for purposes of undertaking exploration activities contemplated by the Joint Venture.

On April 6, 2007, NEI and La Merced del Pueblo de Cebolleta, a private entity that has authority over the natural resources of the Property ("Cebolleta"), entered into a mining lease agreement (the "Mining Lease Agreement"), pursuant to which NEI acquired the mining lease to the Property from Cebolleta (the "Lease") for cash payments of \$3,000,000. As of June 30, 2007, we have reimbursed NEI an aggregate of \$1,470,000. As a result, we have a 49% equity interest in Cibola and NEI has a 51% equity interest in Cibola, respectively. NEI contributed the Lease to Cibola Resources LLC.

Under terms of a Letter Agreement (the "Letter Agreement") between Cebolleta and NEI, further payments to the order and direction of Cebolleta are required as follows:

- (a) \$2,000,000 six months from the effective date of the Letter Agreement (paid \$980,000, being the Company's portion);
- (b) \$500,000 representing an advanced royalty, every 12 months from the effective date of the Letter Agreement until uranium production begins (to be deducted from any royalties paid in that same year);
- (c) \$1.00 per pound upon an independent mining engineering firm's completion of a feasibility study, and all prior payments made to Cebolleta will be credited to the recoverable reserve payment;
- (d) 5.00% to 8.00% production royalty payments depending upon the uranium sale price; and
- (e) \$30,000 per year towards a scholarship fund.

We are required to contribute 49% of the aforementioned payments in order to retain our interest in the Joint Venture. Through the date of this Annual Report, the Company has paid \$2,450,000 in mineral right and property acquisition costs, \$36,750 in database acquisition costs, and an additional \$1,129,846 in exploration costs on behalf of Cibola for a cumulative contribution of \$3,579,846.

On November 1, 2007 we entered into a binding letter Agreement to Purchase Assets with Melvin O. Stairs, Jr. ("Mr. Stairs"), for a mineral exploration claim and related database information located in Maricopa County, Arizona. Under the terms of the agreement, the Company will pay total consideration of \$1,200,000 including i) a \$10,000 deposit upon execution (paid), ii) installments of \$95,000 cash on January 10, 2008 (paid) and August 15, 2008 (issued), and iii) installments totaling \$100,000 on January 10 and August 15 of each year for the period from January 10, 2009 through August 15, 2013. Additionally, the Company has granted the seller security interest on the acquired assets until the agreement is paid in full. On August 25, 2008 we entered into an amendment agreement pursuant to which the total consideration payable was reduced to \$300,000 as follows: i) a \$10,000 deposit upon execution (paid), ii) installments of \$95,000 cash on January 10, 2008 (paid) and \$57,000 cash (paid) and \$38,000 by way of issuance of 19,000 restricted common shares of the Company at a deemed price of \$2.00 per share on August 15, 2008, and a final payment of \$50,000 by way of cash, plus \$50,000 by way of restricted common shares of the Company at a deemed price based on the average closing price of the shares on the 5 previous days preceding the payment due date of October 31, 2009.

On November 13, 2007, we entered into an agreement to acquire certain mineral property leases located in Cibola County, New Mexico for total consideration of \$400,000. Under the terms of the agreement, we paid an initial deposit of \$100,000 upon closing with the remaining balance due in three installments of \$100,000 due on March 31, 2008 (paid), December 31, 2008, and December 31, 2009. At our option, the final two installments may be paid in stock, based on the average trading price of our common stock over the 10 days immediately preceding the due date. On December 12, 2008 we entered into an agreement amending the aforementioned underlying agreement to acquire mineral leases to the following: \$5,000 on or before December 31, 2008 (paid) and \$45,000 on or before December 31, 2009. At our option, the final installment may be paid in stock, based on the average trading price of its common stock over the 10 days immediately preceding the due date.

62

We are committed to pay our key executives a total of approximately \$610,000 per year for management services.

We are currently leasing office premises in New Mexico, Texas, and Vancouver, B.C., Canada for monthly payments totaling \$12,497. All office lease agreements are on a month to month basis with the exception of New Mexico lease, which expires in March, 2010.

The following sets forth our contractual obligations in tabular form as at July 31, 2009:

Contractual Obligations	Total	Payments Due by Period			
		Less Than 1 Year	1-3 Years	3-5 Years	More Than 5 Years
Capital Lease Obligations	\$Nil	\$Nil	\$Nil	\$Nil	\$Nil
Operating Leases	\$34,427	\$34,427	\$Nil	\$Nil	\$Nil
Purchase Obligations	\$95,000	\$95,000	\$Nil	\$Nil	\$Nil
Other Long-Term Liabilities	\$144,029	\$141,779	\$2,250	\$Nil	\$Nil
Reflected on the Registrant's Balance Sheet under GAAP	\$Nil	\$Nil	\$Nil	\$Nil	\$Nil

\$273,456    \$271,206    \$2,250    \$Nil    \$Nil

#### Purchase of Significant Equipment

We currently do not plan to acquire any significant equipment in fiscal 2010.

#### Off-Balance Sheet Arrangements

We do not have any off-balance sheet arrangements that have or are reasonably likely to have a current or future effect on our financial condition, changes in financial condition, revenues or expenses, results of operations, liquidity, capital expenditures or capital resources that are material to investors.

#### Critical Accounting Policies

Our financial statements and accompanying notes have been prepared in accordance with United States generally accepted accounting principles applied on a consistent basis. The preparation of financial statements in conformity with US generally accepted accounting principles requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities, the disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities at the date of the financial statements and the reported amounts of revenues and expenses during the reporting periods.

We regularly evaluate the accounting policies and estimates that we use to prepare our financial statements. In general, management's estimates are based on historical experience, on information from third party professionals, and on various other assumptions that are believed to be reasonable under the facts and circumstances. Actual results could differ from those estimates made by management.

#### Mineral Property Costs

We are primarily engaged in the acquisition, exploration and development of mineral properties.

Mineral property acquisition costs are initially capitalized when incurred in accordance with EITF 04-2, "Whether Mineral Rights are Tangible or Intangible Assets". At the end of each fiscal quarter end, the Company assesses the carrying costs for impairment under SFAS 144, "Accounting for Impairment or Disposal of Long Lived Assets". If proven and probable reserves are established for a property and it has been determined that a mineral property can be economically developed, costs will be amortized using the units-of-production method over the estimated life of the reserve.

63

---

Mineral property exploration costs are expensed as incurred.

As of the date of this annual report, we have not established any proven or probable reserves on our mineral properties and have incurred only acquisition and exploration costs.

#### Databases

Costs related to internally developed databases are expensed as incurred. Costs of acquired mineral property databases are capitalized upon acquisition. Mineral property data bases are tested for impairment whenever events or changes indicate the carrying value amount may not be recoverable. An impairment loss is recognized if it is determined that



the carrying amount is not recoverable and exceeds fair value. Mineral property databases are amortized over five years using the straight-line method.

#### Restoration and Remediation Costs (Asset Retirement Obligations)

Various federal and state mining laws and regulations require us to reclaim the surface areas and restore underground water quality for its mine projects to the pre-existing mine area average quality after the completion of mining.

Future reclamation and remediation costs, which include production equipment removal and environmental remediation, are accrued based on management's best estimate at the end of each period of the costs expected to be incurred at each project. Such estimates would be determined by our engineering studies calculating the cost of future of surface and groundwater activities, current regulations, actual expenses incurred, and technology and industry standards.

In accordance with Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 143 "*Accounting for Asset Retirement Obligations*," we will capitalize the measured fair value of asset retirement obligations to mineral rights and properties. The asset retirement obligations would be accreted to an undiscounted value until the time at which they are expected to be settled. Actual retirement costs will be recorded against the asset retirement obligations when incurred. Any difference between the recorded asset retirement obligations and the actual retirement costs incurred will be recorded as a gain or loss in the period of settlement.

#### Impairment of Long-Lived Assets

Long-lived assets are reviewed for impairment whenever events or changes in circumstances indicate the carrying amount of an asset may not be recoverable. Circumstances which could trigger a review include, but are not limited to: significant decreases in the market price of the asset; significant adverse changes in the business climate or legal factors; accumulation of costs significantly in excess of the amount originally expected for the acquisition or construction of the asset; current period cash flow or operating losses combined with a history of losses or a forecast of continuing losses associated with the use of the asset; and current expectation that the asset will more likely than not be sold or disposed significantly before the end of its estimated useful life. Recoverability of these assets is measured by comparison of its carrying amount to future undiscounted cash flows the assets are expected to generate. An impairment loss is recognized when the carrying amount is not recoverable and exceeds fair value.

#### Financial Instruments

The fair values of cash and cash equivalents, restricted cash, other current monetary assets, accounts payable and accrued liabilities were estimated to approximate their carrying values due to the immediate or short-term maturity of these financial instruments. Our operations and financing activities are conducted primarily in United States dollars, and as a result we are not subject to significant exposure to market risks from changes in foreign currency rates. Management has determined that we are not exposed to significant credit risk.

---

#### Stock-Based Compensation

On January 1, 2006, we adopted SFAS No. 123 (revised 2004) (SFAS No. 123R), Share-Based Payment, which addresses the accounting for stock-based payment transactions, requiring such transactions to be accounted for using the fair value method. We use the Black-Scholes option-pricing model to determine the grant date fair-value of stock-based awards under SFAS No. 123R. The fair value is recorded in income depending on the terms and conditions of the award, and the nature of the relationship of the recipient of the award to us. We record the grant date fair value in income in line with the period over which it was earned. For employees and management this is typically

considered to be the vesting period of the award. For consultants the fair value of the award is recorded in income over the term of the service period, and unvested amounts are revalued at each reporting period over the service period. We estimate the expected forfeitures and update the valuation accordingly.

#### Recently Adopted Accounting Policies

Effective August 1, 2008, we adopted SFAS No. 157 "Fair Value Measurements". In February 2008, the FASB issued FASB Staff Position No. FAS 157-2, "Effective Date of FASB Statement No. 157, which provides a one year deferral of the effective date of SFAS No. 157 for non-financial assets and non-financial liabilities, except those that are recognized or disclosed in the financial statements at fair value at least annually. In October 2008, the FASB issued FASB Staff Position No. SFAS 157-3, "Determining the Fair Value of a Financial Asset When the Market for That Asset Is Not Active," which clarifies the application of SFAS 157 for markets that are not active and illustrates key considerations in determining the fair value of a financial asset when the market for that financial asset is not active. We adopted the provisions of SFAS No. 157 on a prospective basis for financial assets and liabilities which require that we determine the fair value of financial assets and liabilities using the fair value hierarchy established in SFAS No. 157. The adoption of SFAS No. 157 did not have a material impact on our results of operations and financial condition for the period ended April 30, 2009 however, this change may have an impact on the financial condition and the results of operations in future periods.

In February 2007, the FASB issued FASB Statement No. 159, *The Fair Value Option for Financial Assets and Financial Liabilities* ("FAS 159"). FAS 159 permits entities to choose to measure many financial instruments and certain other items at fair value, with the objective of improving financial reporting by mitigating volatility in reported earnings caused by measuring related assets and liabilities differently without having to apply complex hedge accounting provisions. The provisions of FAS 159 are effective for fiscal years beginning after November 15, 2007. Effective August 1, 2008, the Company adopted FAS 159, which did not have a material impact on the Company's consolidated financial statements.

In May 2008, the FASB issued SFAS No. 162 "The Hierarchy of Generally Accepted Accounting Principles" ("SFAS 162"). SFAS 162 identifies the sources of accounting principles and the framework for selecting the principles to be used in the preparation of financial statements of nongovernmental entities that are presented in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles in the United States. SFAS 162 is effective sixty days following the SEC's approval of PCAOB amendments to AU Section 411, "The Meaning of 'Present fairly in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles' " which occurred on September 16, 2008. The adoption of SFAS 162 did not have a material impact on the consolidated financial position, results of operations or cash flows.

#### Recent Accounting Pronouncements

In December 2007, the FASB issued SFAS No. 141 (Revised 2007), "Business Combinations," or SFAS No. 141R. SFAS No. 141R will change the accounting for business combinations. Under SFAS No. 141R, an acquiring entity will be required to recognize all the assets acquired and liabilities assumed in a transaction at the acquisition-date fair value with limited exceptions. SFAS No. 141R will change the accounting treatment and disclosure for certain specific items in a business combination. SFAS No. 141R applies prospectively to business combinations for which the acquisition date is on or after the beginning of the first annual reporting period beginning on or after December 15, 2008. We do not expect that SFAS No. 141R will have a material impact on the consolidated financial position, results of operations or cash flows.

---

In December 2007, the FASB issued SFAS No. 160, "Noncontrolling Interests in Consolidated Financial Statements -- An Amendment of ARB No. 51," or SFAS No. 160. SFAS No. 160 establishes new accounting and reporting standards for the noncontrolling interest in a subsidiary and for the deconsolidation of a subsidiary. SFAS No. 160 is

effective for fiscal years beginning on or after December 15, 2008. We do not expect that SFAS No. 160 will have a material impact on the consolidated financial position, results of operations or cash flows.

In March 2008, the FASB issued SFAS No. 161, "Disclosures about Derivative Instruments and Hedging Activities." SFAS No. 161 amends and expands the disclosure requirements of SFAS No. 133, Accounting for Derivative Instruments and Hedging Activities. It requires qualitative disclosures about objectives and strategies for using derivatives, quantitative disclosures about fair value amounts of gains and losses on derivative instruments, and disclosures about credit-risk-related contingent features in derivative agreements. In September 2008, the FASB issued FASB Staff Position ("FSP") FSP FAS 133-1 and FIN 45-4, "Disclosures about Credit Derivatives and Certain Guarantees: An Amendment of FASB Statement No. 133 and FASB Interpretation No. 45; and Clarification of the Effective Date of FASB Statement No. 161". This FSP amends FASB Statement No. 133, "Accounting for Derivative Instruments and Hedging Activities", to require disclosures by sellers of credit derivatives, including credit derivatives embedded in a hybrid instrument. This FSP also amends FASB Interpretation No. 45, "Guarantor's Accounting and Disclosure Requirements for Guarantees, Including Indirect Guarantees of indebtedness of Others", to require an additional disclosure about the current status of the payment/performance risk of a guarantee. Further, this FSP clarifies the Board's intent about the effective date of FASB Statement No. 161, "Disclosures about Derivative Instruments and Hedging Activities". This statement is effective for financial statements issued for fiscal years beginning after November 15, 2008. We do not expect that these pronouncements will have a material impact on the consolidated financial position, results of operations or cash flows.

In April 2008, the FASB issued FASB Staff Position FAS 142-3, "Determination of Useful Life of Intangible Assets" (FSP 142-3). FSP 142-3 amends the factors that should be considered in developing the renewal or extension assumptions used to determine the useful life of a recognized intangible asset under FAS 142, "Goodwill and Other Intangible Assets." FSP 142-3 also requires expanded disclosure regarding the determination of intangible asset useful lives. FSP 142-3 is effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2008. Earlier adoption is not permitted. We do not believe the adoption of FSP 142-3 will have a material impact on the consolidated financial statements.

In May 2008, the FASB issued FASB FSB Accounting Principles Board ("APB") Opinion No. 14-1, "Accounting for Convertible Debt Instruments That May Be Settled in Cash upon Conversion (Including Partial Cash Settlement)" ("FSB APB 14-1"). The FSP will require cash settled convertible debt to be separated into debt and equity components at issuance and a value to be assigned to each. The value assigned to the debt component will be the estimated fair value, as of the issuance date, of a similar bond without the conversion feature. The difference between the bond cash proceeds and this estimated fair value will be recorded as a debt discount and amortized to interest expense over the life of the bond. FSP APB 14-1 will become effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2008. We do not expect that FSB APB 14-1 will have a material impact on the consolidated financial position, results of operations or cash flows.

In June 2008, the FASB issued FSP EITF 03-6-1, "Determining Whether Instruments Granted in Share-Based Payment Transactions Are Participating Securities" ("FSP EITF 03-6-1"). FSP EITF 03-6-1 addresses whether instruments granted in share-based payment transactions are participating securities prior to vesting and, therefore, need to be included in the earnings allocation in computing earnings per share under the two-class method as described in SFAS No. 128, "Earnings per Share." Under the guidance in FSP EITF 03-6-1, unvested share-based payment awards that contain non-forfeitable rights to dividends or dividend equivalents (whether paid or unpaid) are participating securities and shall be included in the computation of earnings per share pursuant to the two-class method. FSP EITF 03-6-1 is effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2008, and interim periods within those fiscal years. All prior-period earnings per share amounts presented shall be adjusted retrospectively. We do not expect that FSP EITF 03-6-1 will have a material impact on the consolidated financial position, results of operations or cash flows.

In June 2008, the FASB ratified the consensus reached by the EITF on Issue No. 07-5, "Determining Whether an Instrument (or Embedded Feature) Is Indexed to an Entity's Own Stock" ("EITF No. 07-5"). EITF No. 07-5 provides

guidance for determining whether an equity-linked financial instrument (or embedded feature) is indexed

66

---

to an entity's own stock. EITF No. 07-5 applies to any freestanding financial instrument or embedded feature that has all of the characteristics of a derivative or freestanding instrument that is potentially settled in an entity's own stock (with the exception of share-based payment awards within the scope of SFAS 123(R)). To meet the definition of "indexed to own stock," an instrument's contingent exercise provisions must not be based on (a) an observable market, other than the market for the issuer's stock (if applicable), or (b) an observable index, other than an index calculated or measured solely by reference to the issuer's own operations, and the variables that could affect the settlement amount must be inputs to the fair value of a "fixed-for-fixed" forward or option on equity shares. EITF No. 07-5 is effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2008, and interim periods within those fiscal years. We do not expect the adoption of EITF No. 07-5 to change the classification or measurement of its financial instruments.

#### ITEM 7A. QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE DISCLOSURES ABOUT MARKET RISK

We are subject to risks related to foreign currency exchange rate fluctuations. However, they have not had a material impact on our results of operations to date.

Our functional currency is the United States dollar. However, a significant portion of our business is transacted in other currencies (the Canadian dollar). As a result, we are subject to exposure from movements in foreign currency exchange rates. We do not use derivative financial instruments for speculative trading purposes, nor do we hedge our foreign currency exposure to manage our foreign currency fluctuation risk.

67

---

#### ITEM 8. FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

URANIUM ENERGY CORP.  
(An Exploration Stage Company)

CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

JULY 31, 2009

Reports of Independent Registered Public Accounting Firms

Consolidated Balance Sheets

Consolidated Statements of Operations

Consolidated Statements of Stockholders' Equity

Consolidated Statements of Cash Flows

Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements

68

---

Report of Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm

To the Board of Directors and Shareholders of Uranium Energy Corp.

We have audited the accompanying consolidated balance sheets of Uranium Energy Corp. as of July 31, 2009 and 2008, and the related statements of operations, stockholders equity, and cash flows for the years ended July 31, 2009 and July 31, 2008, the 7 month period ended July 31, 2007, and for the period May 16, 2003 (inception) through July 31, 2009. These financial statements are the responsibility of the Company's management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audits. The financial statements for the period May 16, 2003 (inception) through December 31, 2006, were audited by other auditors whose report dated February 26, 2007 expressed an unqualified opinion on those statements. The financial statements for the period May 16, 2003 (inception) through December 31, 2006 include total net loss of \$13,119,021. Our opinion on the statements of operations, stockholders' equity, and cash flows for the period May 16, 2003 (inception) through July 31, 2009, insofar as it relates to amounts for prior periods through December 31, 2006, is based solely on the report of other auditors.

We conducted our audits in accordance with the standards of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (United States). Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. An audit also includes assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. We believe that our audits provide a reasonable basis for our opinion.

In our opinion, based on our audit and the report of other auditors, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the consolidated financial position of Uranium Energy Corp. as at July 31, 2009 and 2008, and the results of its operations and its cash flows for the years ended July 31, 2009 and July 31, 2008, the 7 month period ended July 31, 2007, and the period from May 13, 2003 (inception) through July 31, 2009, in conformity with United States generally accepted accounting principles.

We also have audited, in accordance with the standards of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (United States), the Company's internal control over financial reporting as of July 31, 2009, based on criteria established in

Internal Control-Integrated Framework issued by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission and our report dated October 13, 2009 expressed an unqualified opinion thereon.

Vancouver, Canada  
October 13, 2009

Chartered Accountants

F-1

---

Report of Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm

The Board of Directors and Shareholders of Uranium Energy Corp.

We have audited Uranium Energy Corp.'s internal control over financial reporting as of July 31, 2009, based on criteria established in Internal Control--Integrated Framework issued by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission (the COSO criteria). Uranium Energy Corp.'s management is responsible for maintaining effective internal control over financial reporting, and for its assessment of the effectiveness of internal control over financial reporting included in the accompanying Management's Report on Internal Control Over Financial Reporting. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the company's internal control over financial reporting based on our audit.

We conducted our audit in accordance with the standards of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (United States). Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether effective internal control over financial reporting was maintained in all material respects. Our audit included obtaining an understanding of internal control over financial reporting, assessing the risk that a material weakness exists, testing and evaluating the design and operating effectiveness of internal control based on the assessed risk, and performing such other procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances. We believe that our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion.

A company's internal control over financial reporting is a process designed to provide reasonable assurance regarding the reliability of financial reporting and the preparation of financial statements for external purposes in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles. A company's internal control over financial reporting includes those policies and procedures that (1) pertain to the maintenance of records that, in reasonable detail, accurately and fairly reflect the transactions and dispositions of the assets of the company; (2) provide reasonable assurance that transactions are recorded as necessary to permit preparation of financial statements in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles, and that receipts and expenditures of the company are being made only in accordance with authorizations of management and directors of the company; and (3) provide reasonable assurance regarding prevention or timely detection of unauthorized acquisition, use or disposition of the company's assets that could have a material effect on the financial statements.

Because of its inherent limitations, internal control over financial reporting may not prevent or detect misstatements. Also, projections of any evaluation of effectiveness to future periods are subject to the risk that controls may become inadequate because of changes in conditions, or that the degree of compliance with the policies or procedures may deteriorate.

In our opinion, Uranium Energy Corp. maintained, in all material respects, effective internal control over financial reporting as of July 31, 2009, based on the COSO criteria.

F-2

We also have audited, in accordance with the standards of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (United States), the consolidated balance sheets of as of July 31, 2009 and 2008, and the related statements of operations, stockholders equity, and cash flows for the years ended July 31, 2009 and July 31, 2008, the 7 month period ended July 31, 2007 and for the period May 16, 2003 (inception) through July 31, 2009 of Uranium Energy Corp. and our report dated October 13, 2009, expressed an unqualified opinion thereon.

Vancouver, Canada  
October 13, 2009

Chartered Accountants

F-3

URANIUM ENERGY CORP.

(An Exploration Stage Company)

CONSOLIDATED BALANCE SHEETS

July 31, 2009      July 31, 2008

CURRENT  
ASSETS

Cash and cash equivalents	\$ 24,265,643	\$ 13,137,318
---------------------------	---------------	---------------

Restricted cash (Note 3)	21,222	164,376
--------------------------	--------	---------

Available-for-sale securities (Note 4)	43,200	-
	26,895	48,745

Accounts and interest receivable		
Due from related parties	-	10,157
Prepaid expenses and deposits	139,514	254,594
	24,496,474	13,615,190
<b>MINERAL RIGHTS AND PROPERTIES</b>		
(Note 5)	12,145,629	13,376,497
<b>DATABASES</b>		
(Note 6)	735,376	970,354
<b>LAND USE AGREEMENTS</b>		
(Note 7)	368,716	41,920
<b>PROPERTY AND EQUIPMENT</b>		
(Note 8)	865,360	1,127,222
	\$ 38,611,555	\$ 29,131,183
<b>CURRENT LIABILITIES</b>		
	\$ 722,019	\$ 865,390
Accounts payable and accrued		



liabilities

Due to  
related  
parties  
(Note 9)

39,781 -

761,800 865,390

STOCKHOLDERS'  
EQUITY

Capital  
stock (Note  
10)

Common  
stock  
\$0.001 par  
value:  
750,000,000  
shares  
authorized

56,237,269 shares issued  
and outstanding  
(July 31, 2008 -  
46,318,739)

56,237 46,319

Additional  
paid-in  
capital

91,686,382 68,619,362

Deficit  
accumulated  
during the  
exploration  
stage

(53,903,464) (40,399,888)

10,600 -

Accumulated  
other  
comprehensive

income

37,849,755      28,265,793

\$ 38,611,555    \$ 29,131,183

COMMITMENTS AND CONTINGENCIES

(Notes 5, 8 and 12)

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

F-4

URANIUM ENERGY CORP.

(An Exploration Stage Company)

CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF OPERATIONS

	Year Ended July 31, 2009	Year Ended July 31, 2008	Seven Months Ended July 31, 2007	For the Period from May 16, 2003 (inception) to July 31, 2009
<b>EXPENSES</b>				
Consulting fees	\$ 220,332	\$ 522,718	\$ 253,026	\$ 1,704,631
Consulting fees - stock based (Note 10)	810,823	463,125	704,058	7,327,981
Depreciation and amortization	526,251	372,886	84,140	1,040,149
General and administrative (Note 9)	3,768,042	5,726,145	2,246,054	14,387,414
	1,223,038	247,830	51,390	1,526,508

Edgar Filing: URANIUM ENERGY CORP - Form 10-K

Impairment loss on mineral properties (Note 5)				
Interest and finance charges (Note 10)	-	55,334	116,396	171,730
Management fees (Note 9)	744,684	791,695	302,697	2,659,785
Management fees - stock based (Notes 9 & 10)	262,500	2,019,250	1,774,500	4,979,503
Mineral property expenditures (Note 5)	4,666,272	7,003,437	2,485,501	16,376,726
Professional fees	680,111	739,853	317,225	2,162,793
Wages and benefits - stock based (Note 10)	666,281	1,326,395	236,213	2,659,967
	13,568,334	19,268,668	8,571,200	54,997,187
<b>LOSS BEFORE OTHER ITEMS</b>	<b>(13,568,334)</b>	<b>(19,268,668)</b>	<b>(8,571,200)</b>	<b>(54,997,187)</b>
<b>OTHER ITEMS</b>				
Gain (loss) on sale of assets	(14,370)	-	-	349,387
Gain on sale of investments	-	47,548	-	47,548
Interest income	54,600	169,812	319,824	620,730
Other income	24,528	10,355	11,462	76,058
	64,758	227,715	331,286	1,093,723
<b>LOSS BEFORE INCOME TAXES</b>	<b>(13,503,576)</b>	<b>(19,040,953)</b>	<b>(8,239,914)</b>	<b>(53,903,464)</b>

## INCOME TAXES

Deferred tax (expense) benefit	-	(195,171)	195,171	-
-----------------------------------	---	-----------	---------	---

NET LOSS FOR THE PERIOD	(13,503,576)	(19,236,124)	(8,044,743)	(53,903,464)
----------------------------	--------------	--------------	-------------	--------------

OTHER  
COMPREHENSIVE  
(LOSS) INCOME

(Note 4)	10,600	(286,987)	286,987	10,600
----------	--------	-----------	---------	--------

TOTAL  
COMPREHENSIVE  
LOSS  
FOR THE  
PERIOD

	\$ (13,492,976)	\$ (19,523,111)	\$ (7,757,756)	\$ (53,892,864)
--	-----------------	-----------------	----------------	-----------------

BASIC AND  
DILUTED NET  
LOSS PER SHARE

	\$ (0.29)	\$ (0.49)	\$ (0.22)
--	-----------	-----------	-----------

WEIGHTED  
AVERAGE  
NUMBER OF  
SHARES  
OUTSTANDING,  
BASIC AND  
DILUTED

	47,358,056	39,397,704	36,389,384
--	------------	------------	------------

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

F-5

---

URANIUM ENERGY CORP.

(An Exploration Stage Company)

CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF STOCKHOLDERS' EQUITY

Edgar Filing: URANIUM ENERGY CORP - Form 10-K

	Common Stock		Additional Paid-in Capital	Subscriptions Received	Deferred Compensation	Accumulated Deficit	Accumulated Comprehensive Income
	Shares	Amount					
Balance, July 31, 2007	37,612,088	\$ 37,612	\$ 42,950,985	\$ 34,750	\$ -	\$ (21,163,764)	
Common stock							
Issued for cash at \$2.40 per share	6,476,916	6,477	15,538,123	-	-	-	
Issued for cash at \$3.75 per share	1,800,000	1,800	6,748,200	-	-	-	
Issued on the exercise of options	330,000	330	206,260	-	-	-	
Issued on the exercise of warrants	48,235	48	137,707	(34,750)	-	-	
Issued pursuant to consulting service agreements	51,500	52	147,618	-	-	-	
Share issuance costs	-	-	(966,799)	-	-	-	

Stock based  
compensation

- options issued for consulting services	-	-	337,151	-	-	-
- options issued for management fees	-	-	2,019,250	-	-	-
- options issued for wages and benefits	-	-	1,326,395	-	-	-
Warrants issued as penalties pursuant to private placement agreements	-	-	55,334	-	-	-
Recovery of short swing profits	-	-	119,138	-	-	-
Net loss for the period	-	-	-	-	-	(19,236,124)
Reversal of unrealized gain on disposal of available-for-sale securities	-	-	-	-	-	-
Balance, July 31, 2008	46,318,739	\$ 46,319	\$ 68,619,362	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (40,399,888)

## URANIUM ENERGY CORP.

(An Exploration Stage Company)

## CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF STOCKHOLDERS' EQUITY

	Common Stock		Additional Paid-in Capital	Subscriptions Received	Deferred Compensation	Accumulated Deficit	A Co
	Shares	Amount					
Balance, July 31, 2008	46,318,739	\$ 46,319	\$ 68,619,362	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (40,399,888)	
Common stock							
Issued for cash at \$2.40 per share	9,299,834	9,300	22,310,302	-	-	-	
Issued on the exercise of options	217,500	218	79,355	-	-	-	
Issued pursuant to mineral property acquisitions	98,668	99	169,406	-	-	-	
Issued pursuant to consulting service agreements	302,528	301	497,675	-	-	-	
Share issuance costs	-	-	(1,363,796)	-	-	-	

Stock based  
compensation

- options issued for consulting services	-	-	328,297	-	-	-
- options issued for management fees	-	-	262,500	-	-	-
- options issued for wages and benefits	-	-	666,281	-	-	-
Warrants issued pursuant to mineral property acquisitions	-	-	117,000	-	-	-
Net loss for the period	-	-	-	-	-	(13,503,576)
Unrealized gain on available-for-sale securities	-	-	-	-	-	-
Balance, July 31, 2009	56,237,269	\$ 56,237	\$ 91,686,382	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (53,903,464)

All share amounts have been restated to reflect the 2:1 reverse stock split effective January 24, 2005 and the 1.5:1 forward stock split effective February 28, 2006.

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

F-7

---

URANIUM ENERGY CORP.

(An Exploration Stage Company)



## CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF CASH FLOWS

	Year Ended July 31, 2009	Year Ended July 31, 2008	Seven Months Ended July 31, 2007	For the Period From May 16, 2003 (inception) to July 31, 2009
<b>CASH FLOWS FROM OPERATING ACTIVITIES</b>				
Net loss for the period	\$ (13,503,576)	\$ (19,236,124)	\$ (8,044,743)	\$ (53,903,464)
Adjustments to reconcile net loss to net cash				
from operating activities:				
Stock based compensation	1,739,604	3,808,770	2,714,771	14,967,451
Stock based mineral property expenditures	-	-	-	138,750
Impairment loss on mineral properties	1,223,038	247,830	51,390	1,526,508
Non-cash other income	(9,914)			(9,914)
Non-cash interest and finance charges	-	55,334	116,396	171,730
Depreciation and amortization	526,251	372,886	84,140	1,040,149
Deferred income tax expense (benefit)	-	195,171	(195,171)	-
(Gain) loss on sale of assets	14,370	-	-	(349,387)

Edgar Filing: URANIUM ENERGY CORP - Form 10-K

Gain on sale of investments	-	(47,548)	-	(47,548)
-----------------------------	---	----------	---	----------

Changes in operating assets and liabilities:

Accounts and interest receivable	21,850	(44,330)	15,605	(26,895)
----------------------------------	--------	----------	--------	----------

Prepaid expenses and deposits	115,080	(91,354)	(143,444)	(118,987)
-------------------------------	---------	----------	-----------	-----------

Accounts payable and accrued liabilities	(127,921)	479,409	72,694	719,117
--	-----------	---------	--------	---------

NET CASH FLOWS USED IN OPERATING ACTIVITIES

	(10,001,218)	(14,259,956)	(5,328,362)	(35,892,490)
--	--------------	--------------	-------------	--------------

CASH FLOWS FROM FINANCING ACTIVITIES

Issuance of shares for cash, net of issuance costs	21,035,379	21,637,396	3,938,500	67,477,971
--	------------	------------	-----------	------------

Recovery of short swing profits	-	119,138	-	119,138
---------------------------------	---	---------	---	---------

Advances (to) from related parties	49,938	(10,157)	(225,581)	39,781
------------------------------------	--------	----------	-----------	--------

NET CASH FLOWS FROM FINANCING ACTIVITIES

	21,085,317	21,746,377	3,712,919	67,636,890
--	------------	------------	-----------	------------

CASH FLOWS FROM INVESTING ACTIVITIES

Net investment in mineral rights and	30,360	(2,161,119)	(2,534,601)	(5,442,108)
--------------------------------------	--------	-------------	-------------	-------------

Edgar Filing: URANIUM ENERGY CORP - Form 10-K

properties

Acquisition of databases	(6,500)	(600,000)	(81,750)	(908,250)
Acquisition of land use rights	(55,200)	(15,000)	-	(70,200)
Purchase of property and equipment	(77,863)	(779,149)	(398,088)	(1,479,840)
Proceeds from sale of assets	10,275	-	-	160,275
Proceeds from sale of investments	-	282,588	-	282,588
Restricted cash	143,154	(159,876)	131,958	(21,222)
NET CASH FLOWS FROM (USED IN) INVESTING ACTIVITIES	44,226	(3,432,556)	(2,882,481)	(7,478,757)
INCREASE (DECREASE) IN CASH AND CASH EQUIVALENTS	11,128,325	4,053,865	(4,497,924)	24,265,643
CASH AND CASH EQUIVALENTS, BEGINNING OF PERIOD	13,137,318	9,083,453	13,581,377	-
CASH AND CASH EQUIVALENTS, END OF PERIOD	\$ 24,265,643	\$ 13,137,318	\$ 9,083,453	\$ 24,265,643

SUPPLEMENTAL CASH FLOW INFORMATION AND  
NONCASH INVESTING AND FINANCING ACTIVITIES

(Note 13)

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

F-8

---

URANIUM ENERGY CORP.

(An Exploration Stage Company)

NOTES TO THE CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS  
JULY 31, 2009

NOTE 1: NATURE OF OPERATIONS

Uranium Energy Corp. (the "Company") was incorporated on May 16, 2003 in the State of Nevada. The Company owns a 100% interest in UEC Resources Ltd. ("UEC Resources"), a private company incorporated in the province of British Columbia, Canada on December 21, 2007. Since November 1, 2004, the Company has acquired mineral leases and entered into joint venture agreements, directly or by way of option, for the purposes of exploring for economic deposits of uranium in the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Texas, Utah, and Wyoming. To July 31, 2009, interests in approximately 39,224 net acres of mineral properties have been staked, leased or optioned by the Company.

These financial statements have been prepared in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles in the United States of America.

The Company commenced operations on May 16, 2003 and has not realized any significant revenues since inception. As at July 31, 2009 the Company has working capital of \$23,734,674 and an accumulated deficit of \$53,903,464. Although existing cash resources are currently expected to provide sufficient funds through the upcoming year, the capital expenditures required to achieve planned principal operations may be substantial. The continuation of the Company as a going concern for a period of longer than the upcoming year is dependent upon the ability of the Company to obtain necessary financing to continue operations. The Company is in the exploration stage of its mineral property development and to date has not yet established any proven mineral reserves on its existing properties. The continued operations of the Company and the recoverability of the carrying value of its assets is ultimately dependent upon the ability of the Company to achieve profitable operations. To date, the Company has completed private placements and received funding through the exercise of stock options and share purchase warrants for net proceeds of \$67,477,971 from the issuance of shares of the Company's common stock.

NOTE 2: SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES

Basis of Presentation and Principles of Consolidation

These consolidated financial statements are presented in United States dollars and have been prepared in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

The accompanying consolidated financial statements include the accounts of Uranium Energy Corp. and its wholly-owned subsidiary, UEC Resources Ltd.. All significant inter-company transactions and balances have been eliminated upon consolidation.

## Cash and Cash Equivalents

The Company considers all highly liquid instruments with an original maturity of three months or less at the time of issuance to be cash equivalents.

## Use of Estimates

The preparation of financial statements in conformity with United States generally accepted accounting principles requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amount of assets and liabilities at the date of the financial statements and revenues and expenses during the period reported. By their nature, these estimates are subject to measurement uncertainty and the effect on the financial statements of changes in such estimates in future periods could be significant. Significant areas requiring management's estimates and assumptions are determining the fair value of transactions involving common stock, valuation and impairment losses on mineral property acquisitions, valuation of stock-based compensation, and valuation of available-for-sale securities. Other areas requiring estimates include allocations of expenditures to resource property interests, depreciation of property and equipment, and amortization of databases. Actual results could differ from those estimates.

F-9

---

## URANIUM ENERGY CORP.

(An Exploration Stage Company)

### NOTES TO THE CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS JULY 31, 2009

## Fair Value Measurements

In September 2006, the FASB issued SFAS No. 157, "*Fair Value Measurements*". The objective of SFAS 157 is to increase consistency and comparability in fair value measurements and to expand disclosures about fair value measurements. SFAS 157 defines fair value, establishes a framework for measuring fair value in generally accepted accounting principles, and expands disclosures about fair value measurements. SFAS 157 applies under other accounting pronouncements that require or permit fair value measurements and does not require any new fair value measurements. The provisions of SFAS 157 are effective for fair value measurements made in fiscal years beginning after November 15, 2007. The adoption of SFAS No. 157 did not have a material effect on the Company's financial statements.

The Company measures its available-for-sale securities at fair value in accordance with SFAS 157. SFAS 157 specifies a valuation hierarchy based on whether the inputs to those valuation techniques are observable or unobservable. Observable inputs reflect market data obtained from independent sources, while unobservable inputs reflect the Company's own assumptions. These two types of inputs have created the following fair value hierarchy:

- ◆ Level 1 - Quoted prices for identical instruments in active markets;
- ◆ Level 2 - Quoted prices for similar instruments in active markets, quoted prices for identical or similar instruments in markets that are not active, and model-derived valuations in which all significant inputs and significant value drivers are observable in active markets; and
- ◆ Level 3 - Valuations derived from valuation techniques in which one or more significant inputs or significant value drivers are unobservable.

This hierarchy requires the Company to minimize the use of unobservable inputs and to use observable market data, if available, when estimating fair value. The fair value of the Company's available-for-sale securities using the following inputs at July 31, 2009 is:

	Quoted Prices in Active Markets for Identical Assets (Level 1)	Significant Other Observable Inputs (Level 2)	Significant Unobservable Inputs (Level 3)
Available-for-Sale Securities			
Strategic Resources Inc.	\$ 15,000	\$ -	\$ -
Uran Limited	28,200	-	-
	\$ 43,200	\$ -	\$ -

#### Mineral Property Costs

The Company is primarily engaged in the acquisition, exploration and development of mineral properties.

Mineral property acquisition costs are initially capitalized as tangible assets when purchased. The Company assesses the carrying costs for impairment when indicators of impairment exist. If proven and probable reserves are established for a property and it has been determined that a mineral property can be economically developed, costs will be amortized using the units-of-production method over the estimated life of the reserve.

Mineral property exploration costs are expensed as incurred.

As of the date of these financial statements, the Company has not established any proven or probable reserves on its mineral properties and has incurred only acquisition and exploration costs.

#### Databases

Costs related to internally developed databases are expensed as incurred. Costs of acquired mineral property databases are capitalized upon acquisition. Mineral property databases are tested for impairment whenever events or changes indicate the carrying value amount may not be recoverable. An impairment loss is recognized if it is determined that the carrying amount is not recoverable and exceeds fair value. Mineral property databases are amortized over five years using the straight-line method.

URANIUM ENERGY CORP.

(An Exploration Stage Company)

NOTES TO THE CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS  
JULY 31, 2009

Restoration and Remediation Costs (Asset Retirement Obligations)

Various federal and state mining laws and regulations require the Company to reclaim the surface areas and restore underground water quality for its mine projects to the pre-existing mine area average quality after the completion of mining.

Future reclamation and remediation costs, which include production equipment removal and environmental remediation, are accrued based on management's best estimate at the end of each period of the costs expected to be incurred at each project. Such estimates would be determined by the Company's engineering studies calculating the cost of future surface and groundwater activities, current regulations, actual expenses incurred, and technology and industry standards.

In accordance with Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 143 "*Accounting for Asset Retirement Obligations*," the Company will capitalize the measured fair value of asset retirement obligations to mineral rights and properties. The asset retirement obligations would be accreted to an undiscounted value until the time at which they are expected to be settled. Actual retirement costs will be recorded against the asset retirement obligations when incurred. Any difference between the recorded asset retirement obligations and the actual retirement costs incurred will be recorded as a gain or loss in the period of settlement.

Impairment of Long-Lived Assets

Long-lived assets are reviewed for impairment whenever events or changes in circumstances indicate the carrying amount of an asset may not be recoverable. Circumstances which could trigger a review include, but are not limited to: significant decreases in the market price of the asset; significant adverse changes in the business climate or legal factors; accumulation of costs significantly in excess of the amount originally expected for the acquisition or construction of the asset; current period cash flow or operating losses combined with a history of losses or a forecast of continuing losses associated with the use of the asset; and current expectation that the asset will more likely than not be sold or disposed significantly before the end of its estimated useful life. Recoverability of these assets is measured by comparison of its carrying amount to future undiscounted cash flows the assets are expected to generate. An impairment loss is recognized when the carrying amount is not recoverable and exceeds fair value.

Financial Instruments

The fair values of cash and cash equivalents, restricted cash, other current monetary assets, accounts payable and accrued liabilities were estimated to approximate their carrying values due to the immediate or short-term maturity of these financial instruments. The Company's operations and financing activities are conducted primarily in United States dollars, and as a result the Company is not subject to significant exposure to market risks from changes in foreign currency rates. Management has determined that the Company is not exposed to significant credit risk.

Loss per Common Share

Basic loss per share includes no potential dilution and is computed by dividing loss attributable to common stockholders by the weighted average number of common shares outstanding for the period. Diluted earnings per share reflects the potential dilution of securities that could share in the earnings (loss) of the Company. The common

shares potentially issuable on conversion of outstanding convertible debentures and exercise of stock options were not included in the calculation of weighted average number of shares outstanding because the effect would be anti-dilutive.

#### Foreign Currency Translation

The functional currency of the Company, including its subsidiary, is the United States dollar. UEC Resources Ltd. maintains its accounting records in its local currency (Canadian dollar). In accordance with SFAS No. 52, "Foreign Currency Translation", the financial statements of the Company's subsidiary is translated into United States dollars using period end exchange rates as to monetary assets and liabilities and average exchange rates as to revenues and expenses. Non-monetary assets are translated at their historical exchange rates. Net gains and losses resulting from foreign exchange translations and foreign currency exchange gains and losses on transactions occurring in a currency other than the Company's functional currency are included in the determination of net income in the period.

F-11

---

### URANIUM ENERGY CORP.

(An Exploration Stage Company)

#### NOTES TO THE CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS JULY 31, 2009

#### Income Taxes

The Company follows the liability method of accounting for income taxes. Under this method, deferred tax assets and liabilities are recognized for the future tax consequences attributable to differences between the financial statement carrying amounts of existing assets and liabilities and their respective tax balances. Deferred tax assets and liabilities are measured using enacted tax rates expected to apply to the taxable income in the years in which those differences are expected to be recovered or settled. The effect on deferred tax assets and liabilities of a change in tax rates is recognized in income in the period that includes the date of enactment. As at July 31, 2009 the Company had net operating loss carry forwards; however, due to the uncertainty of realization, the Company has provided a full valuation allowance for the potential deferred tax assets resulting from these losses carry forwards.

#### Stock-Based Compensation

On January 1, 2006, the Company adopted SFAS No. 123 (revised 2004) (SFAS No. 123R), Share-Based Payment, which addresses the accounting for stock-based payment transactions, requiring such transactions to be accounted for using the fair value method. Awards of shares for property or services are recorded at the more readily measurable of the fair value of the stock and the fair value of the service. The Company uses the Black-Scholes option-pricing model to determine the grant date fair-value of stock-based awards under SFAS No. 123R. The fair value is recorded in income depending on the terms and conditions of the award, and the nature of the relationship of the recipient of the award to the Company. The Company records the grant date fair value in income in line with the period over which it was earned. For employees and management this is typically considered to be the vesting period of the award. For consultants the fair value of the award is recorded in income over the term of the service period, and unvested amounts are revalued at each reporting period over the service period. The Company estimates the expected forfeitures and updates the valuation accordingly.

#### Property and Equipment



## Edgar Filing: URANIUM ENERGY CORP - Form 10-K

Property and equipment are recorded at cost and are amortized using the straight-line method over their estimated useful lives at the following rates:

Computer equipment	3 years
Exploration equipment	5 years
Furniture and fixtures	5 years
Leasehold improvements	Term of Lease
Vehicles	5 years

### Recently Adopted Accounting Policies

Effective August 1, 2008, the Company adopted SFAS No. 157 "Fair Value Measurements". In February 2008, the FASB issued FASB Staff Position No. FAS 157-2, "Effective Date of FASB Statement No. 157, which provides a one year deferral of the effective date of SFAS No. 157 for non-financial assets and non-financial liabilities, except those that are recognized or disclosed in the financial statements at fair value at least annually. In October 2008, the FASB issued FASB Staff Position No. SFAS 157-3, "Determining the Fair Value of a Financial Asset When the Market for That Asset Is Not Active," which clarifies the application of SFAS 157 for markets that are not active and illustrates key considerations in determining the fair value of a financial asset when the market for that financial asset is not active. The Company adopted the provisions of SFAS No. 157 on a prospective basis for financial assets and liabilities which require that the Company determine the fair value of financial assets and liabilities using the fair value hierarchy established in SFAS No. 157. The adoption of SFAS No. 157 did not have a material impact on the Company's results of operations and financial condition for the period ended April 30, 2009 however, this change may have an impact on the financial condition and the results of operations in future periods.

In February 2007, the FASB issued FASB Statement No. 159, *The Fair Value Option for Financial Assets and Financial Liabilities* ("FAS 159"). FAS 159 permits entities to choose to measure many financial instruments and certain other items at fair value, with the objective of improving financial reporting by mitigating volatility in reported earnings caused by measuring related assets and liabilities differently without having to apply complex hedge accounting provisions. The provisions of FAS 159 are effective for fiscal years beginning after November 15, 2007. Effective August 1, 2008, the Company adopted FAS 159, which did not have a material impact on the Company's consolidated financial statements.

F-12

---

## URANIUM ENERGY CORP.

(An Exploration Stage Company)

### NOTES TO THE CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS JULY 31, 2009

In May 2008, the FASB issued SFAS No. 162 "The Hierarchy of Generally Accepted Accounting Principles" ("SFAS 162"). SFAS 162 identifies the sources of accounting principles and the framework for selecting the principles to be used in the preparation of financial statements of nongovernmental entities that are presented in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles in the United States. SFAS 162 is effective for financial statements issued for interim and annual periods ending after September 15, 2009. The adoption of SFAS 162 did not have a material impact on the consolidated financial position, results of operations or cash flows.

### Recent Accounting Pronouncements

In December 2007, the FASB issued SFAS No. 141 (Revised 2007), "Business Combinations," or SFAS No. 141R. SFAS No. 141R will change the accounting for business combinations. Under SFAS No. 141R, an acquiring entity will be required to recognize all the assets acquired and liabilities assumed in a transaction at the acquisition-date fair value with limited exceptions. SFAS No. 141R will change the accounting treatment and disclosure for certain specific items in a business combination. SFAS No. 141R applies prospectively to business combinations for which the acquisition date is on or after the beginning of the first annual reporting period beginning on or after December 15, 2008. The Company does not expect that SFAS No. 141R will have a material impact on the consolidated financial position, results of operations or cash flows.

In December 2007, the FASB issued SFAS No. 160, "Noncontrolling Interests in Consolidated Financial Statements -- An Amendment of ARB No. 51," or SFAS No. 160. SFAS No. 160 establishes new accounting and reporting standards for the noncontrolling interest in a subsidiary and for the deconsolidation of a subsidiary. SFAS No. 160 is effective for fiscal years beginning on or after December 15, 2008. The Company does not expect that SFAS No. 160 will have a material impact on the consolidated financial position, results of operations or cash flows.

In March 2008, the FASB issued SFAS No. 161, "Disclosures about Derivative Instruments and Hedging Activities." SFAS No. 161 amends and expands the disclosure requirements of SFAS No. 133, Accounting for Derivative Instruments and Hedging Activities. It requires qualitative disclosures about objectives and strategies for using derivatives, quantitative disclosures about fair value amounts of gains and losses on derivative instruments, and disclosures about credit-risk-related contingent features in derivative agreements. In September 2008, the FASB issued FASB Staff Position ("FSP") FAS 133-1 and FIN 45-4, "Disclosures about Credit Derivatives and Certain Guarantees: An Amendment of FASB Statement No. 133 and FASB Interpretation No. 45; and Clarification of the Effective Date of FASB Statement No. 161". This FSP amends FASB Statement No. 133, "Accounting for Derivative Instruments and Hedging Activities", to require disclosures by sellers of credit derivatives, including credit derivatives embedded in a hybrid instrument. This FSP also amends FASB Interpretation No. 45, "Guarantor's Accounting and Disclosure Requirements for Guarantees, Including Indirect Guarantees of indebtedness of Others", to require an additional disclosure about the current status of the payment/performance risk of a guarantee. Further, this FSP clarifies the Board's intent about the effective date of FASB Statement No. 161, "Disclosures about Derivative Instruments and Hedging Activities". This statement is effective for financial statements issued for fiscal years beginning after November 15, 2008. The Company does not expect that these pronouncements will have a material impact on the consolidated financial position, results of operations or cash flows.

In April 2008, the FASB issued FASB Staff Position FAS 142-3, "Determination of Useful Life of Intangible Assets" ("FSP 142-3"). FSP 142-3 amends the factors that should be considered in developing the renewal or extension assumptions used to determine the useful life of a recognized intangible asset under FAS 142, "Goodwill and Other Intangible Assets." FSP 142-3 also requires expanded disclosure regarding the determination of intangible asset useful lives. FSP 142-3 is effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2008. Earlier adoption is not permitted. The Company does not believe the adoption of FSP 142-3 will have a material impact on the consolidated financial statements.

In May 2008, the FASB issued FASB Accounting Principles Board ("APB") Opinion No. 14-1, "Accounting for Convertible Debt Instruments That May Be Settled in Cash upon Conversion (Including Partial Cash Settlement)" ("FSB APB 14-1"). The FSP will require cash settled convertible debt to be separated into debt and equity components at issuance and a value to be assigned to each. The value assigned to the debt component will be the estimated fair value, as of the issuance date, of a similar bond without the conversion feature. The difference between the bond cash proceeds and this estimated fair value will be recorded as a debt discount and amortized to interest expense over the life of the bond. FSB APB 14-1 will become effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2008. The Company does not expect that FSB APB 14-1 will have a material impact on the consolidated financial position, results of operations or cash flows.

---

URANIUM ENERGY CORP.

(An Exploration Stage Company)

NOTES TO THE CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS  
JULY 31, 2009

In June 2008, the FASB issued FSP EITF 03-6-1, "Determining Whether Instruments Granted in Share-Based Payment Transactions Are Participating Securities" ("FSP EITF 03-6-1"). FSP EITF 03-6-1 addresses whether instruments granted in share-based payment transactions are participating securities prior to vesting and, therefore, need to be included in the earnings allocation in computing earnings per share under the two-class method as described in SFAS No. 128, "Earnings per Share." Under the guidance in FSP EITF 03-6-1, unvested share-based payment awards that contain non-forfeitable rights to dividends or dividend equivalents (whether paid or unpaid) are participating securities and shall be included in the computation of earnings per share pursuant to the two-class method. FSP EITF 03-6-1 is effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2008, and interim periods within those fiscal years. All prior-period earnings per share amounts presented shall be adjusted retrospectively. The Company does not expect that FSP EITF 03-6-1 will have a material impact on the consolidated financial position, results of operations or cash flows.

In June 2008, the FASB ratified the consensus reached by the EITF on Issue No. 07-5, "Determining Whether an Instrument (or Embedded Feature) Is Indexed to an Entity's Own Stock" ("EITF No. 07-5"). EITF No. 07-5 provides guidance for determining whether an equity-linked financial instrument (or embedded feature) is indexed to an entity's own stock. EITF No. 07-5 applies to any freestanding financial instrument or embedded feature that has all of the characteristics of a derivative or freestanding instrument that is potentially settled in an entity's own stock (with the exception of share-based payment awards within the scope of SFAS 123(R)). To meet the definition of "indexed to own stock," an instrument's contingent exercise provisions must not be based on (a) an observable market, other than the market for the issuer's stock (if applicable), or (b) an observable index, other than an index calculated or measured solely by reference to the issuer's own operations, and the variables that could affect the settlement amount must be inputs to the fair value of a "fixed-for-fixed" forward or option on equity shares. EITF No. 07-5 is effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2008, and interim periods within those fiscal years. The Company does not expect the adoption of EITF No. 07-5 to change the classification or measurement of its financial instruments.

NOTE 3: RESTRICTED CASH

Restricted cash included certificates of deposit issued to the Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality, Land Quality Division ("Wyoming DEQ, LQD"), in lieu of a surety bond. The certificates of deposit accrue interest at 3.5% and 2.0% per annum, are automatically renewable and are protected by federal insurance up to \$100,000. Additionally, the Company has deposits of \$15,000 (2008 - \$18,000) with the Arizona State Land Department pursuant to exploration activities in the State of Arizona, and a deposit of \$5,418 (2008 - \$5,418) with the State of Colorado pursuant to exploration activities in that state. During the year ended July 31, 2009 the Company was notified that the two certificates of deposits were released by the Wyoming DEQ, LQD as the majority of land reclamation was completed to their satisfaction. Accordingly a total of \$138,658 has been removed from restricted cash. An amount of \$804 (2008 - \$140,958) remains held by the Wyoming DEQ, LQD.

NOTE 4: AVAILABLE-FOR-SALE SECURITIES

Available-for-sale securities consisted of shares in a publicly traded uranium exploration companies listed on the TSX Venture and Australian Stock Exchanges. During the year ended July 31, 2009 the Company recorded an unrealized gain of \$10,600 on available-for-sale securities which is recognized in accumulated other comprehensive income.

NOTE 5: MINERAL RIGHTS AND PROPERTIES

Uranium Exploration

Since November 1, 2004, the Company has been acquiring mineral leases for the purpose of exploring for economic deposits of uranium in the states of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Texas, Utah, and Wyoming.

F-14

---

URANIUM ENERGY CORP.

(An Exploration Stage Company)

NOTES TO THE CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS  
JULY 31, 2009

As of July 31, 2009 a total of 46,752 gross acres (39,224 net mineral acres) of mineral properties have been staked, leased or optioned pursuant to agreements by the Company in the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Texas, Utah, and Wyoming for the purposes of uranium exploration for a total cost of \$5,454,567 plus \$8,217,570 representing the fair value of non-cash compensation, for a cumulative cost of \$13,672,137. The totals include 3,291 net acres (6,717 gross acres leased by Cibola Resources LLC of which the Company holds a 49% interest). These leases are subject to varying royalty interests, some of which are indexed to the sale price of uranium. As of July 31, 2009 total yearly recurring maintenance payments of \$376,751 are required to maintain existing mineral leases.

Goliad Project

On October 11, 2005, the Company entered into a mineral asset option agreement (the "Moore Option") granting the Company the option to acquire certain mineral property leases in the State of Texas for total consideration of \$200,000 and 3,000,000 post-split restricted common shares at a fair value of \$0.33 per share. In consideration for the Moore Option and its partial exercise over the option term, the Company has made cash payments totaling \$200,000 and issued 3,000,000 post-split shares of restricted common stock. Upon completion of the terms of the Moore Option title to the leases were transferred to the Company.

Acquisition costs for the Moore Option total \$8,407,500 as of July 31, 2008 and include the following: (i) cash payments of \$200,000, (ii) 750,000 restricted common shares issued on October 11, 2005 with a fair value of \$250,000, (iii) 500,000 restricted common shares issued on April 10, 2006 with a fair value of \$1,150,000, (iv) 250,000 restricted common shares issued on September 28, 2006 with a fair value of \$462,500, (v) 750,000 restricted common shares issued on October 10, 2006 with a fair value of \$975,000, and (vi) 750,000 restricted common shares issued on April 11, 2007 with a fair value of \$5,370,000. Additionally, the Company has incurred \$281,627 in other mineral right and property acquisition charges on the Goliad project, for a cumulative cost of \$8,689,127 as of July 31, 2009.

Cibola Resources LLC

On April 27, 2007, with a reference date of April 26, 2007, the Company entered into a joint venture with Neutron Energy Inc. ("NEI"), a Wyoming corporation, in connection with the exploration of a property covering 6,717 acres located in Cibola County, New Mexico (the "Property") for uranium resources. In connection with the joint venture, Cibola Resources LLC ("Cibola"), a limited liability company under the laws of the State of Delaware, was formed to undertake the exploration activities as contemplated by the parties.

NEI acquired a ten year mining lease (the "Lease") to the Property from La Merced del Pueblo de Cebolleta ("Cebolleta"), a private entity that has the authority over the natural resources of the Property, pursuant to a Mining Lease and Agreement between Cebolleta and NEI effective April 6, 2007 (the "Mining Lease Agreement"), and has contributed the Lease to Cibola. Terms of the Lease provide for:

- (a) initial payments of \$3,000,000 (paid by NEI, of which 49% was reimbursed to NEI by the Company);
- (b) an additional cash payment of \$2,000,000 six months from the effective date of the Lease (\$980,000 paid, being the Company's portion);
- (c) every year after April 6, 2007 until uranium production begins, an advance royalty of \$500,000 (to be deducted from any royalties paid in that same year);
- (d) a recoverable reserve payment of \$1 per pound of recoverable uranium reserves upon the completion of a feasibility study by an independent mining engineering firm, which will be reduced by all prior payments as described in clause (a) through (c) above;
- (e) a production royalty of between 4.50% and 8.0% depending upon the sale price of uranium; and
- (f) the funding of a \$30,000 per year scholarship program.

The Company has reimbursed an aggregate of \$2,450,000 to NEI (49%) of the capital invested to date. As a result, NEI and the Company hold a 51% and 49% interest, respectively, in Cibola and the Company is obligated to pay 49% of all future commitments under the terms of the Lease. Additionally, the Company has paid or accrued \$1,129,846 in exploration costs on behalf of Cibola for a cumulative contribution of \$3,579,846.

F-15

---

URANIUM ENERGY CORP.

(An Exploration Stage Company)

NOTES TO THE CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS  
JULY 31, 2009

New River Project

Effective November 1, 2007, the Company entered into a binding letter Agreement to Purchase Assets (the "Agreement") with Melvin O. Stairs, Jr. ("Mr. Stairs"), whereby the Company acquired from Mr. Stairs an undivided 100% legal, beneficial and registered interest in and to a certain mineral exploration claim represented by permit number 08-111678, which is located at T7N R3E, Section 32, in Maricopa County, Arizona (the "Mineral Claim"), together with a certain database containing various material information respecting the subject Mineral Claim (the Mineral Claim and its database, collectively, the "Assets").

On August 25, 2008 the Company entered into an agreement amending the underlying Agreement to Purchase Assets from Melvin O. Stairs, Jr. Under the terms of the Amending Agreement, the Purchase Price Payment has been amended to the following:

- (a) Purchase Price Payments: pay to the order and direction of Mr. Stairs the following Purchase Price Payments in the aggregate sum of \$300,000 in the following manner and at the following times:

i. an initial and non-refundable Purchase Price Payment of \$10,000 immediately upon the Acceptance Date of the Agreement (paid);

ii. a further non-refundable Purchase Price Payment of \$95,000 on or before January 10, 2008 (paid); and

iii. a further non-refundable Purchase Price Payment of \$95,000 immediately upon the Acceptance Date of the Amending Agreement in the following manner:

1. an initial \$57,000 cash payment (paid); and

2. the \$38,000 balance by way of issuance of an aggregate of 19,000 fully paid and non-assessable restricted common shares at a deemed issuance price of \$2.00 per share (issued); and

iv. a further non-refundable Purchase Price Payment of \$100,000 payable on or before October 31, 2009 in the following manner:

1. an initial \$50,000 cash payment; and

2. the \$50,000 balance by way of issuance of an aggregate number of fully paid and non-assessable restricted common shares at a deemed issuance price calculated as the previous five-day trading average immediately prior to October 31, 2009, which would equate to the said balance of \$50,000; and

(b) Purchase Price Maintenance Payments: pay, or cause to be paid, all outstanding, existing and future underlying regulatory and governmental fees, payments and assessment work required to keep the Mineral Claim interests comprising the Assets in good standing during the continuance of the Agreement and prior to the Company's satisfaction of the entire Purchase Price consideration and including, without limitation, all permitting costs, transfer fees and any reclamation costs associated in any manner with the Mineral Claim interests comprising the Assets.

Pursuant to the terms of the Agreement, in order to secure the complete and timely payment of the Company's purchase price obligations to Mr. Stairs under the Agreement, the Company granted a security interest in and to, a lien upon and a right of set-off against its right, title and interest in and to the Assets.

Additionally, the Company has incurred \$13,000 in other mineral right and property acquisition charges on the New River project, for a cumulative cost of \$195,070 as of July 31, 2009.

F-16

---

URANIUM ENERGY CORP.

(An Exploration Stage Company)

NOTES TO THE CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS  
JULY 31, 2009

### F-33 Acquisition (Todilto)

On November 13, 2007, the Company entered into an agreement to acquire certain mineral property leases located in Cibola County, New Mexico for total consideration of \$400,000. Under the terms of the agreement, the Company paid an initial deposit of \$100,000 upon closing with the remaining balance due in three installments of \$100,000 due on March 31, 2008 (paid), December 31, 2008, and December 31, 2009. At the Company's option, the final two installments may be paid in stock, based on the average trading price of its common stock over the 10 days immediately preceding the due date. On December 12, 2008 the Company entered into an agreement amending the aforementioned underlying agreement to acquire mineral leases to the following: \$5,000 on or before December 31, 2008 (paid) and \$45,000 on or before December 31, 2009. At the Company's option, the final installment may be paid in stock, based on the average trading price of its common stock over the 10 days immediately preceding the due date.

### Uran Joint Venture

On January, 14, 2009, the Company entered into an option and joint venture agreement (the "Agreement") with Uran Limited ("Uran") of Perth, Australia, in connection with the proposed exploration and development of certain tenements comprising the Company's "Grants Ridge" uranium project located in New Mexico. The Agreement was subject to Uran's satisfactory completion of due diligence work on the Grants Ridge project which was completed in February of 2009 in accordance with terms of the Agreement. Upon completion of the following terms of the Agreement, Uran can earn a 65% interest in the Grants Ridge project by: (a) making an initial cash payment of \$75,000 (received); (b) incurring project exploration expenditures of \$100,000 in year one, \$200,000 in year two, \$300,000 in year three, \$400,000 in year four and \$500,000 in year five, for total aggregate exploration expenditures of \$1,500,000 over the 5 year option period; (c) completing a feasibility study; and (d) issuing and delivering an initial 1,000,000 Uran ordinary shares to the Company (received) plus issue a further 750,000 shares staged over the next 3 years for total aggregate issuance of 3,250,000 Uran ordinary shares. Uran can withdraw from the Agreement after expenditures of \$250,000.

Additionally, the Company has incurred \$91,203 in other mineral right and property acquisition charges on the Todilto project, for a cumulative cost of \$296,203 as at July 31, 2009. Pursuant to the Uran joint venture agreement, the Company received a cash payment of \$75,000 and 1,000,000 ordinary shares of Uran Limited with a fair value of \$17,600 on the date of receipt. Accordingly, cumulative acquisition costs have been reduced by \$92,600 as of July 31, 2009.

### Holley Option

On March 28, 2007 the Company entered into a letter option agreement (the "Holley Option") granting the Company the option to acquire certain mineral property leases, which are located in the States of Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah, together with certain historical database records for total consideration of \$1,594,690. During the year ended July 31, 2009, the Company decided to terminate the Holley Option. Accordingly, \$1,176,748 in mineral rights and properties were written down to impairment.

Mineral rights and properties acquisition costs consist of the following:

July 31, 2009	July 31, 2008
---------------	---------------

Mineral	
Rights and	

Properties, Unproven		
Goliad, Texas	\$ 8,689,127	\$ 8,683,438
Cibola Resources, New Mexico	2,450,000	2,450,000
Holley Option, Colorado, New Mexico and Utah	1,181,758	1,181,661
Todilto, New Mexico	203,603	291,681
New River, Arizona	195,070	121,600
Other property acquisitions	952,579	951,587
	13,672,137	13,679,967
Write down for loss on impairment	(1,526,508)	(303,470)
	\$ 12,145,629	\$ 13,376,497

Mineral property exploration costs on a regional basis are as follows:

F-17

---

URANIUM ENERGY CORP.

(An Exploration Stage Company)

NOTES TO THE CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS  
JULY 31, 2009



Edgar Filing: URANIUM ENERGY CORP - Form 10-K

	Year Ended July 31, 2009	Year Ended July 31, 2008	Seven Months Ended July 31, 2007	For the Period From May 16, 2006 (inception) to July 31, 2009
Exploration Costs				
Arizona	\$ 14,350	\$ 16,443	\$ -	\$ 107,733
Colorado	55,191	177,140	13,504	283,356
Nevada	-	-	-	963
New Mexico	791,320	560,843	182,089	1,587,513
Texas	3,704,740	5,847,212	2,145,550	13,335,161
Utah	10,773	33,544	-	51,674
Wyoming	89,898	368,255	144,358	1,010,326
	\$ 4,666,272	\$ 7,003,437	\$ 2,485,501	\$ 16,376,726

NOTE 6: DATABASES

Database acquisition costs consist of the following:

	July 31, 2009	July 31, 2008
Mineral Property Databases		
Moore	\$ 141,890	\$ 141,890
Jebsen/Triantis	50,000	50,000
Brenniman	209,000	209,000
Halterman	166,500	166,500

Edgar Filing: URANIUM ENERGY CORP - Form 10-K

Peirce	36,750	36,750
Jebsen	100,000	100,000
Tronox, LLC	500,000	500,000
Other database acquisitions	6,500	-
	1,210,640	1,204,140
Accumulated amortization	(475,264)	(233,786)
	\$ 735,376	\$ 970,354

NOTE 7: LAND USE AGREEMENTS

Land use acquisition costs, including right of way and easement agreements consist of the following:

	July 31, 2009	July 31, 2008
Land Use Agreements		
Real right-of-way	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000
Stanford right-of-way	33,770	-
Graham right-of-way	170,585	-
Jacob right-of-way	80,200	-
Halespeska right-of-way	75,600	28,520
	375,155	43,520
	(6,439)	(1,600)

Accumulated  
amortization

\$ 368,716    \$ 41,920

F-18

---

 URANIUM ENERGY CORP.

(An Exploration Stage Company)

 NOTES TO THE CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS  
 JULY 31, 2009

## NOTE 8: PROPERTY AND EQUIPMENT

Property and equipment acquisition costs consist of the following:

	July 31, 2009	July 31, 2008
Property and Equipment		
Computer equipment	\$ 234,862	\$ 239,217
Exploration equipment	247,828	232,322
Furniture and fixtures	49,280	59,997
Land	175,144	175,144
Leasehold improvements	8,728	8,728
Vehicles	672,988	686,569
	1,388,830	1,401,977
Less: accumulated depreciation	(523,470)	(274,755)

\$ 865,360    \$ 1,127,222

NOTE 9: DUE TO RELATED PARTIES AND RELATED PARTY TRANSACTIONS

During the year ended July 31, 2009 the Company had transactions with certain officers and directors of the Company as follows:

- (a) incurred \$744,684 in management fees paid to directors and officers during the period, of which \$39,781 is outstanding as at July 31, 2009 and reported as due to related parties;
- (b) incurred \$262,500 in stock based compensation for the incremental fair value of options granted to directors and officers that were repriced during the period; and
- (c) incurred \$108,873 in general and administrative costs paid to companies controlled by a direct family member of a current officer.

All related party transactions involving provision of services or tangible assets were recorded at the exchange amount, which is the value established and agreed to by the related parties reflecting arms length consideration payable for similar services or transfers.

NOTE 10: CAPITAL STOCK

Capital Stock

The Company's capital stock as at July 31, 2009 was 750,000,000 authorized common shares, with a par value of \$0.001 per share.

2008 Share Transactions

On December 12, 2007 the Company completed a private placement in the amount of 1,800,000 Units at a subscription price of \$3.75 for gross proceeds to the Company of \$6,750,000. Each Unit is comprised of one common share and one non-transferable share purchase warrant of the Company. Each warrant entitles the holder to purchase an additional common share of the Company for a period of one year from the date of issuance at an exercise price of \$4.25 per share.

F-19

---

URANIUM ENERGY CORP.

(An Exploration Stage Company)

NOTES TO THE CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS  
JULY 31, 2009

The December 12, 2007 private placement included a registration rights agreement, requiring a registration statement respecting the investors' securities within the Company declared effective by the SEC within four months from the original date of issuance by the Company of the securities underlying the original subscription agreements. Under the

terms of the registration rights agreement, the Company shall use its reasonable best efforts to maintain the effectiveness of the registration statement for a period of not less than three years from the original date of issuance. If the Company fails to maintain the effectiveness of the registration statement for the three year period, additional warrants could be issuable as liquidated damages. Any additional warrant issuance is provided for under the terms of the registration rights agreement whereby 1/100 of an additional warrant was issuable to each such investor for each \$1.00 in aggregate subscription price funds paid by the investor to the Company under the private placement and in respect of each 30 day period (or partial period thereof) of delay of the aforementioned registration statement effectiveness. As of July 31, 2008 1,755,060 additional warrants could be issuable as liquidated damages through the three year period expiring December 12, 2010.

On November 6, 2007 the Company issued 10,000 restricted common shares pursuant to a financial consulting agreement. At the time of issuance, the shares had a value of \$4.46 per share and \$44,600 was recorded as stock-based consulting fees. On January 24, 2008 the Company issued 7,500 restricted common shares pursuant to the same agreement. At the time of issuance, the shares had a value of \$2.42 per share and \$18,150 was recorded as stock-based consulting fees. On April 30, 2008 the Company issued 7,500 restricted common shares pursuant to the same agreement. At the time of issuance, the shares had a value of \$2.42 per share and \$18,150 was recorded as stock-based consulting fees. Additionally, on July 31, 2008 the Company recorded an obligation to issue 7,500 restricted common shares pursuant to the same agreement. At the time of issuance on August 13, 2008 the shares had a value of \$2.06 per share and \$15,450 was recorded as stock-based consulting fees.

On May 1, 2008 the Company issued 15,000 restricted common shares pursuant to a business consulting and services agreement. At the time of issuance, the shares had a value of \$2.55 per share and \$38,250 was recorded as stock-based consulting fees.

On May 22, 2008 the Company issued 11,500 restricted common shares pursuant to a right of way and easement agreement. At the time of issuance, the shares had a value of \$2.48 per share and \$28,520 was recorded as a stock-based asset acquisition to amortized over the term of the agreement.

On July 7, 2008 and July 18, 2008 the Company completed private placements in the aggregate amount of 6,476,916 Units at a subscription price of \$2.40 for gross proceeds to the Company of \$15,544,600. Each Unit is comprised of one common share and one half of one non-transferable share purchase warrant of the Company. Each whole warrant entitles the holder to purchase an additional common share of the Company for a period of one year from the date of issuance at an exercise price of \$3.10 per share.

The July 7, 2008 and July 18, 2008 private placements included a registration rights agreement, requiring a registration statement respecting the investors' securities within the Company declared effective by the SEC by September 25, 2008. Under the terms of the registration rights agreement, the Company shall use its reasonable best efforts to maintain the effectiveness of the registration statement for a period of not less than two years from the original date of issuance. If the Company fails to maintain the effectiveness of the registration statement for the two year period, additional warrants could be issuable as liquidated damages. Any additional warrant issuance is provided for under the terms of the registration rights agreement whereby 1/100 of an additional warrant was issuable to each such investor for each \$1.00 in aggregate subscription price funds paid by the investor to the Company under the private placement and in respect of each 30 day period (or partial period thereof) of delay of the aforementioned registration statement effectiveness. As of July 31, 2008 3,419,812 additional warrants could be issuable as liquidated damages through the two year period expiring July 7, 2010 and July 18, 2010.

During the year ended July 31, 2008 48,235 common share purchase warrants were exercised for total proceeds of \$137,755 and 330,000 common stock options were exercised for total proceeds of \$206,590.

URANIUM ENERGY CORP.

(An Exploration Stage Company)

NOTES TO THE CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS  
JULY 31, 2009

2009 Share Transactions

On August 13, 2008 and October 23, 2008, the Company issued 7,500 fully vested restricted common shares pursuant to a financial consulting agreement. At the time of issuances, the shares had a value of \$2.06 and \$0.53 per share respectively, and \$19,425 was recorded as stock-based consulting fees.

On October 23, 2008, the Company issued 19,000 fully vested restricted common shares pursuant to an asset purchase agreement (refer to Note 5). At the time of issuance, the shares had a value of \$0.53 per share and \$10,070 was recorded as stock-based mineral rights and properties acquisitions.

On December 5, 2008, the Company issued 25,000 fully vested restricted common shares pursuant to a land use agreement. At the time of issuance, the shares had a value of \$0.21 per share and \$5,250 was recorded as stock-based land use agreements.

On February 13, 2009 and April 7, 2009, the Company issued 13,039 fully vested restricted common shares pursuant to a financial consulting agreement. At the time of issuances, the shares had a value of \$0.47 and \$0.55 per share respectively, and \$13,299 was recorded as stock-based consulting fees.

On March 17, 2009, April 21, 2009, May 13, 2009, June 16, 2009, and July 20, 2009, the Company issued 29,000 fully vested restricted common shares on each date, pursuant to a consulting agreement. At the time of issuances, the shares had a value of \$0.53, \$0.65, \$1.21, \$2.81 and \$2.89 per share respectively, and \$234,610 was recorded as stock-based consulting fees.

On March 17, 2009, the Company issued 6,000 fully vested restricted common shares pursuant to a consulting agreement. At the time of issuance, the shares had a value of \$0.53 per share and \$3,180 was recorded as stock-based consulting fees.

On March 27, 2009, the Company issued 20,000 fully vested restricted common shares pursuant to a consulting agreement. At the time of issuance, the shares had a value of \$0.56 per share and \$11,200 was recorded as stock-based consulting fees. On April 27, 2009 and May 28, 2009, the Company issued 10,000 fully vested restricted common shares on each date, pursuant to the same agreement. At the time of issuances, the shares had a value of \$1.10 and \$1.81 per share respectively, and \$29,100 was recorded as stock-based consulting fees. Additionally, on June 29, 2009 and July 29, 2009, the Company issued 13,333 fully vested restricted common shares on each date, pursuant to the same agreement. At the time of issuances, the shares had a value of \$3.14 and \$2.60 per share respectively, and \$76,532 was recorded as stock-based consulting fees.

On May 29, 2009, the Company issued 23,077 fully vested restricted common shares pursuant to a consulting agreement. At the time of issuance, the shares had a value of \$2.35 per share and \$54,231 was recorded as stock-based consulting fees.

On June 26, 2009, the Company completed a private placement in the aggregate amount of 9,299,834 Units at a subscription price of \$2.40 for gross proceeds to the Company of \$22,319,602. Each Unit is comprised of one common share and one half of one transferable share purchase warrant of the Company. Each whole warrant entitles the holder to purchase an additional common share of the Company for a period of two years from the date of issuance

at an exercise price of \$3.10 per share. The Company agreed to file the Registration Statement with the SEC within 10 calendar days following the Closing Date, and to cause the Registration Statement to be declared effective by the SEC within two months from the Closing Date herein. The Registration Statement was declared effective on August 20, 2009.

On July 16, 2009, the Company issued 48,834 fully vested restricted common shares pursuant to a land use agreement. At the time of issuance, the shares had a value of \$2.83 per share and \$138,200 was recorded as stock-based land use agreements. Additionally, on July 24, 2009, the Company issued 5,834 fully vested restricted common shares pursuant to the same agreement. At the time of issuance, the shares had a value of \$2.74 per share and \$15,985 was recorded as stock-based land use agreements.

On July 24, 2009, the Company issued 18,293 fully vested restricted common shares pursuant to a consulting agreement. At the time of issuance, the shares had a value of \$2.74 per share and \$50,123 was recorded as stock-based consulting fees.

F-21

---

URANIUM ENERGY CORP.

(An Exploration Stage Company)

NOTES TO THE CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS  
JULY 31, 2009

On July 29, 2009, the Company issued 2,414 fully vested restricted common shares pursuant to a consulting agreement. At the time of issuance, the shares had a value of \$2.60 per share and \$6,276 was recorded as stock-based consulting fees.

During the year ended July 31, 2009 a total of 217,500 common stock options were exercised for proceeds of \$79,573.

Share Purchase Warrants

The December 12, 2007 private placement included a registration rights agreement, requiring a registration statement respecting the investors' securities within the Company declared effective by the SEC within four months from the original date of issuance by the Company of the securities underlying the original subscription agreements. Under the terms of the registration rights agreement, the Company shall use its reasonable best efforts to maintain the effectiveness of the registration statement for a period of not less than three years from the original date of issuance. If the Company fails to maintain the effectiveness of the registration statement for the three year period, additional warrants could be issuable as liquidated damages. Any additional warrant issuance is provided for under the terms of the registration rights agreement whereby 1/100 of an additional warrant was issuable to each such investor for each \$1.00 in aggregate subscription price funds paid by the investor to the Company under the private placement and in respect of each 30 day period (or partial period thereof) of delay of the aforementioned registration statement effectiveness. As at July 31, 2009, 1,147,100 additional warrants could be issuable as liquidated damages through the three year period expiring December 12, 2010.

The July 7, 2008 and July 18, 2008 private placements included a registration rights agreement, requiring a registration statement respecting the investors' securities within the Company declared effective by the SEC by September 25, 2008. Under the terms of the registration rights agreement, the Company shall use its reasonable best efforts to maintain the effectiveness of the registration statement for a period of not less than two years from the

original date of issuance. If the Company fails to maintain the effectiveness of the registration statement for the two year period, additional warrants could be issuable as liquidated damages. Any additional warrant issuance is provided for under the terms of the registration rights agreement whereby 1/100 of an additional warrant was issuable to each such investor for each \$1.00 in aggregate subscription price funds paid by the investor to the Company under the private placement and in respect of each 30 day period (or partial period thereof) of delay of the aforementioned registration statement effectiveness. As at July 31, 2009 1,865,352 additional warrants could be issuable as liquidated damages through the two year period expiring July 7, 2010 and July 18, 2010.

On July 23, 2009 the Company issued 50,000 warrants at an exercise price of \$1.95 per share pursuant to two land use agreements. The term of these warrants is five years. The fair value of these warrants at the date of grant was estimated using the Black-Scholes option pricing model with an expected life of 5 years, a risk free interest rate of 1.08%, a dividend yield of 0%, and an expected volatility of 117%. Accordingly, \$117,000 was recorded as stock based land use agreements.

A summary of the Company's common share purchase warrants as of July 31, 2009 and changes during the period is presented below:

	Number of warrants	Weighted average exercise price	Weighted average Remaining life (years)
Balance, July 31, 2007	4,009,998	\$ 2.66	1.70
Issued	5,240,898	3.54	1.62
Exercised	(48,235)	(2.86)	(0.56)
Balance, July 31, 2008	9,202,661	3.16	1.25
Issued	4,599,917	3.10	2.00
Expired	(5,464,203)	(3.46)	n/a
Balance, July 31, 2009	8,338,375	\$ 2.97	1.83

The aggregate intrinsic value ("AIV") under the provisions of SFAS No. 123R of the 500,000 compensation warrants previously issued to consultants as at July 31, 2009 was estimated at \$840,000.



## URANIUM ENERGY CORP.

(An Exploration Stage Company)

NOTES TO THE CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS  
JULY 31, 2009

### Stock Options

On December 19, 2005 the Board of Directors of the Company ratified, approved and adopted a Stock Option Plan for the Company in the amount of 5,000,000 shares. On April 10, 2006 the Company amended its 2005 Stock Option Plan whereby, subject to adjustment from time to time as provided in Article 11.1, the number of common shares available for issuance under the Plan was increased from 5,000,000 shares to 7,500,000 shares. On October 10, 2006 the Company ratified the 2006 Stock Incentive Plan whereby, subject to adjustment from time to time as provided in Article 18.1, the number of common shares available for issuance under the Plan was increased to 10,000,000 shares.

On July 23, 2009, the Company's shareholders approved the adoption of the Company's 2009 Stock Incentive Plan in the amount of 5,000,000 shares.

On November 7, 2008 a total of 240,000 stock options were granted to consultants and an employee at an exercise price of \$0.95 per share. The term of these options is ten years. The \$57,600 fair value of these options was estimated using the Black-Scholes option pricing model with an expected life of 5 years, a risk free interest rate of 0.28%, a dividend yield of 0%, and an expected volatility of 105.16%. Unvested stock options issued to consultants are revalued at each reporting period.

On January 14, 2009 a total of 20,000 stock options were granted to a consultant at an exercise price of \$0.45 per share. The term of these options is ten years. The \$7,400 fair value of these options was estimated using the Black-Scholes option pricing model with an expected life of 5 years, a risk free interest rate of 0.10%, a dividend yield of 0%, and an expected volatility of 136.59%. Unvested stock options issued to consultants are revalued at each reporting period.

On November 1, 2008, December 19, 2008 and January 14, 2009 the Company approved the repricing of certain stock options issued to consultants, management and employees. On November 1, 2008 options with exercise prices ranging from \$2.35 to \$5.70 per share were repriced to \$0.95 per share. The fair value of the repricing was estimated using the Black-Scholes option pricing model with an expected life ranging from 3.2 to 4.6 years, a risk free interest rate of 0.24%, a dividend yield of 0%, and an expected volatility of 105%. On December 19, 2008 options with exercise prices ranging from \$0.95 to \$3.80 per share were repriced to \$0.45 per share. The fair value of the repricing was estimated using the Black-Scholes option pricing model with an expected life ranging from 2.9 to 4.9 years, a risk free interest rate of 0.11%, a dividend yield of 0%, and an expected volatility of 117%. On January 14, 2009 options with an exercise price of \$0.95 per share were repriced to \$0.45 per share. The fair value of the repricing was estimated using the Black-Scholes option pricing model with an expected life of 4.8 years, a risk free interest rate of 0.10%, a dividend yield of 0%, and an expected volatility of 137%.

On February 5, 2009 a total of 50,000 stock options were granted to a consultant at an exercise price of \$0.46 per share. The term of these options is ten years. The \$18,500 fair value of these options was estimated using the Black-Scholes option pricing model with an expected life of 5 years, a risk free interest rate of 0.23%, a dividend yield of 0%, and an expected volatility of 113.08%. Unvested stock options issued to consultants are revalued at each reporting period.

On March 30, 2009 a total of 25,000 stock options were granted to a consultant at an exercise price of \$0.56 per share. The term of these options is ten years. The \$10,750 fair value of these options was estimated using the Black-Scholes option pricing model with an expected life of 5 years, a risk free interest rate of 0.16%, a dividend yield of 0%, and an expected volatility of 107.02%. Unvested stock options issued to consultants are revalued at each reporting period.

On May 8, 2009 a total of 155,000 stock options were granted to consultants, management and employees at an exercise price of \$1.50 per share. The term of these options is ten years. The \$190,650 fair value of these options was estimated using the Black-Scholes option pricing model with an expected life of 5 years, a risk free interest rate of 0.17%, a dividend yield of 0%, and an expected volatility of 119.53%. Unvested stock options issued to consultants are revalued at each reporting period.

A summary of the Company's stock options as of July 31, 2009 and changes during the period is presented below:

F-23

---

URANIUM ENERGY CORP.

(An Exploration Stage Company)

NOTES TO THE CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS  
JULY 31, 2009

	Number of options	Weighted average exercise price	Weighted average Remaining life (years)
Balance, July 31, 2007	3,832,500	\$ 1.44	8.82
Issued	2,065,000	2.93	10.00
Exercised	(330,000)	(0.62)	(8.20)
Cancelled	(105,000)	(5.61)	(8.83)
Balance, July 31, 2008	5,462,500	1.97	8.46
Issued	490,000	0.79	10.00
Exercised	(217,500)	(0.37)	(7.32)

Edgar Filing: URANIUM ENERGY CORP - Form 10-K

Forfeited	(454,500)	(0.77)	(8.05)
Balance, July 31, 2009	5,280,500	\$ 0.57	7.54

The AIV under the provisions of SFAS No. 123R of all outstanding options at July 31, 2008 was estimated at \$10,819,815. Additionally, the AIV of options exercised during the year ended July 31, 2008 was estimated at \$409,839.

A summary of options outstanding and exercisable as at July 31, 2009:

Range of Exercise Prices	Options Outstanding		Options Exercisable	
	Outstanding at July 31, 2009	Weighted Average Exercise Price	Exercisable at July 31, 2009	Weighted Average Exercise Price
\$0.33 to \$0.46	4,625,500	\$ 0.41	4,455,500	\$ 0.41
\$0.56 to \$0.95	350,000	0.92	301,250	0.94
\$1.50	155,000	1.50	82,500	1.50
\$2.46 to \$5.70	150,000	3.82	150,000	3.82
	5,280,500	\$ 0.57	4,989,250	\$ 0.54

### Stock Based Compensation

A summary of stock based compensation expense for the year ended July 31, 2009:

Year Ended July 31, 2009	Year Ended July 31, 2008	Seven Months Ended July 31, 2007	For the Period From May 16, 2003 (inception) to July 31, 2009

Stock Based  
ConsultingAmortization  
of deferred  
compensation

\$ -	\$ -	\$ 246,458	\$ 1,157,500
------	------	------------	--------------

Restricted  
common stock  
issued for  
consulting  
services

482,526	125,975	74,725	689,476
---------	---------	--------	---------

Options  
issued to  
consultants

328,297	337,150	382,875	3,862,479
---------	---------	---------	-----------

Warrants  
issued for  
consulting  
services

-	-	-	1,618,526
---	---	---	-----------

810,823	463,125	704,058	7,327,981
---------	---------	---------	-----------

Stock Based  
Management  
FeesAmortization  
of deferred  
compensation

-	-	-	650,000
---	---	---	---------

Options  
issued to  
management

262,500	2,019,250	1,774,500	4,329,503
---------	-----------	-----------	-----------

262,500	2,019,250	1,774,500	4,979,503
---------	-----------	-----------	-----------

Stock Based  
Wages and  
BenefitsOptions  
issued to

666,281	1,326,395	236,213	2,659,967
---------	-----------	---------	-----------

employees

\$ 1,739,604    \$ 3,808,770    \$ 2,714,771    \$ 14,967,451

F-24

---

URANIUM ENERGY CORP.

(An Exploration Stage Company)

NOTES TO THE CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS  
JULY 31, 2009

NOTE 11: INCOME TAXES

As of July 31, 2009 the Company had United States and Canadian net operating loss carry forwards of approximately \$26 million that may be available to reduce future years' taxable income. These carry forwards will begin to expire, if not utilized, commencing in 2023. Future tax benefits which may arise as a result of these losses have not been recognized in these financial statements, as their realization is determined not likely to occur and accordingly, the Company has recorded a valuation allowance for the deferred tax asset relating to these tax loss carry forwards.

In 2006, the FASB issued Interpretation No. 48 (FIN 48), "Accounting for Uncertainty in Income Taxes - an Interpretation of SFAS No. 109." FIN 48 clarifies the accounting for uncertainty in income taxes recognized in an enterprise's financial statements in accordance with SFAS No. 109, "Accounting for Income Taxes." FIN 48 also prescribes a recognition threshold and measurement of a tax position taken or expected to be taken in an enterprise's tax return. FIN 48 is effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2006. Accordingly, the Company adopted FIN 48 effective August 1, 2007. The adoption of FIN 48 did not have any impact on the Company's financial position.

The Company's policy is to accrue any interest and penalties related to unrecognized tax benefits in its provision for income taxes. Additionally, FIN 48 requires that a company recognize in its financial statements the impact of a tax position that is more likely than not to be sustained upon examination based on the technical merits of the position. The Company has incurred taxable losses for all tax years since inception and accordingly, no provision for taxes has been recorded for the current or any prior fiscal year.

The Company reviews its valuation allowance requirements on an annual basis based on projected future operations. When circumstances change and this causes a change in management's judgment about the recoverability of future tax assets, the impact of the change on the valuation allowance is generally reflected in current income.

A reconciliation of income tax computed at the federal and state statutory tax rates and the Company's effective tax rate is as follows:

Year	Year	Seven
Ended	Ended	Months
July 31,	July 31,	Ended
2009	2008	July 31,
		2007

Federal income tax provision	35.00%	35.00%	35.00%
States income tax provision, net of federal income tax effect	1.44%	2.55%	5.48%
Total income tax provision	36.44%	37.55%	40.48%

The actual income tax provisions differ from the expected amounts calculated by applying the combined federal and state corporate income tax rates to the Company's loss before income taxes. The components of these differences are as follows:

	Year Ended July 31, 2009	Year Ended July 31, 2008	Seven Months Ended July 31, 2007
Loss before income taxes	\$ (13,503,576)	\$ (19,040,953)	\$ (8,239,914)
Corporate tax rate	36.44%	37.55%	40.48%
Expected tax expense (recovery)	(4,897,929)	(7,121,393)	(3,335,517)
Increase (decrease) resulting from:			
Foreign losses	158,154	-	-

Permanent differences	357,016	1,010,229	715,422
True-up adjustment	-	14,110	100,492
State tax rate true-up	348,901	460,669	-
Foreign loss true-up	114,249	-	-
Change in valuation allowance	3,915,746	5,831,556	2,324,432
From Operations	(3,863)	195,171	(195,171)
Unrecognized gain, other comprehensive income	3,863	(195,171)	195,171
Future income tax provision (recovery)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

F-25

---

URANIUM ENERGY CORP.

(An Exploration Stage Company)

NOTES TO THE CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS  
JULY 31, 2009

The components of loss from continuing operations before income taxes, by tax jurisdiction, were as follows:

Year Ended July 31, 2009	Year Ended July 31, 2008	Seven Months Ended July 31, 2007
-----------------------------	-----------------------------	--

United States	\$ 11,922,033	\$ 17,898,460	\$ 8,239,914
Foreign	1,581,543	1,142,493	-
	\$ 13,503,576	\$ 19,040,953	\$ 8,239,914

The Company's deferred tax assets are as follows:

	July 31, 2009	July 31, 2008
Deferred tax assets		
Mineral property acquisitions	\$ 582,355	\$ 128,821
Exploration costs	4,625,377	3,546,331
Stock option expense	1,784,591	1,609,675
Charitable donations	18,633	12,380
Loss carry forwards	9,124,769	6,926,433
	16,135,724	12,223,640
Valuation allowance	(16,118,522)	(12,203,916)
Net Deferred Tax Assets	17,203	19,724
Deferred tax liability, depreciable property	(13,340)	(19,724)
	(3,863)	-



Deferred tax  
liability, other  
comprehensive  
income

Net Deferred Income Tax Assets	\$ -	\$ -
--------------------------------------	------	------

As the criteria for recognizing future income tax assets have not been met due to the uncertainty of realization, a valuation allowance of 100% has been recorded for the current and prior year.

The Company's net operating loss carryforwards expire as follows:

July 31, 2023	\$ 24,133
July 31, 2024	72,628
July 31, 2025	387,588
July 31, 2026	5,593,907
July 31, 2027	3,747,248
July 31, 2028	8,696,297
July 31, 2029	7,373,915
	\$ 25,895,716

For U.S. federal income tax purposes a change in ownership under IRC Section 382 may have occurred in a prior year. If an ownership change has occurred, the utilization of these losses against future income would be subject to an annual limitation. The annual limitation would be equal to the value of the Company immediately prior to the change in ownership multiplied by the IRC Section 382 rate in effect during the month of the change.

F-26

---

URANIUM ENERGY CORP.

(An Exploration Stage Company)

NOTES TO THE CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS  
JULY 31, 2009

NOTE 12: COMMITMENTS AND CONTINGENCIES

The Company is currently leasing office premises in New Mexico, Texas and Vancouver, B.C., Canada with total monthly payments of \$12,497. All office lease agreements are on a month to month basis with the exception of the New Mexico office lease which expires in March, 2010.

The aggregate minimum lease and purchase payments over the next five years are as follows:

July 31, 2010	\$ 157,753
July 31, 2011	2,250
	\$ 160,003

On September 6, 2007 the Company entered into an agreement for media distribution services valued at approximately \$270,000. Under the terms of the agreement, the Company paid a retainer of \$100,000, with the balance of the agreement due upon completion of the services. For the year ended July 31, 2009, services have been provided in the amount of \$100,000 and no further amounts are outstanding or will become payable under this agreement.

The Company is committed to pay its key executives a total of approximately \$610,000 per year for management services.

Goliad County Notice

As disclosed in the Company's Current Report on Form 8-K filed on March 20, 2008 with the SEC, a lawsuit has been filed in U.S. District Court by Goliad County, Texas and an individual landowner alleging infractions of the United States Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974 in connection with its exploration activities in Goliad County. The Company believes this claim regarding its exploration activities to be completely without merit and will be vigorously defended. The responsible state agency with sole jurisdiction over the Company's exploration activities previously investigated a similar claim by the County and found the Company to be in compliance with all applicable regulatory and

environmental requirements.

Specifically, as the agency noted in an April 2007 letter to the County's attorney, the state agency hydrologist "concluded from the available information that no ground-water contamination has occurred as a result of the drilling activities." The state agency concluded its letter by noting that "[t]o date, the Commission's investigation of your complaint has not revealed any practice or activity within the approved permit area that has adversely affected the wells identified in your complaint or the related aquifer, or is out of compliance with the Texas Uranium Mining Regulations...". Later in a September 2007 letter to the Goliad groundwater district, the agency reiterated its findings stating the agency's "investigation of your complaint has not revealed any practice or activity at UEC's Uranium Exploration Permit No. 123 that is out of compliance... We consider this investigation to be closed."

The Company's Goliad Project has been inspected on a monthly basis since the close of the investigation, and no violations have been noted. In fact, an inspection report from November of 2007 observed that "prompt attention" to site restoration during exploration was apparent and "the area inspected looked very good". The Company is dedicated to full compliance with all aspects of the state regulatory process and will continue to focus its attention and efforts on obtaining all necessary authorizations for its Goliad Project.

The lawsuit, which was commenced by the filing of the plaintiffs' Original Complaint on or about March 17, 2008, follows on a notice of intent to file litigation issued by counsel for Goliad County and an individual landowner which was disclosed in the Company's current report filed with the SEC on Form 8-K on March 3, 2008. The plaintiffs have requested that the Court grant the following relief: (a) that the Court exercise jurisdiction over the lawsuit; (b) an order enjoining the Company from further exploration activities in the Weesatche Project in Goliad County; (c) an order requiring the Company to clean up the alleged contamination of the aquifer; (d) an order enjoining initiation of the aquifer exemption process until the Company has cleaned up the alleged contamination; (e) an order prohibiting the Company from using any water quality data for purposes of establishing baseline water quality if such data was collected after initiation of mining activity (although the Company has not commenced any mining activity); (f) an order granting Goliad County payment of its expert fees incurred in the prosecution of the lawsuit; (g) an order granting Goliad County payment of its attorney fees; and (h) such additional relief as the Court may deem just, proper and equitable, including an award of reasonable attorneys' fees, expenses and costs.

F-27

---

URANIUM ENERGY CORP.

(An Exploration Stage Company)

NOTES TO THE CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS  
JULY 31, 2009

On June 5, 2009, the United States District Court issued an order dismissing the lawsuit filed by Goliad County commissioners against the Company. The lawsuit alleged infractions of the Safe Drinking Water Act ("SDWA") nearby to areas where the Company has conducted exploration activities. In his June 5, 2009 order dismissing the case, the Judge stated that the County's case failed to pass the threshold jurisdictional requirements, even when considered in the light most favorable to the County. As the Judge noted, the Texas Railroad Commission stated in an April 2007 letter to the County's attorney that an agency hydrologist "...concluded from the available information that no ground-water contamination has occurred as a result of the drilling activities." The Judge concluded that "...the touchstone of Goliad County's SDWA claim is its allegation that UEC 'converted' the exploratory boreholes into 'injection wells' and/or an 'injection activity,'...the Court has concluded that no such conversion or injection activity took place..."

NOTE 13: SUPPLEMENTAL CASH FLOW INFORMATION AND NONCASH INVESTING AND FINANCING ACTIVITIES

On October 23, 2008, the Company issued 19,000 restricted common shares pursuant to an asset purchase agreement (refer to Note 5). At the time of issuance, the shares had a value of \$0.53 per share and \$10,070 was recorded as stock-based mineral rights and properties acquisitions.

On December 5, 2008, the Company issued 25,000 restricted common shares pursuant to a land use agreement. At the time of issuance, the shares had a value of \$0.21 per share and \$5,250 was recorded as stock-based land use agreements.

On July 16, 2009, the Company issued 48,834 restricted common shares pursuant to a land use agreement. At the time of issuance, the shares had a value of \$2.83 per share and \$138,200 was recorded as stock-based land use agreements. Additionally, on July 24, 2009, the Company issued 5,834 restricted common shares pursuant to the same agreement. At the time of issuance, the shares had a value of \$2.74 per share and \$15,985 was recorded as stock-based land use agreements.

On July 23, 2009 the Company issued 50,000 warrants at an exercise price of \$1.95 per share pursuant to two land use agreements. The term of these warrants is five years. The fair value of these warrants at the date of grant was estimated using the Black-Scholes option pricing model with an expected life of 5 years, a risk free interest rate of 1.08%, a dividend yield of 0%, and an expected volatility of 117%. Accordingly, \$117,000 was recorded as stock based land use agreements.

July 31, 2009      July 31, 2008

Cash and  
Cash  
Equivalents  
Consist of:

Cash in bank	\$ 1,056,865	\$ 974,407
-----------------	--------------	------------

Term deposits	23,208,778	12,162,911
------------------	------------	------------

	\$ 24,265,643	\$ 13,137,318
--	---------------	---------------

Year Ended July 31, 2009	Year Ended July 31, 2008	Seven Months Ended July 31, 2007	For the Period From May 16, 2003 (inception) to
--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--	---

July 31,  
2009

Interest paid	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Income taxes paid	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

F-28

URANIUM ENERGY CORP.

(An Exploration Stage Company)

NOTES TO THE CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS  
JULY 31, 2009

NOTE 14: SUBSEQUENT EVENTS

On August 28, 2009 Uranium Energy Corp. ("UEC") entered into a non-arms length Restated And Amended Consulting Agreement (the

"Agreement") with a company (the "Company") to provide various corporate development and investor communications related services. The Company is controlled and/or managed by an independent director of UEC. The services that have been provided, and are to be provided, are separate and apart from the time and effort that the independent director provides to UEC on an ongoing basis as a member of the Board of Directors. Under the terms of the Agreement, on August 28, 2009 UEC issued as fully paid and non-assessable 300,000 restricted common shares.

On October 13, 2009, the Company entered into a securities purchase agreement with URN Resources Inc., a subsidiary of Uranium One Inc., to acquire all of its 99% interest in the South Texas Mining Venture, L.L.P. (

"STMV"), a Texas limited liability partnership. Under the terms of the securities purchase agreement, the Company agreed to issue 2,500,000 shares of common stock to acquire STMV. The closing of the acquisition is subject to a number of conditions including, among other things, the receipt by both parties of certain consents and releases at closing.

On October 13, 2009, the Company entered into an agreement in principle with Everest Exploration Inc. (

"Everest") to purchase substantially all of the assets of Everest, including its 1% interest in STMV. To make the acquisition, the Company will pay 200,000 shares of common stock of the Company and a cash payment of \$1,000,000 to be used, in part, for reclamation work to be performed by Everest and, subsequent to final closing, the Company, for final reclamation on two properties previously mined and restored by Everest. Among other things, this agreement in principle is subject to the Company's due diligence and the execution of a definitive asset purchase agreement.

F-29

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

None.

## ITEM 9A. CONTROLS AND PROCEDURES

### Evaluation of Disclosure Controls and Procedures

Our management, with the participation of our Principal Executive Officer and Principal Financial Officer, has evaluated the effectiveness of our disclosure controls and procedures (as such term is defined in Rules 13a-15(e) and 15d-15(e) under the Exchange Act, as of the end of the period covered by this report. Disclosure controls and procedures include, without limitation, controls and procedures designed to ensure that information required to be disclosed in the reports we file or submit under the Exchange Act is accumulated and communicated to management, including our Principal Executive Officer and Principal Financial Officer, as appropriate, to allow timely decisions regarding required disclosure. Based on such evaluation, our Principal Executive Officer and Principal Financial Officer have concluded that, as of the end of the period covered by this report, our disclosure controls and procedures are effective in recording, processing, summarizing and reporting, on a timely basis, information required to be disclosed by us in the reports that we file or submit under the Exchange Act.

It should be noted that any system of controls is based in part upon certain assumptions designed to obtain reasonable (and not absolute) assurance as to its effectiveness, and there can be no assurance that any design will succeed in achieving its stated goals.

### Management's Report on Internal Control Over Financial Reporting

The management of the company is responsible for establishing and maintaining adequate internal control over financial reporting, as required by Sarbanes-Oxley (SOX) Section 404 A. The Company's internal control over financial reporting is a process designed under the supervision of the Company's Principal Executive Officer and Principal Financial Officer to provide reasonable assurance regarding the reliability of financial reporting and the preparation of the company's financial statements for external purposes in accordance with United States generally accepted accounting principles ("US GAAP").

As of July 31, 2009, management assessed the effectiveness of the company's internal control over financial reporting based on the criteria for effective internal control over financial reporting established in Internal Control -Integrated Framework issued by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission ("COSO") and SEC guidance on conducting such assessments. Based on that evaluation, they concluded that, as at July 31, 2009 such internal controls and procedures were effective.

The independent registered public accounting firm that audited the financial statements has issued an attestation report internal control over financial reporting which has been included in the financial statements.

We will continue to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of our internal controls and procedures over financial reporting on an ongoing basis and are committed to taking further action by implementing additional enhancements or improvements, or deploying additional human resources as may be deemed necessary.

### Changes in Internal Controls

On October 22, 2008 we filed a Form 10-K for the period ended July 31, 2008. In the Form 10-K, management concluded that: (1) inadequate entity level controls due to: (i) weak tone at the top to implement an effective control environment, and (ii) failure in the operation of our whistle blower policy; (2) inadequate segregation of duties consistent with control objectives; (3) insufficient written policies and procedures for accounting and financial reporting with respect to the requirements and application of US GAAP and SEC disclosure requirements; and (4) ineffective controls over period end financial disclosure and reporting processes represented material weaknesses in

our internal control over financial reporting as at July 31, 2008. Accordingly, our management concluded that our disclosure controls and procedures and internal controls over financial reporting were not effective as at July 31, 2008.

We are committed to improving our financial organization. As part of this commitment, in August 2008 we hired additional staff and engaged consultants who assisted in the preparation, implementation and monitoring of sufficient written policies and checklists from August 2008 to present, including the redesign of staffing responsibilities, and set forth procedures for accounting and financial reporting with respect to the requirements and application of US GAAP and SEC disclosure requirements. Management believes that the preparation and implementation of sufficient written policies and checklists, including a redesign of staffing responsibilities, and the monitoring of those procedures from September 2008 to present have remedied the weaknesses of inadequate segregation of duties consistent with control objectives, insufficient written policies and procedures for accounting and financial reporting with respect to the requirements and application of US GAAP and SEC disclosure requirements, and ineffective controls over period end financial disclosure and reporting processes.

As described in the immediately preceding paragraph, management believes that it has remediated the deficiencies in our disclosure controls and procedures related to: (1) inadequate segregation of duties consistent with control objectives; (2) insufficient written policies and procedures for accounting and financial reporting with respect to the requirements and application of US GAAP and SEC disclosure requirements; and (3) ineffective controls over period end financial disclosure and reporting processes. In addition, management has remediated the deficiencies in our disclosure controls and procedures related to inadequate entity level controls. Specifically, in May 2009, the Company appointed a new independent director who also serves on the Company's Audit Committee. The Company has also revised its whistle blower policy to make an independent director the contact person. Management is in the process of monitoring and testing these changes.

There have been no other changes in our internal control over financial reporting (as defined in Rules 13a-15(f) and 15d-15(f) under the Exchange Act) during the fourth quarter ended July 31, 2009 that have materially affected, or are reasonably likely to materially affect, our internal control over financial reporting.

#### ITEM 9B. OTHER INFORMATION

Not applicable.

#### ITEM 10. DIRECTORS, EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AND CORPORATE GOVERNANCE

Our directors and executive officers and their respective ages as of the date hereof are as follows:

Name	Age	Position with the Company
Amir Adnani	31	President, Chief Executive Officer, Principal Executive Officer and a director
Alan P. Lindsay	59	Chairman and a director
Harry L. Anthony	62	Chief Operating Officer and a director
Pat Obara	53	Secretary, Treasurer, Chief Financial Officer and Principal Accounting Officer

## Edgar Filing: URANIUM ENERGY CORP - Form 10-K

Ivan Obolensky	84	Director
Erik Essiger	44	Director
Vincent Della Volpe	67	Director
Mark Katsumata	43	Director

The following describes the business experience of each of our directors and executive officers, including other directorships held in reporting companies:

100

---

### Alan P. Lindsay

. Mr. Lindsay a co-founder of Uranium Energy Corp. has served as Chairman of the Company since December 2005. He is also a founder of MIV Therapeutics Inc. ("MIVT") and from 2000 to present has been the Chairman of MIVT where he also served as President and CEO until January 2008. MIVT is a publicly traded bio-medical company recently awarded the prestigious Frost and Sullivan 2005 and 2008 Award for Technology Innovation in the field of Medical Coatings and in 2006 MIVT was appointed to Fortune 500's Top 100 Nanotechnology Companies. Mr. Lindsay was a founder of AZCO Mining and served as chairman, president and CEO of AZCO from 1992 to 2000. The company was listed on the Toronto and American Stock Exchanges. During his tenure at AZCO, the Company sold the Sanchez copper deposit to Phelps Dodge for \$55 million and established a joint venture with Phelps Dodge on the Piedras Verdes copper deposit with 2.1 billion pounds of copper reserves. Mr. Lindsay also co-founded Anatolia Minerals Development and New Oropuru Resources, two publicly traded companies with significant gold discoveries. Mr. Lindsay was chairman of TapImmune from December 2005 through July 2009 and helped reorganize the company and arranged for the acquisition of the technology from The University of British Columbia. Mr. Lindsay is a Director of Strategic American Oil Corporation.

### Amir Adnani

. Mr. Adnani is a co-founder of Uranium Energy Corp and has been our President, Chief Executive Officer, Principal Executive Officer and a director since January 24, 2005. Mr. Adnani is an entrepreneur with an extensive background in business development and marketing. In September 2004, he founded and was a director and President of Blender Media Inc., a Vancouver based company that provides strategic marketing and financial communications services to public companies and investors in mineral exploration, mining, and energy sectors. Effective October 1, 2006, Mr. Adnani is no longer a director, officer or shareholder of Blender Media Inc. In June 2001, Mr. Adnani co-founded, and from June 2001 to September 2004, was a director and officer of Fort Sun Investments Inc, a strategic marketing and financial communications services company for public companies. Mr. Adnani holds a Bachelor of Science degree from the University of British Columbia. Mr. Adnani is not a director or officer of any other U.S. reporting company.

### Harry L. Anthony

. Mr. Anthony has been our Chief Operating Officer and a director since February 2006. Mr. Anthony has over thirty years of experience in the uranium mining industry. From approximately 1997 to present, Mr. Anthony had been a consultant through Anthony Engineering Services for several major uranium companies and international agencies, which duties generally include project evaluation, operations "trouble shooter" and technical and financial expert. From approximately 1990 through 1997, Mr. Anthony was a senior vice president of Uranium Resources, Inc., where he managed all facets of operations and technical support to achieve production goals, drilling, ion exchange, reverse osmosis, software development and equipment design. His duties also included oversight of construction, technical aspects, and daily operations of plants and wellfields, budget planning and forecasting, property evaluations and reserve estimations. Mr. Anthony also previously served as the vice-president of engineering/engineering manager of Uranium Resources, Inc., and a project superintendent and project engineer for Union Carbide Corp. Mr. Anthony was on the board of directors of Uranium Resources, Inc. from 1984 through 1994. He is the author of several publications and the recipient of the awards "Distinguished Member of the South Texas Mineral Section of AIME -1987" and "1999 Outstanding Citizen of the Year - Kingsville Chamber of Commerce". Mr. Anthony received an M.S. in Engineering Mechanics in 1973 and a B.S. in Engineering Mechanics in 1969 from Pennsylvania State University. Mr. Anthony is not a director or officer of any other U.S. reporting company.

### Pat Obara



## Edgar Filing: URANIUM ENERGY CORP - Form 10-K

. Mr. Obara became our Secretary, Treasurer, Chief Financial Officer and Principal Accounting Officer on August 23, 2006. During the past five years Mr. Obara has worked as a consultant to several private and publicly listed companies providing various consulting services in the areas of corporate finance and administration. From March of 2003 to present Mr. Obara has provided various administrative consulting services to private companies involved in business activities in Asia and North America. Prior to April of 2004 Mr. Obara served as the Chief Financial Officer and a director of two public companies listed on the TSX Venture Exchange. Mr. Obara was involved in the restructuring, organizing and management of these early stage companies which were involved in the resource and technology sectors. Mr. Obara is not a director or officer of any other U.S. reporting company.

### Erik Essiger

. Mr. Essiger became a director of our company and a member of our Audit Committee on August 23, 2006. During the past five years Mr. Essiger has been: the Managing Director and the founder of Precisetech GmbH, a corporate finance advisory company focused on international M&A transactions (from October 2004 to present); a member of the Supervisory Board of Corix Capital AG (from December 2003 to present); the Senior Manager, Transaction Services Strategy Group, with PricewaterhouseCoopers AG, heading up the commercial and

101

---

due diligence practice of that group in Germany which provided services mainly to private equity clients of the firm (from April 2003 to September 2004); and a member of the Executive Board (Vorstand) of MultiMedia Technologies AG, a producer of set-top-boxes and a company operating in the fields of interactive digital television and the streaming media market (from July 2000 to July 2002) Mr. Essiger also has extensive international experience in corporate restructuring; especially in Germany, Russia, Hong Kong and Switzerland; and he was a member of the German-Russian co-operation council.

### Ivan Obolensky

. Mr. Obolensky has 40 years experience in the investment banking business as a financial analyst, with specific expertise in the defense aerospace, oil and gas, nuclear power, metals and minerals, publishing and high technology industries. He has been an executive of several investment banks, including Sterling Grace & Co., Jesup, Josephthal & Co., Dominick and Dominick, Inc., Middendorf Colgate, and CB Richard Ellis Mosley Hallgarten. Since November 1990 to date, Mr. Obolensky has been Vice President of Shields & Company, an Investment Bank and Member of the New York Stock Exchange. Ivan Obolensky is a Registered Investment Advisor and a member of the New York Society of Security Analysts. He has made frequent appearances as a guest on CNBC, CNNfn, and Bloomberg TV. Mr. Obolensky is also a member of various foundations and philanthropic organizations, and serves as Chairman and CEO of the Soldiers' Sailors' Marines' and Airmen's Club in New York. He is a graduate of Yale University and a retired Lieutenant (Junior Grade) in the U.S. Naval Air Corps.

### Vincent Della Volpe

. Mr. Della Volpe has served as a professional money manager for over 35 years, including as a senior portfolio manager of pension funds for Honeywell Corporation and senior vice president of the YMCA Retirement fund in New York. Throughout his career Mr. Della Volpe has particularly focused on the management of energy and utility equity portfolios, and he also has experience managing venture capital investments. Mr. Della Volpe holds a Bachelor of Arts in Accounting and an MBA in finance, both from Seton Hall University. Since September 2006, Mr. Della Volpe has served as a director of Gold Canyon Resources, Inc., a junior natural resources company incorporated in British Columbia, Canada, that is listed on the TSX Venture Exchange. Mr. Della Volpe has been retired since March 2003. During the prior 11 years he was employed by the YMCA Retirement Fund. In addition to his position as director of the Company, he has been a director of Gold Canyon Resources since Sept 2006.

### Mark Katsumata.

Mr. Katsumata is a Certified General Accountant in Canada with an extensive background in both U.S. and Canadian accounting and regulatory procedures specifically pertaining to mining. Mr. Katsumata joined the Company's board of directors in May 2009 and serves on the Company's Audit Committee as its Chairman. Since 1994, Mr. Katsumata has served as the chief financial officer/vice president, finance for a number of publicly-listed companies, including Denison Mines Corp, where he was responsible for managing all financial and tax matters. Mr. Katsumata is not a director or officer of any other U.S. reporting company.

### Advisory Board

We have also established an Advisory Board currently comprised of Mr. Craig Holmes, Mr. Jon Indall, Dr. John D. Nelson and Mr. Anthony J. Thompson. The purpose of the Advisory Board is to provide support in our search and acquisition of uranium properties, and for the design, permitting and reclamation of our uranium properties.

#### Craig Holmes

, age 57, has extensive experience in uranium mine permitting in the United States which traces back to the advent of ISR uranium mining in the United States in 1976. Mr. Holmes is the founding partner of Eggleston Holmes and Associate (EHA) and served as a General Partner in the firm from 1983 to December 2006. During his tenure with EHA, Mr. Holmes served a major part in conducting numerous environmental assessments related to uranium mining and processing. Mr. Holmes continues to work full time as a regulatory consultant to the uranium industry in Texas and Wyoming. Mr. Holmes devotes a significant amount of his time to us in the areas of permitting and technical services, and in legislative efforts pertaining to rules governing the uranium industry.

His 30-year career has been dedicated to the permitting of uranium projects spanning 26 different projects in Texas, Wyoming and New Mexico. He was involved in the baseline and environmental impact analyses in support of permits and a radioactive material licenses for the Highlands In-Situ Recovery Project in Wyoming. Additionally, he participated in technical evaluations regarding waste disposal and radiological assessments for the Smith Ranch In-Situ Recovery Project for Rio Algom Mining Corporation. More recently, Mr. Holmes acted as Project Manager and Advisor to Mesteña Uranium, LLC, a private uranium-producing company based in south Texas. In this role, he

102

---

was responsible for preparing all required baseline studies, writing the applications for the mine permit, the production area authorizations, and the radioactive material license. He was also responsible for preparing all data needed for an air permit exemption, and the EPA aquifer exemption. As a result of his deep involvement with regulatory matters, Mr. Holmes has made a significant contribution to the formulation of the rules and regulations that govern the ISR permitting process today. He received his BSc and MSc from the University of Pittsburgh.

#### Jon Indall

, age 57, is a prominent attorney, and an acknowledged expert in representing uranium industry interests in the United States. Mr. Indall currently is and has been a partner at the law firm of Comeau, Maldegen, Templeman & Indall in Santa Fe, New Mexico for over 25 years. Mr. Indall's career in the law and as an authoritative lobbyist spans over 30 years, with specialization in natural resources and environmental law, and with a special focus on the uranium mining industry. Mr. Indall has represented the Uranium Producers of America - a trade association of domestic uranium producers - since its inception in 1985. He drafted and successfully assisted in lobbying Title X of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 which has provided over \$500 million of federal reimbursements for costs related to reclamation of uranium and thorium mill tailings sites. He was also instrumental in the revitalization of the UPA in 2005, and has been active in negotiations with the US Department of Energy regarding sales of the their excess uranium inventories. In court, Mr. Indall has represented senior mining companies including Homestake Mining, Kerr-McGee, Kennecott Corp, and Pennzoil Corp. He has also represented uranium mining and development companies Cameco, Uranium Resources Inc, United Nuclear Corporation, Strathmore Resources and many others. Mr. Indall received his BA from the University of Kansas, and his Juris Doctorate from the University of Kansas Law School. He is currently a member of the American Bar Association (Natural Resources Section), the State Bar of New Mexico (Natural Resources Section), and First Judicial District Bar Association.

#### Dr. John D. Nelson

, age 69 is a professional engineer, with licenses in five states, and a long-term professor of civil engineering at Colorado State University. As a professor, he developed a major geotechnical engineering program for the field of mine tailings management, primarily as it relates to uranium mining, and is an industry expert in this specialized field. Dr. Nelson served as the chairman of the Annual Conference on Tailings and Mine Waste for 20 years. He is the senior author of a primary report, *Long-Term Stability of Uranium Mill Tailings*, prepared for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) -- a source document for environmental impact statements in this industry. He also served as a consultant to the NRC, including the review of all uranium tailings management plans for mill licensing applications from 1978 until 1984. Since 1985, he has served as a consulting engineer for the mining industry and has acted as the senior technical engineer for several tailings dam projects including Uravan, Gas Hills, Maybell, and York Canyon. Dr. Nelson received his BSc, MSc and PhD in Civil Engineering from the Illinois Institute of Technology in Chicago. He is Professor Emeritus at Colorado State University.

### Anthony J. Thompson

, age 67 has been practicing environmental and occupational health and safety law since the mid-1970's. He is the primary outside counsel to the National Mining Association (NMA) for uranium issues, and he has represented much of the domestic uranium mining and milling industry either as counsel to NMA or as counsel to individual licensees since the late 1970's. He is the prime author of NMA's White Paper entitled "Recommendations for a Coordinated Approach to Regulating the Uranium Recovery Industry." Mr. Thompson received his BA in History from Princeton University and his law degree from the University of Virginia School of Law. He is a member of the American Nuclear Society, the American Bar Association and the Society for Mining, Metallurgy, and Exploration.

Tom Pool, age 68 is recognized as an authoritative analyst for the development of new production facilities, evaluation of strategies, and assessment of production costs. He is proficient with preliminary and detailed feasibility studies for new project development and financing. He is highly experienced with valuations of uranium projects and deposits, and with property brokerage.

Since 1993, Mr. Pool has served as the Chairman of International Nuclear, Inc., based in Golden, Colorado. Over the past 40 years, his career includes senior management roles with prominent uranium organizations including having served as Vice President Engineering of Nuclear Fuels Corporation, Acting Technical Superintendent for the Beverley in-situ leach uranium mine in South Australia, Manager of Uranium Supply for ConverDyn, Internal Consultant for the CONCORD group of companies, Vice President of Marketing with Energy Fuels Nuclear and Vice President of NUXCO Information Services. Mr. Pool also served as a Director of Intermountain Resources. He has authored more than fifty papers on key aspects of uranium development, production and markets.

103

---

### Katherine Armstrong,

age 57 is highly knowledgeable regarding the natural resources and environment of the state of Texas. She was appointed to the Texas Parks and Wildlife Commission in 1999 by Governor George W. Bush, and was named chairman in 2001 by Governor Rick Perry. The Texas Parks and Wildlife Department is the country's second-largest wildlife agency. Ms. Armstrong serves on several boards and advisory committees. Earlier she was active with the selection committee for the White House Fellows Program and as vice-chairman of the Dallas Zoological Society. Currently, she is a director of the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association and the Texas Wildlife Association. She serves on the advisory board of the Harte Research Institute for Gulf of Mexico Studies at Texas A&M-Corpus Christi, and is a director of the Texas Watershed Management Foundation.

### Term of Office

All of our directors hold office until the next annual general meeting of the shareholders or until their successors are elected and qualified. Our officers are appointed by our board of directors and hold office until their earlier death, retirement, resignation or removal.

### Significant Employees

There are no significant employees other than our executive officers.

### Audit Committee

Our board of directors has established an Audit Committee, comprised of Mark Katsumata, Vincent Della Volpe and Ivan Obolensky. The Audit Committee operates pursuant to a charter adopted by the board.

Mark Katsumata, Vincent Della Volpe and Ivan Obolensky are "independent" directors of the Company as that term is defined in Rule 121 of the American Stock Exchange listing standards. The board of directors of the Company has determined that Mark Katsumata qualifies as an audit committee financial expert pursuant to SEC rules.

### Family Relationships

Alan Lindsay is the father-in-law of Amir Adnani.

#### Involvement in Certain Legal Proceedings

None of our directors, executive officers, advisory board members or control persons have been involved in any of the events prescribed by Item 401(f) of Regulation S-K during the past five years, including:

1. any bankruptcy petition filed by or against any business of which such person was a general partner or executive officer either at the time of the bankruptcy or within two years prior to that time;
2. any conviction in a criminal proceeding or being subject to a pending criminal proceeding (excluding traffic violations and other minor offenses);
3. being subject to any order, judgment, or decree, not subsequently reversed, suspended or vacated, of any court of competent jurisdiction, permanently or temporarily enjoining, barring, suspending or otherwise limiting his involvement in any type of business, securities or banking activities; or
4. being found by a court of competent jurisdiction (in a civil action), the Commission or the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to have violated a federal or state securities or commodities law, and the judgment has not been reversed, suspended, or vacated.

#### Code of Business Conduct and Ethics Policy

We have adopted a Code of Business Conduct and Ethics Policy that applies to all directors and officers. The code describes the legal, ethical and regulatory standards that must be followed by the directors and officers of the

104

---

Company and sets forth high standards of business conduct applicable to each director and officer. As adopted, the Code of Business Conduct and Ethics Policy sets forth written standards that are designed to deter wrongdoing and to promote, among other things:

1. honest and ethical conduct, including the ethical handling of actual or apparent conflicts of interest between personal and professional relationships;
2. compliance with applicable governmental laws, rules and regulations;
3. the prompt internal reporting of violations of the code to the appropriate person or persons identified in the code; and
4. accountability for adherence to the code.

A copy of the Code of Business Conduct and Ethics Policy can be viewed on our website at the following URL: [http://www.uraniumenergy.com/about\\_us/corporate\\_governance/code\\_of\\_ethics/](http://www.uraniumenergy.com/about_us/corporate_governance/code_of_ethics/).

#### Compliance with Section 16(a) of the Exchange Act

Section 16(a) of the Exchange Act requires our directors and officers, and the persons who beneficially own more than 10% of our common stock, to file reports of ownership and changes in ownership with the SEC. Copies of all filed reports are required to be furnished to us pursuant to Rule 16a-3 promulgated under the Exchange Act. Based solely on the reports received by us and on the representations of the reporting persons, we believe that these persons have

complied with all applicable filing requirements during the year ended July 31, 2009.

## ITEM 11. EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION

### Compensation Discussion and Analysis

The Compensation Committee of the Board of Directors of the Company is responsible for establishing and administering the Company's executive and director compensation.

The Compensation Committee's compensation objective is designed to attract and retain the best available talent while efficiently utilizing available resources. The committee compensates executive management primarily through base salary and equity compensation designed to be competitive with comparable companies, and to align management's compensation with the long-term interests of shareholders. In determining an executive management's compensation, the Compensation Committee also takes into consideration the financial condition of the Company and discussions with the executive.

In determining the compensation for Messrs. Adnani, Anthony and Obara, the Compensation Committee considered compensation paid to other executive officers of other companies within the industry, the executive's performance in meeting goals, and the complexity of the management position and the experience of the person. Of the amount of the compensation paid to the executive officer, the majority of the compensation was in the form of options. The number of options granted was determined in large part due to the financial condition of the Company which currently has no revenues. The Compensation Committee did not have a specific formula to determine the amount of the executive compensation and what portion of such compensation would be in the form of cash and equity securities. Therefore, the determination of an executive salary including the amount of cash and equity securities may be considered arbitrary taking into account the foregoing factors.

Similarly, directors receive cash compensation for their service as such, as well as options. The number of options granted to each director is based on the experience of the director, time spent on Company matters and the compensation paid to other directors of companies in the industry.

105

The following table sets forth the compensation paid to our Chief Executive Officer, Chief Financial Officer and those executive officers that earned in excess of \$100,000 during the years ended July 31, 2009 and 2008, and the seven months ended July 31, 2007 (the "Named Executive Officers"):

Summary Compensation Table

Name and Principal Position	Year	Salary (\$)	Bonus (\$)	Stock Awards (\$)	Option Awards (\$)	Non-Equity Incentive Plan Compensation (\$)	Non-Qualified Deferred Compensation Earnings (\$)	All Other Compensation (\$)
Amir Adnani, President and Chief	2009	233,134 <sup>(2)</sup>	-	-	44,750 <sup>(3)</sup>	-	-	
	2008	276,990 <sup>(2)</sup>	-	-	407,500 <sup>(3)</sup>	-	-	
	2007 <sup>(1)</sup>	88,750 <sup>(2)</sup>	-	-	616,500 <sup>(3)</sup>	-	-	

Executive  
Officer

Harry L.  
Anthony,  
Chief  
Operating  
Officer

2009	218,694 <sup>(2)</sup>	-	-	44,750 <sup>(3)</sup>	-	-
2008	269,927 <sup>(2)</sup>	-	-	407,500 <sup>(3)</sup>	-	-
2007 <sup>(1)</sup>	93,750 <sup>(2)</sup>	-	-	616,500 <sup>(3)</sup>	-	-

Pat Obara,  
Secretary,  
Treasurer  
and Chief  
Financial  
Officer

2009	129,529 <sup>(2)</sup>	-	-	26,750 <sup>(3)</sup>	-	-
2008	142,453 <sup>(2)</sup>	-	-	203,750 <sup>(3)</sup>	-	-
2007 <sup>(1)</sup>	51,707 <sup>(2)</sup>	-	-	68,500 <sup>(3)</sup>	-	-

(1) For the seven month period ended July 31, 2007.

(2) These amounts represent fees paid by us to the Named Executive Officers during the past year pursuant to various employment and consulting services agreements, as between us and the Named Executive Officers, which are more particularly described below.

(3) These amounts represent the fair value of these options at the date of grant which was estimated using the Black-Scholes option pricing model. See Note 10 to our financial statements contained herein.

(4) The Company did not record any non-equity incentive compensation plan expense, non-qualified deferred compensation expense or other compensation expense for the Named Executive Officers.

Stock Options Grants

We granted options to purchase shares of our common stock to the Named Executive Officers in the fiscal year ended July 31, 2009 as follows:

Name	Number of Securities Underlying Options	Exercise Price	Grant Date Fair Value of Option
Amir Adnani, President and Chief Executive Officer	\$Nil	N/A	\$Nil

Harry L.  
Anthony,  
Chief  
Operating  
Officer                 \$Nil    N/A                 \$Nil

Pat Obara,  
Chief  
Financial  
Officer                 \$Nil    N/A                 \$Nil

106

No options were exercised by the Named Executive Officers in the fiscal year ended July 31, 2009.

The following table sets forth information as at July 31, 2009, relating to options that have been granted to the Named Executive Officers:

## Outstanding Equity Awards at Fiscal Year End

Name	Option Awards				Stock Awards				
	Number of Securities Underlying Unexercised Options Exercisable (#)	Number of Securities Underlying Unexercised Options Unexercisable (#)	Equity Incentive Plan Awards: Number of Securities Underlying Unexercised Unearned Options (#)	Option Exercise Price (\$)	Option Expiration Date	Number of Shares or Units of Stock That Have Not Vested (#)	Market Value of Shares or Units of Stock That Have Not Vested (\$)	Equity Incentive Awards: Number of Un-earned Shares, Units or Rights That Have Not Vested (\$)	Equity Incentive Plan Awards: Market Payout Value of Unearned Shares, Units or Rights That Have Not Vested (\$)
Amir Adnani, President and CEO	202,500	-	-	0.33	12/20/15	-	-	-	-
	225,000	-	-	0.45	01/01/17	-	-	-	-
	250,000	-	-	0.45	04/07/18	-	-	-	-
Harry L. Anthony, Chief Operating Officer	202,500	-	-	0.33	12/20/15	-	-	-	-
	172,500	-	-	0.33	02/01/16	-	-	-	-
	225,000	-	-	0.45	01/01/17	-	-	-	-
	250,000	-	-	0.45	04/07/18	-	-	-	-

Pat Obara, Chief	200,000	-	-	0.45	10/10/16	-	-	-	-
Financial Officer	25,000	-	-	0.45	01/01/17	-	-	-	-
	125,000	-	-	0.45	04/07/18	-	-	-	-

(1) There are no outstanding stock awards for the Named Executive Officers.

#### Long Term Incentive Plans

The Company does not maintain any long-term incentive plans, including, without limitation, any pension or other contribution plan.

107

---

#### Directors Compensation Table

The following table sets forth information relating to compensation paid to our directors in the year ended July 31, 2009:

Name	Fees Earned or Paid in Cash (\$)	Stock Awards (\$)	Option Awards (\$)	Non-Equity Incentive Plan Compensation (\$)	Non- Qualified Deferred Compensation Earnings (\$)	All Other Compensation (\$)	Total (\$)
Alan P. Lindsay, Chairman	63,554 <sup>(1)</sup>	-	20,000 <sup>(2)</sup>	-	-	-	83,554
Amir Adnani	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Harry L. Anthony	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Erik Essiger	37,181	-	11,000 <sup>(2)</sup>	-	-	-	48,181
Ivan Obolensky	27,500	-	8,000 <sup>(2)</sup>	-	-	-	35,500
Vincent Della Volpe	28,000	-	15,000 <sup>(2)</sup>	-	-	-	43,000
Mark Katsumata	4,252	-	92,250 <sup>(2)</sup>	-	-	-	96,502



Edgar Filing: URANIUM ENERGY CORP - Form 10-K

(1) Alan P. Lindsay received monthly fees through July 31, 2009, for the provision of various management consulting services provided by Mr. Lindsay to us on a monthly basis and from time to time.

(2) This amount represents the fair value of options at the date of grant or repriced during the year, estimated using the Black-Scholes option pricing model. See Note 10 to our financial statements contained herein.

(3) As of July 31, 2009 our directors held options to acquire an aggregate of 2,852,500 shares of our common stock: Alan P. Lindsay 850,000 options, Amir Adnani 677,500 options, Harry L. Anthony 850,000 options, Erik Essiger 150,000 options, Ivan Obolensky 100,000 options, Vincent Della Volpe 150,000 options, and Mark Katsumata 75,000 options.

The following table sets forth information relating to compensation paid to our directors in the year ended July 31, 2008:

Name	Fees Earned or Paid in Cash (\$)	Stock Awards (\$)	Option Awards (\$)	Total (\$)
Alan P. Lindsay, Chairman	66,420 (1)	-	407,500(2)	473,920
Amir Adnani	-	-	-	-
Harry L. Anthony	-	-	-	-
Erik Essiger	15,692	-	81,500(2)	97,192
Ivan Obolensky	10,167	-	163,000 (2)	173,167
Vincent Della Volpe	7,025	-	348,500(2)	355,525

(1) Alan P. Lindsay received \$6,000 per month through July 31, 2008, for the provision of various management consulting services provided by Mr. Lindsay to us on a monthly basis and from time to time.

(2) This amount represents the fair value of options at the date of grant estimated using the Black-Scholes option pricing model. See Note 10 to our financial statements contained herein.

(3) As of July 31, 2008 our directors held options to acquire an aggregate of 2,777,500 shares of our common stock: Alan P. Lindsay 850,000 options, Amir Adnani 677,500 options, Harry L. Anthony 850,000 options, Erik Essiger 150,000 options, Ivan Obolensky, 100,000 options and Vincent Della Volpe 150,000 options.

The following table sets forth information relating to compensation paid to our directors in the seven month period ended July 31, 2007:

Name	Fees Earned or Paid in Cash (\$)	Stock Awards (\$)	Option Awards (\$)	Total (\$)
Alan P. Lindsay, Chairman	9,540 <sup>(1)</sup>	-	-	9,540
Amir Adnani	-	-	-	-
Harry L. Anthony	-	-	-	-
Erik Essiger	-	-	-	-
Ivan Obolensky	-	-	473,000 <sup>(2)</sup>	473,000
Vincent Della Volpe	-	-	-	-

(1) Alan P. Lindsay received \$3,000 per month through March 31, 2007, for the provision of various management consulting services provided by Mr. Lindsay to us on a monthly basis and from time to time.

(2) This amount represents the fair value of options at the date of grant estimated using the Black-Scholes option pricing model. See Note 10 to our financial statements contained herein.

(3) As of July 31, 2007 our directors held options to acquire and aggregate of 1,927,500 shares of our common stock: Alan P. Lindsay 600,000 options, Amir Adnani 427,500 options, Harry L. Anthony 600,000 options, Erik Essiger 100,000 options, Ivan Obolensky, 100,000 options and Vincent Della Volpe 100,000 options.

## Employment and Consulting Agreements

### Anthony Employment Agreement

On February 15, 2006, our Board of Directors authorized and approved the execution of an employment agreement between us and Harry L. Anthony (the "Anthony Employment Agreement"). On July 1, 2006, our Board of Directors approved an amendment to the Anthony Employment Agreement extending the initial term thereunder to July 1, 2008. Pursuant to the terms and provisions of the Anthony Employment Agreement, as amended: (i) Mr. Anthony shall

provide duties to us commensurate with his executive position as our Chief Operating Officer and he will also become a member of our Board of Directors; (ii) we shall pay to Mr. Anthony a monthly fee of \$10,000 to October 1, 2006 when the monthly fee paid to Mr. Anthony increased to \$12,500 through February 28, 2007, when an additional increase to \$13,750 is currently being paid; (iii) we granted an aggregate of 375,000 stock options to Mr. Anthony to purchase shares of our common stock at \$0.33 per share and a further 225,000 stock options to purchase shares of our common stock at \$3.30 per share, both for a ten-year term from the date of grant; and (iv) the Anthony Employment Agreement may be terminated without cause by either of us by providing prior written notice of the intention to terminate at least 90 days (in the case of our company after the initial term) or 30 days (in the case of Mr. Anthony) prior to the effective date of such termination.

During the seven months ended July 31, 2007, an aggregate of \$93,750 was incurred by us to Mr. Anthony under the terms and provisions of the Anthony Employment Agreement. As of the date of this annual report no balance remains due and owing to Mr. Anthony as compensation under the Anthony Employment Agreement.

On March 1, 2008, the Compensation Committee ratified the approval of an increase in the monthly service agreement fee for Mr. Anthony from USD \$13,750 to USD \$19,166.67.

#### Adnani Executive Services Agreement

On July 1, 2006, our Board of Directors authorized and approved an executive services agreement between us and Amir Adnani, as amended by letter agreement dated July 1, 2007 (the "Adnani Executive Services Agreement"). The current initial term of the agreement is two years expiring on July 1, 2009. Pursuant to the terms and provisions of the Adnani Executive Services Agreement: (i) Mr. Adnani shall continue to provide duties to us commensurate with his current executive positions as our President and Chief Executive Officer; (ii) we shall pay to Mr. Adnani a monthly fee of \$10,000.00 to December 31, 2006, when the monthly fee paid to Mr. Adnani increased to \$12,500

109

---

through June 30, 2007, when an additional increase to \$13,750 is currently being paid; (iii) we confirmed the previous granting of his existing pre-forward split stock options and we granted an aggregate of 202,500 stock options to Mr. Adnani to purchase shares of our common stock at \$0.33 per share and a further 225,000 stock options to purchase shares of our common stock at \$3.30 per share, both for a ten-year term from the date of grant; and (iv) the Adnani Executive Services Agreement may be terminated without cause by either of us by providing prior written notice of the intention to terminate at least 90 days (in the case of our company after the initial term) or 30 days (in the case of Mr. Adnani) prior to the effective date of such termination.

During the seven months ended July 31, 2007, an aggregate of \$88,750 was incurred by us to Mr. Adnani under the terms and provisions of the Adnani Executive Services Agreement. As of the date of this annual report no balance remains due and owing to Mr. Adnani as compensation under the Adnani Executive Services Agreement.

On March 1, 2008, the Compensation Committee ratified the approval of an increase in the monthly service agreement fee for Mr. Adnani from USD \$13,750 to USD \$19,166.67.

#### Obara Builders Ltd. Consulting Services Agreement

On August 15, 2007, with an effective date of July 1, 2007, our Board of Directors authorized and approved the "Obara Builders Consulting Services Agreement". The initial term of the agreement is two years expiring on July 1, 2009. Pursuant to the terms and provisions of the Obara Builders Consulting Services Agreement: (i) Mr. Obara shall continue to provide duties to us commensurate with his current executive positions as our Secretary, Treasurer, Chief Financial Officer and Principal Accounting Officer; (ii) we shall pay to Obara Builders Ltd., a private company controlled by Pat Obara, or to Pat Obara personally, a monthly fee of CAD \$10,000; (iii) we approved the granting of

stock options from time to time to Mr. Obara at such fair market exercise price or prices per Option Share as may be determined by our Board of Directors and we confirmed the previous granting of his existing stock options of 200,000 stock options to Mr. Obara to purchase shares of our common stock at \$1.30 per share and a further 25,000 stock options to purchase shares of our common stock at \$3.30 per share, both for a ten-year term from the date of grant; and (iv) the Obara Builders Ltd. Consulting Services Agreement may be terminated without cause by either of us by providing prior written notice of the intention to terminate at least 90 days (in the case of our company after the initial term) or 30 days (in the case of Mr. Obara) prior to the effective date of such termination.

On March 1, 2008, the Compensation Committee ratified the approval of an increase in the monthly service agreement fee for Mr. Obara from CAD \$10,000 to CAD \$12,500.

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

The following table sets forth certain information with respect to the beneficial ownership of our common stock by each stockholder known by us to be the beneficial owner of more than 5% of our common stock and by each of our current directors and executive officers. Each person has sole voting and investment power with respect to the shares of common stock, except as otherwise indicated. Beneficial ownership consists of a direct interest in the shares of common stock, except as otherwise indicated. As of October 9, 2009, there are 56,725,516 shares of common stock issued and outstanding.

110

Name and Address of Beneficial Owner	Amount and Nature of Beneficial Ownership	Percentage of Beneficial Ownership
(1)	(1)	(1)
Directors and Officers:		
Amir Adnani 320 - 1111 West Hastings Street Vancouver, B. C., Canada, V6E 2J3	2,661,801 <sup>(2)</sup>	4.6%
Alan P. Lindsay 2701 - 1500 Hornby Street Vancouver, B. C., Canada, V6Z 2R1	2,419,787 <sup>(3)</sup>	4.2%
	1,872,500 <sup>(4)</sup>	3.2%

Harry L.  
Anthony  
P.O. Box  
1328  
Kingsville,  
TX, U.S.A.,  
78364

Pat Obara	500,000 <sup>(5)</sup>	*
-----------	------------------------	---

2791 West  
35<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Vancouver, B.  
C., Canada,  
V6N 2M1

Erik Essiger	225,000 <sup>(6)</sup>	*
--------------	------------------------	---

P.O. Box  
37491, Dubai,  
UAE

Ivan Obolensky	166,000 <sup>(7)</sup>	*
-------------------	------------------------	---

425 East 79<sup>th</sup>  
Street  
New York,  
NY, U.S.A.,  
10021

Vincent Della Volpe	200,000 <sup>(8)</sup>	*
------------------------	------------------------	---

32 Evergreen  
Drive,  
Lincoln Park,  
NJ, U.S.A.,  
07035

Mark Katsumata	150,000 <sup>(9)</sup>	*
-------------------	------------------------	---

14447  
Blackburn  
Crescent  
White Rock,  
B.C., Canada,  
V4B 3A3

All executive officers and directors as a group (7)	8,195,088 <sup>(10)</sup>	14.2%
--	---------------------------	-------

persons)

Major  
Shareholders:

Vontobel	3,125,001 <sup>(11)</sup>	5.4%
Fund Global Trend New Power 69, Route D'Esch, L-1470 Luxemburg		

\* Less than one percent.

1. Under Rule 13d-3, a beneficial owner of a security includes any person who, directly or indirectly, through any contract, arrangement, understanding, relationship, or otherwise has or shares: (i) voting power, which includes the power to vote, or to direct the voting of shares; and (ii) investment power, which includes the power to dispose or direct the disposition of shares. Certain shares may be deemed to be beneficially owned by more than one person (if, for example, persons share the power to vote or the power to dispose of the shares). In addition, shares are deemed to be beneficially owned by a person if the person has the right to acquire the shares (for example, upon exercise of an option) within 60 days of the date as of which the information is provided. In computing the percentage ownership of any person, the amount of shares outstanding is deemed to include the amount of shares beneficially owned by such person (and only such person) by reason of these acquisition rights. As a result, the percentage of outstanding shares of any person as shown in this table does not necessarily reflect the person's actual ownership or voting power with respect to the number of shares of common stock actually outstanding as of the date of this annual report. As of the date of this annual report, there were 56,725,516 shares issued and outstanding.
2. This figure includes (i) 1,731,301 shares of common stock, (ii) 3,000 shares of common stock held of record by Amir Adnani's wife, (iii) stock options to purchase 927,500 shares of our common stock.
3. This figure includes (i) 1,306,287 shares of common stock, (ii) 163,500 shares of common stock held of record by Alan P. Lindsay's wife, (iii) stock options to purchase 950,000 shares of our common stock. Mr. Lindsay is the father-in-law of Amir Adnani.
4. This figure includes (i) 772,500 shares of common stock, (ii) stock options to purchase 1,100,000 shares of our common stock.
5. This figure represents stock options to purchase 500,000 shares of our common stock.
6. This figure represents stock options to purchase 225,000 shares of our common stock.

7. This figure represents (i) 16,000 shares of common stock, and (ii) stock options to purchase 150,000 shares of our common stock.
8. This figure represents stock options to purchase 200,000 shares of our common stock.
9. This figure represents stock options to purchase 150,000 shares of our common stock.
10. This figure includes (i) 3,992,588 shares of common stock, and (ii) stock options to purchase 4,202,500 shares of our common stock.
11. This figure includes (i) 2,083,334 shares of our common stock, and (ii) 1,041,667 share purchase warrants. Anders Malcolm, Managing Director of Vontobel Fund Global New Trend Power, has discretionary voting and investment authority over these shares.

#### Changes in Control

We are unaware of any contract, or other arrangement or provision, the operation of which may at a subsequent date result in a change of control of our company.

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

##### Related Party Transactions

During the year ended July 31, 2009, the Company had transactions with certain officers and directors of the Company as follows:

(a) incurred \$744,684 in management fees and bonuses (\$233,300 to Amir Adnani, \$218,694 to Harry Anthony, \$129,529 to Pat Obara, \$63,554 to Alan Lindsay, \$37,181 to Erik Essiger, \$27,500 to Ivan Obolensky, \$28,000 to Vincent Della Volpe, and \$4,252 to Mark Katsumata) and recorded \$262,500 in stock based compensation for the fair value of options granted to directors and officers or repriced during the period (\$44,750 to Amir Adnani, \$44,750 to Harry Anthony, \$20,000 to Alan Lindsay, \$15,000 to Vincent Della Volpe, \$26,750 to Pat Obara, \$8,000 to Ivan Obolensky, \$11,000 to Erik Essiger, and \$92,250 to Mark Katsumata);

(b) incurred \$108,873 in general and administrative costs paid to companies controlled by a direct family member of a current officer (Mr. Adnani).

During the year ended July 31, 2008, the Company had transactions with certain officers and directors of the Company as follows:

(a) incurred \$791,695 in management fees and bonuses (\$276,990 to Amir Adnani, \$269,927 to Harry Anthony, \$142,453 to Pat Obara, \$66,420 to Alan Lindsay, \$15,692 to Erik Essiger, \$10,167 to Ivan Obolensky, and \$7,025 to Vincent Della Volpe) and recorded \$2,019,250 in stock based compensation for the fair value of options granted to directors and officers during the period (\$407,500 to Amir Adnani, \$407,500 to Harry Anthony, \$407,500 to Alan Lindsay, \$348,500 to Vincent Della Volpe, \$203,750 to Pat Obara, \$163,000 to Ivan Obolensky, and \$81,500 to Erik Essiger);

(b) incurred \$10,157 in general and administrative costs to be reimbursed by a companies controlled by a direct family members of a current officer (Mr. Adnani) and a current director (Mr. Lindsay); and

(c) incurred \$80,225 in consulting fees and \$106,761 in general and administrative costs, including \$38,796 in rental charges and \$30,089 in media, marketing and website development fees, paid to companies controlled by a direct

family member of a current officer (Mr. Adnani).

During the seven months ended July 31, 2007, we had transactions with certain officers and directors as follows:

112

---

- a. incurred \$302,697 in management fees (\$88,750 to Amir Adnani, \$93,750 to Harry Anthony, \$58,950 to Randall Reneau, \$51,707 to Pat Obara, and \$9,540 to Alan Lindsay) and recorded an additional \$1,774,500 in stock based compensation expense (\$616,500 to Amir Adnani, \$616,500 to Harry Anthony, \$473,000 to Ivan Obolensky, and \$68,500 to Pat Obara);
- b. incurred \$20,745 in consulting fees paid to a company controlled by a direct family member of a current director (Mr. Alan Lindsay);
- c. incurred \$11,980 in media and website development fees paid to a company controlled by a direct family member of a current officer (Mr. Amir Adnani);
- d. paid management bonuses of \$225,581 accrued in the prior fiscal year (\$130,000 to Amir Adnani, \$25,000 to Harry Anthony, \$62,000 to Randall Reneau, and \$8,581 to Pat Obara).

All related party transactions involving provision of services or tangible assets were recorded at the exchange amount, which is the value established and agreed to by the related parties reflecting arms length consideration payable for similar services or transfers.

Amir Adnani and Alan Lindsay are the founders, and may be considered promoters, of the Company. Mr. Adnani and Mr. Lindsay were issued an aggregate of 1,575,000 shares of our common stock at a price of \$0.0013 per share for total proceeds of \$2,100 at the time of the organization of the Company. Neither Mr. Adnani nor Mr. Lindsay have received anything of value from the Company in their capacities as promoters of the Company.

Amounts owing to related parties are unsecured, non-interest bearing and without specific terms of repayment.

Our Audit Committee is charged with reviewing and approving all related party transactions and reviewing and making recommendations to the board of directors, or approving any contracts or other transactions with any of our current or former executive officers.

#### Material Contracts

##### Anthony Employment Agreement

On February 15, 2006, our Board of Directors authorized and approved the execution of the "Anthony Employment Agreement". On July 1, 2006, our Board of Directors approved an amendment to the Anthony Employment Agreement extending the initial term to July 1, 2008. Pursuant to the terms and provisions of the Anthony Employment Agreement, as amended: (i) Mr. Anthony shall provide duties to us commensurate with his executive position as our Chief Operating Officer and he will also become a member of our Board of Directors; (ii) we shall pay to Mr. Anthony a monthly fee of \$10,000 to October 1, 2006, when the monthly fee paid to Mr. Anthony increased to \$12,500 through February 28, 2007, when an additional increase to \$13,750 was approved by our Board of Directors; (iii) we granted an aggregate of 250,000 pre-forward split stock options to Mr. Anthony to purchase shares of our restricted common stock at \$0.50 per share for a ten-year term; and (iv) the Anthony Employment Agreement may be terminated without cause by either of us by providing prior written notice of the intention to terminate at least 90 days (in the case of our company after the initial term) or 30 days (in the case of Mr. Anthony) prior to the effective date of



such termination.

On March 1, 2008, the Compensation Committee ratified the approval of an increase in the monthly service agreement fee to Mr. Anthony from USD \$13,750 to USD \$19,166.67.

#### Adnani Executive Services Agreement

On July 1, 2006, our Board of Directors authorized and approved the execution of the "Adnani Executive Services Agreement", which was extended by way of letter agreement dated July 1, 2007. The initial term of the agreement is now two years expiring on July 1, 2009. Pursuant to the terms and provisions of the Adnani Executive Services Agreement: (i) Mr. Adnani shall continue to provide duties to us commensurate with his current executive positions as our President and Chief Executive Officer; (ii) we shall pay to Mr. Adnani a monthly fee of \$10,000 to December 31, 2006, when the monthly fee paid to Mr. Adnani increased to \$12,500 through June 30, 2007, when an additional

113

---

increase to \$13,750 was approved by our Board of Directors; (iii) we confirmed the previous granting of his existing pre-forward split stock options; and (iv) the Adnani Executive Services Agreement may be terminated without cause by either of us by providing prior written notice of the intention to terminate at least 90 days (in the case of our company after the initial term) or 30 days (in the case of Mr. Adnani) prior to the effective date of such termination.

On March 1, 2008, the Compensation Committee ratified the approval of an increase in the monthly service agreement fee for Mr. Adnani from USD \$13,750 to USD \$19,166.67.

#### Holley Option Agreement

On March 28, 2007, we entered into the Holley Option granting us the option to acquire certain mineral property leases, which are located in the States of Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah, together with certain historical database records for total consideration of \$1,594,690. Under the terms of the Holley Option, and in order to maintain our option to acquire the assets, we are required to make the following option price payments totaling \$1,500,000 to the order and direction of the Holley Option holders in the following manner:

- (a) an initial payment of \$25,000 on the execution date (paid);
- (b) a payment of \$100,000 on March 28, 2007 (paid);
- (c) a payment of \$475,000 on or before April 27, 2007 (paid);
- (d) a further payment of \$500,000 on or before April 27, 2008 (paid); and
- (e) a final payment of \$400,000 on or before April 27, 2009.

Upon execution of the Holley Option we also reimbursed the Holley Option holders approximately \$95,000 for prior regulatory property payments having been made to the New Mexico Bureau of Land Management. In addition, we will be required to pay a royalty of 2% or 3% of the gross proceeds received from the sale of any uranium or vanadium produced in relation to any mineral claim covered under the Holley Option and, at any time during the option period or thereafter, we may elect to purchase the royalty interest at a base cost of \$300,000 for each 1% royalty interest we wish to acquire.

During the year ended July 31, 2009, we decided to terminate the Holley Option. Accordingly, \$1,176,748 in mineral rights and properties were written down to impairment.

#### Obara Builders Consulting Services Agreement

On August 15 2007, with an effective date of July 1, 2007, our Board of Directors authorized and approved the execution of the "Obara Builders Executive Services Agreement". The initial term of the agreement is two years expiring on July 1, 2009. Pursuant to the terms and provisions of the Obara Builders Ltd. Consulting Services Agreement: (i) Mr. Obara shall continue to provide duties to us commensurate with his current executive positions as our Secretary, Treasurer, Chief Financial Officer and Principal Accounting Officer; (ii) we shall pay to Obara Builders Ltd., a private company controlled by Pat Obara, or to Pat Obara personally, a monthly fee of CAD \$10,000; (iii) we approved the granting of stock options from time to time at such fair market exercise price or prices per Option Share as may be determined by our Board of Directors; and (iv) the Obara Builders Ltd. Consulting Services Agreement may be terminated without cause by either of us by providing prior written notice of the intention to terminate at least 90 days (in the case of our company after the initial term) or 30 days (in the case of Mr. Obara) prior to the effective date of such termination.

On March 1, 2008, the Compensation Committee ratified the approval of an increase in the monthly service agreement fee for Mr. Obara from CAD \$10,000 to CAD \$12,500.

114

---

#### Neutron Energy Inc. ("NEI") Agreement

On May 1, 2007, the Company entered into a Members' Agreement and Operating Agreement in respect of the Cibola property. The lease relating to the Cibola property was obtained pursuant to a letter agreement with the lessor.

#### Members' Agreement

The Members' Agreement sets forth the rights of NEI and the Company in respect of their interests in Cibola. Under the terms of the Members' Agreement, each of NEI and the Company (each a "Member") are obligated to contribute funds to Cibola to fund adopted programs and budgets in proportion to their respective interests in Cibola. NEI has been appointed as the manager to have overall management responsibility for the operations of Cibola. The Members' Agreement contains representations and warranties of each of the parties that are customary for agreements of this type. In addition, Cibola has agreed to indemnify each of NEI and the Company for losses arising as a result of any act or omission (other than willful misconduct or gross negligence) of NEI or the Company believed by them, in good faith, to be within the scope of authority conferred under the terms of the Members' Agreement. The resignation of a Member or any reduction of a Member's ownership interest in Cibola shall not relieve such Member of its share of any liability arising out of operations conducted or any other matter occurring prior to such resignation or reduction.

Upon the dissolution, liquidation or termination of Cibola, each Member shall remain liable to the other for its proportionate share of any continuing obligations arising out of or relating to Cibola for any liability. Each of NEI and the Company have granted a lien upon and a security interest in its ownership interest in Cibola to the other to secure every obligation and liability under the agreement. Neither NEI nor the Company may transfer all or any part of its rights or obligations under the agreement except with the consent of the other party. The parties have agreed that any interest or right to acquire any interest in real property or water rights within the Area of Interest (as defined in the Letter Agreement) in respect of the Cibola property that is acquired or proposed to be acquired during the term of the agreement by a Member shall be subject to the other Member's right to participate ratably in such interest.

#### Operating Agreement

The Operating Agreement sets forth terms relating to the conduct of exploration activities at the Cibola property and other matters relating to the management and operations of Cibola and otherwise. The agreement is effective for so long as the lease relating to the Cibola property remains in effect and thereafter until mining has permanently ceased

on the Cibola property. Under the terms of the Operating Agreement, Cibola has assumed from the Members all environmental liabilities relating to the Cibola property. The Operating Agreement contains provisions relating to the elimination of an interest smaller than 10% in Cibola whereby any such interest shall be relinquished and shall be deemed to have accrued automatically to the other Member. The Operating Agreement sets forth the same representations and warranties provided in the Members' Agreement. The Operating Agreement also provides for preemptive rights in the event a Member desires to transfer its interest in Cibola to a third party whereby the non-transferring Member shall have the preemptive right to acquire any interest proposed to be transferred by the transferring Member. Under the terms of the Operating Agreement, the Members are required, within 180 days of the date of the Agreement, to prepare and adopt an initial exploration program and budget and the operations of Cibola shall be conducted in accordance therewith.

The Operating Agreement provides that Cibola shall be dissolved upon the occurrence of, among other things, unanimous written consent of the Members, at the election of a Member upon 60 days notice of termination to the other Member if an annual program and budget for the nine months after the expiration of the latest adopted program and budget is not adopted, upon the resignation of a Member pursuant to the provision in that regard set forth in the agreement or upon the bankruptcy, insolvency, dissolution or assignment for the benefit of creditors of a Member. A Member may elect to resign from Cibola by giving written notice to the other Member of such resignation and, upon such resignation, the resigning Member shall be deemed to have transferred to the remaining Member all of its ownership interest in Cibola.

---

Letter Agreement

Under the terms of the letter agreement, in addition to the amounts already paid to Cebolleta, a further payment of \$2,000,000 is required to be made to Cebolleta six months after the date of the letter agreement by Cibola. In addition, every year after the date of the letter agreement until production starts at a mine on the Cibola property, Cibola is required to pay an advance royalty of \$500,000 to Cebolleta. As soon as an independent mining engineering firm completes a feasibility study with respect to the property, Cibola is required to make an additional cash payment to Cebolleta of \$1.00 times the number of pounds of recoverable uranium reserved on the property within measured and indicated mineral reserves calculated in compliance with Canadian guidelines, subject to certain adjustments.

Cibola is also required to pay to Cebolleta a gross proceeds royalty on all uranium mined from the property according to the following schedule:

Royalty Rate	Uranium Sales Price
4.50%	\$40.00 or less/lb
5.00%	\$40.01 - \$65.00/lb
5.75%	\$65.01 - \$75.00/lb
6.50%	\$75.01 - \$100.00/lb
7.00%	\$100.01 - \$125.00/lb
7.50%	\$125.01 - \$150.00/lb
8.00%	\$150.01 or more/lb

The lease is effective for a ten year term and thereafter so long as Cibola is in good faith actively conducting operations on the property. During the term of the lease, Cibola is required to pay an agreed upon dollar amount as compensation for damage to or loss of use of each acre of cultivated crops, grazing range land, improved pasture and livestock lost as a result of exploration activities on the property. Cibola is also required to provide preferential contracting and employment opportunities for members of Cebolleta and conduct a program for training members of Cebolleta and other employees in mining technology and skilled trades. Furthermore, Cibola may not use water produced on the property if such use would, in any way, diminish the amount of water available to Cebolleta or its members for domestic, agricultural, ranching and other existing uses.

#### Stairs Agreement

Effective November 1, 2007, we entered into a binding letter Agreement to Purchase Assets (the "Agreement") with Melvin O. Stairs, Jr. ("Mr. Stairs"), whereby we acquired from Mr. Stairs an undivided 100% legal, beneficial and registered interest in and to a certain mineral exploration claim represented by permit number 08-111678, which is located at T7N R3E, Section 32, in Maricopa County, Arizona (the "Mineral Claim"), together with a certain database containing various material information respecting the subject Mineral Claim (the Mineral Claim and its database, collectively, the "Assets"). As consideration for acquisition of the Assets, we have agreed to make the following payments (each a "Purchase Price Payment") and the following Mineral Claim maintenance payments (each a "Purchase Price Maintenance Payment") to Mr. Stairs in the following manner at the following times after November 1, 2007 (the "Acceptance Date"):

(a) Purchase Price Payments: pay to the order and direction of Mr. Stairs the following Purchase Price Payments in the aggregate sum of U.S. \$1,200,000 in the following manner and at the following times:

- (i) an initial and non-refundable Purchase Price Payment of U.S. \$10,000 immediately upon the Acceptance Date of the Agreement (paid);
- (ii) further non-refundable Purchase Price Payments of U.S. \$95,000 on or before January 10, 2008 (paid) and August 15, 2008; and

116

---

- (iii) further non-refundable Purchase Price Payments of U.S. \$100,000 every six months commencing on or before January 10, 2009 and ending August 15, 2013; and

(b) Purchase Price Maintenance Payments: pay, or cause to be paid, all outstanding, existing and future underlying regulatory and governmental fees, payments and assessment work required to keep the Mineral Claim interests comprising the Assets in good standing during the continuance of the Agreement and prior to our satisfaction of the entire Purchase Price consideration and including, without limitation, all permitting costs, transfer fees and any reclamation costs associated in any manner with the Mineral Claim interests comprising the Assets.

Pursuant to the terms of the Agreement, in order to secure the complete and timely payment of our purchase price obligations to Mr. Stairs under the Agreement, we granted a security interest in and to, a lien upon and a right of set-off against our right, title and interest in and to the Assets.

In addition, and pursuant to the terms of the Agreement, at any time prior to the earlier of the payment of the entire Purchase Price by us to Mr. Stairs or the termination of the Agreement for any reason, we have a right of first refusal to acquire all or any portion of any interest in the Agreement or to any mineral property interest which Mr. Stairs may have an interest in at anytime and which Mr. Stairs desires to dispose of (collectively, the "Holding"). If Mr. Stairs receives a bona fide offer to purchase from, or where a sale is solicited by Mr. Stairs, then upon settling the proposed

terms thereof with a third party for the purchase or sale of the Holding, Mr. Stairs shall offer to sell the Holding to us. The offer to sell to us shall be on the same terms and conditions and of equivalent dollar value as those contained in the offer to the third party; provided, however, that should Mr. Stairs and us fail to agree upon a determination of the equivalent dollar value for any such offer, such equivalent dollar value shall be determined by arbitration under the provisions of the Agreement. We shall be entitled to elect, by notice to Mr. Stairs within 30 calendar days from the date of receipt of the offer to sell, to acquire the Holding, on the same terms and conditions as those set forth in the offer to the third party. If we do not exercise its right to acquire the Holding, Mr. Stairs may, for a period of 60 calendar days following the last date upon which we could have made the election, dispose of the Holding, but only on the same terms and conditions as set forth in that offer.

On August 25, 2008 we entered into an amendment agreement pursuant to which the total consideration payable was reduced to \$300,000 as follows: i) a \$10,000 deposit upon execution (paid), ii) installments of \$95,000 cash on January 10, 2008 (paid) and \$57,000 cash (paid) and \$38,000 by way of issuance of 19,000 restricted common shares of the Company at a deemed price of \$2.00 per share (pending regulatory approval) on August 15, 2008, and a final payment of \$50,000 by way of cash, plus \$50,000 by way of restricted common shares of the Company at a deemed price based on the average closing price of the shares on the 5 previous days preceding the payment due date of October 31, 2009.

#### F-33 Acquisition

On November 13, 2007, we entered into an agreement to acquire certain mineral property leases located in Cibola County, New Mexico for total consideration of \$400,000. Under the terms of the agreement, we paid an initial deposit of \$100,000 upon closing with the remaining balance due in three installments of \$100,000 due on March 31, 2008 (paid), December 31, 2008, and December 31, 2009. At our option, the final two installments may be paid in stock, based on the average trading price of our common stock over the 10 days immediately preceding the due date. On December 12, 2008 we entered into an agreement amending the aforementioned underlying agreement to acquire mineral leases to the following: 1) \$5,000 on or before December 31, 2008 (paid) and \$45,000 on or before December 31, 2009. At our option, the final installment may be paid in stock, based on the average trading price of our common stock over the 10 days immediately preceding the due date.

#### ITEM 14. PRINCIPAL ACCOUNTING FEES AND SERVICES

Ernst & Young LLP serve as our independent registered public accounting firm and audited our financial statements for the fiscal years ended July 31, 2009 and 2008, and seven month period ended July 31, 2007. Dale Matheson Carr-Hilton LaBonte LLP served as our independent registered public accounting firm and audited our financial statements for the fiscal years ended December 31, 2006, 2005 and 2004. Aggregate fees for professional services rendered to us by our auditors are set forth below:

117

	Year Ended July 31, 2009	Year Ended July 31, 2008	Seven Months Ended July 31, 2007
Audit Fees	\$ 183,975	\$ 177,000	\$ 98,500
	3,559	16,250	-

Audit-Related  
Fees

Tax Fees	30,198	-	16,100
Total	\$ 217,732	\$ 193,250	\$ 114,600

Audit Fees.

Aggregate fees for professional services in connection with the audit of our annual financial statements and the quarterly reviews of our financial statements included in our quarterly reports.

Audit-Related Fees.

Our auditors provided audit-related services to us in connection with the review of other regulatory filings.

Tax Fees.

Our auditors did not provide tax preparation services.

All Other Fees.

Our auditors did not provide any other services to us other than those described above.

Pre-Approval of Services by the Independent Auditor

The Audit Committee is responsible for the pre-approval of audit and permitted non-audit services to be performed by the Company's independent auditor, Ernst & Young LLP. The Audit Committee will, on an annual basis, consider and, if appropriate, approve the provision of audit and non-audit services by Ernst & Young LLP. Thereafter, the Audit Committee will, as necessary, consider and, if appropriate, approve the provision of additional audit and non-audit services by Ernst & Young LLP which are not encompassed by the Audit Committee's annual pre-approval and are not prohibited by law. The Audit Committee has delegated to the Chair of the Audit Committee the authority to pre-approve, on a case-by-case basis, non-audit services to be performed by Ernst & Young LLP. The Audit Committee has approved all of the audit and permitted non-audit services performed by Ernst & Young LLP in the year ended July 31, 2009.

ITEM 15. EXHIBITS

The following exhibits are filed with this Annual Report on Form 10-K:

Exhibit Number	Description of Exhibit
3.1	Articles of Incorporation, as amended <sup>(1)</sup>
3.1.1	Certificate of Amendment to Articles of Incorporation <sup>(2)</sup>
3.2	Bylaws <sup>(1)</sup>

Edgar Filing: URANIUM ENERGY CORP - Form 10-K

- 3.3 Audit Committee Charter<sup>(1)</sup>
- 3.4 Ethics Charter<sup>(1)</sup>
- 10.1 Consulting Agreement between Uranium Energy Corp. and Randall Reneau<sup>(3)</sup>
- 10.2 Mineral Asset Option Agreement<sup>(3)</sup>
- 10.3 Agreement and Addendum between Harry A. Moore Trust and Uranium Energy Corp.<sup>(4)</sup>
- 10.4 Financial Consulting Services Agreement between Uranium Energy Corp. and International Market Trend AG<sup>(5)</sup>
- 10.5 Harry A. Moore Trust Agreement<sup>(5)</sup>
- 10.6 Amending Agreement to Employment Agreement between Uranium Energy Corp. and Harry Anthony<sup>(6)</sup>
- 10.7 Consulting Services and Right of First Refusal Agreement between Uranium Energy Corp. and Jim Knupke<sup>(5)</sup>
- 10.8 Corporate Relations Consulting Services Agreement between Uranium Energy Corp. and Michael Baybak and Corp. Inc.<sup>(5)</sup>
- 10.9 Corporate Finance Consulting Services Agreement between Uranium Energy Corp. and Eurotrade Management Group Ltd.<sup>(5)</sup>
- 10.10 Executive Services Agreement between Uranium Energy Corp. and Amir Adnani<sup>(6)</sup>
- 10.11 Reneau Services Agreement between Uranium Energy Corp. and Randall Reneau<sup>(6)</sup>
- 10.12 Uranium Mining Lease among Uranium Energy Corp., John G. Jebsen and John Triantis<sup>(7)</sup>
- 10.13 Consulting Agreement dated February 1, 2007 between the Company and Epoch Financial Group Inc. <sup>(12)</sup>
- 10.14 Web Services Agreement dated March 21, 2007 between the Company and Market Pathways Financial Relations Inc.<sup>(12)</sup>
- 10.15 Letter Option Agreement dated March 28, 2007 between the Company and Betty, Fred and Marty Holley<sup>(12)</sup>
- 10.16 Consulting Agreement dated March 29, 2007 between the Company and EuroXchange Consulting Ltd.<sup>(12)</sup>
- 10.17 Database Agreement dated April 4, 2007 between the Company and Paul Pierce<sup>(12)</sup>
- 10.18 Letter Agreement between La Merced del Pueblo de Cebolleta and Neutron Energy, Inc.<sup>(11)</sup>
- 10.19 Limited Liability Company Members' Agreement of Cibola Resources LLC between Neutron Energy, Inc. and Uranium Energy Corp.<sup>(11)</sup>

Edgar Filing: URANIUM ENERGY CORP - Form 10-K

- 10.20 Limited Liability Company Members' Agreement of Cibola Resources LLC between Neutron Energy, Inc. and Uranium Energy Corp.<sup>(11)</sup>
- 10.21 Agency Agreement between Uranium Energy Corp. and National Bank Financial Inc., RBC Dominion Securities Inc. and Canaccord Capital Corporation dated December 12, 2007  
(17)
- 10.22 Registration Rights Agreement dated December 12, 2007 between Uranium Energy Corp. and National Bank Financial Inc.  
(17)
- 10.23 Form of Subscription Agreement between Uranium Energy Corp. and certain selling stockholders  
(17)
- 10.24 Form of Warrant Certificate  
(17)
- 10.25 Form of Registration Rights Agreement between Uranium Energy Corp. and the subscribers of the July 2008 Units  
(18)
- 10.26 Form of Subscription Agreement between Uranium Energy Corp. and the subscribers of the July 2008 Units  
(18)
- 10.27 Form of Warrant Certificate provided by Uranium Energy Corp. to the subscribers of the July 2008 Units  
(18)
- 10.28 Consulting Services Agreement between Uranium Energy Corp. and Obara Builders Ltd.  
(14)
- 10.29 Amendment and Extension to Executive Services Agreement between Uranium Energy Corp. and Amir Adnani <sup>(15)</sup>
- 10.30 Agreement to Purchase Assets between the Uranium Energy Corp. and Melvin O. Stairs, Jr.  
(16)
- 10.31 2005 Stock Option Plan of Uranium Energy Corp.<sup>(8)</sup>
- 10.32 Amended 2005 Stock Option Plan<sup>(9)</sup>
- 10.33 2006 Stock Incentive Plan of Uranium Energy Corp.<sup>(10)</sup>



Edgar Filing: URANIUM ENERGY CORP - Form 10-K

- 10.34 Option and Joint Venture Letter Agreement between Uran Limited and the Company dated January 14, 2009<sup>(19)</sup>
- 10.35 Variation Agreement between Uran Limited and the Company dated May 28, 2009<sup>(20)</sup>
- 10.36 Mineral Property Option and Joint Venture Agreement between the Company and Strategic Resources Inc.<sup>(21)</sup>
- 10.37 Further Amended and Restated Executive Services Agreement with Amir Adnani Corp. dated July 23, 2009<sup>(22)</sup>
- 10.38 Further Amended and Restated Executive Services Agreement with Harry L. Anthony dated July 23, 2009<sup>(22)</sup>
- 10.39 Form of Warrant Certificate<sup>(23)</sup>
- 10.40 2009 Stock Incentive Plan<sup>(24)</sup>
- 23.1 Consent of Independent Auditors, Ernst & Young, LLP, filed herewith as an exhibit
- 31.1 Certification of Chief Executive Officer pursuant to Securities Exchange Act of 1934 Rule 13a-14(a) or 15d-14(a) , filed herewith as an exhibit
- 31.2 Certification of Chief Financial Officer pursuant to Securities Exchange Act of 1934 Rule 13a-14(a) or 15d-14(a) , filed herewith as an exhibit
- 32.1 Certification of Principal Executive Officer and Principal Financial Officer pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 1350, filed herewith as an exhibit

1. Incorporated by reference to our Registration Statement on Form SB-2 filed with the SEC on August 4, 2005.
2. Incorporated by reference to our Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the SEC on February 9, 2006.
3. Incorporated by reference to the amendment to our Registration Statement on Form SB-2 filed with the SEC on November 9, 2005.
4. Incorporated by reference to our Current Report on Form 8-K as filed with the SEC on December 21, 2005.
5. Incorporated by reference to our Annual Report on Form 10-KSB for the year ended December 31, 2005 filed with the SEC on April 13, 2006.
6. Incorporated by reference to our Registration Statement on Form SB-2 filed with the SEC on October 4, 2006.
7. Incorporated by reference to our Quarterly Report on Form 10-QSB filed with the SEC on August 21, 2006.

Edgar Filing: URANIUM ENERGY CORP - Form 10-K

8. Incorporated by reference to our Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the SEC on December 21, 2005.
9. Incorporated by reference to our Quarterly Report on Form 10-QSB filed with the SEC on May 15, 2006.
10. Incorporated by reference to our Quarterly Report on Form 10-QSB filed with the SEC on November 20, 2006.
11. Incorporated by reference to our Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the SEC on May 4, 2007.
12. Incorporated by reference to our Registration Statement on Form SB-2/A filed with the SEC on May 14, 2007.
13. Incorporated by reference to our Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the SEC on June 13, 2007.
14. Incorporated by reference to our Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the SEC on October 9, 2007.
15. Incorporated by reference to our Annual Report on Form 10-KSB filed with the SEC on October 29, 2007.
16. Incorporated by reference to our Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the SEC on November 6, 2007.
17. Incorporated by reference to our Registration Statement on Form S-1 filed with the SEC on February 12, 2008.
18. Incorporated by reference to our Registration Statement on Form S-1 filed with the SEC on July 29, 2008.
19. Incorporated by reference to our Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the SEC on January 16, 2009.
20. Incorporated by reference to our Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the SEC on May 28, 2009.
21. Incorporated by reference to our Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the SEC on June 9, 2009.
22. Incorporated by reference to our Current Report on Form 8-K filed with the SEC on July 23, 2009.
23. Incorporated by reference to our Registration Statement on Form S-3 filed with the SEC on July 14, 2009.
24. Incorporated by reference to our Registration Statement on Form S-8 filed with the SEC on October 1, 2009.

---

SIGNATURES

Pursuant to the requirements of Section 13 and 15 (d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the registrant has duly caused this report to be signed on its behalf by the undersigned, thereunto duly authorized.

U R A N I U M  
ENERGY CORP.

By: /s/ Amir  
Adnani  
Amir Adnani  
President, Chief  
Executive Officer  
and a director  
Date: October

14, 2009.

In accordance with the Exchange Act, this report has been signed below by the following persons on behalf of the registrant and in the capacities and on the dates indicated.

By: /s/ Amir  
Adnani  
Amir Adnani  
President, Chief  
Executive Officer  
and a director  
Date: October

14, 2009.

By: /s/ Pat Obara  
Pat Obara  
Secretary, Treasurer and Chief Financial Officer  
Date: October

14, 2009.

By: /s/ Alan P. Lindsay  
Alan P. Lindsay  
Chairman and a director  
Date: October

14, 2009.

By: /s/ Harry L. Anthony  
Harry L. Anthony  
Chief Operating Officer and a director

Date: October

14, 2009.

By: /s/ Ivan Obolensky

Ivan Obolensky

A director

Date: October

14, 2009.

By: /s/ Erik Essiger

Erik Essiger

A director

Date: October

14, 2009.

By: /s/ Vincent Della Volpe

Vincent Della Volpe

A director

Date: October

14, 2009.

By: /s/ Mark Katsumata

Mark Katsumata

A director

Date: October

14, 2009.

---