

No Act

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



13000244

Received SEC
~~XXXXXXXXXX~~
Washington, DC 20549

P.E. 1/9/13

January 14, 2013

Taavi Annus
Bryan Cave LLP
taavi.annus@bryancave.com

Act: 1934
Section: _____
Rule: 14a-8
Public _____
Availability: 1/14/13

Re: Express Scripts Holding Company

Dear Mr. Annus:

This is in regard to your letter dated January 9, 2013 concerning the shareholder proposal submitted by the AFL-CIO Reserve Fund for inclusion in Express Scripts' proxy materials for its upcoming annual meeting of security holders. Your letter indicates that the proponent has withdrawn the proposal, and that Express Scripts therefore withdraws its January 7, 2013 request for a no-action letter from the Division. Because the matter is now moot, we will have no further comment.

Copies of all of the correspondence related to this matter will be made available on our website at <http://www.sec.gov/divisions/corpfin/cf-noaction/14a-8.shtml>. For your reference, a brief discussion of the Division's informal procedures regarding shareholder proposals is also available at the same website address.

Sincerely,

Mark F. Vilardo
Special Counsel

cc: Brandon J. Rees
Office of Investment
American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations
815 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006

Received SEC
JAN 14 2013
Washington, DC 20549



Taavi Annus
 Direct: 314-259-2037
 Fax: 314-552-8037
 taavi.annus@bryancave.com

January 9, 2013

VIA E-MAIL (shareholderproposals@sec.gov)

U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission
 Division of Corporation Finance
 Office of Chief Counsel
 101 F Street, N.E.
 Washington, DC 20549

Re: Withdrawal of No-Action Request Regarding the Stockholder Proposal
 Submitted by AFL-CIO Reserve Fund


Ladies and Gentlemen:

In a letter dated January 7, 2013 (the "No-Action Request"), Express Scripts Holding Company (the "Company") requested confirmation that the staff of the Division of Corporation Finance would not recommend enforcement action if the Company omitted from its proxy materials for the Company's 2013 Annual Meeting of Stockholders the proposal (the "Proposal") submitted by the AFL-CIO Reserve Fund (the "Proponent") pursuant to Rule 14a-8 under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, for inclusion in the proxy materials for the 2013 Annual Meeting.

Attached as Exhibit A is a copy of the letter dated January 8, 2013, from the Proponent voluntarily withdrawing the Proposal. In reliance on this letter, the Company hereby withdraws the No-Action Request relating to the Proposal.

If you have any questions or would like any additional information regarding the foregoing, please do not hesitate to contact me at 314-259-2037 or R. Randall Wang at 314-259-2149.

Sincerely,



Taavi Annus

Bryan Cave LLP
 One Metropolitan Square
 211 North Broadway
 Suite 3800
 St. Louis, MO 63102-2750
 Tel (314) 259-2000
 Fax (314) 259-2020
 www.bryancave.com

Bryan Cave Offices

- Atlanta
- Boulder
- Charlotte
- Chicago
- Colorado Springs
- Dallas
- Denver
- Frankfurt
- Hamburg
- Hong Kong
- Irvine
- Jefferson City
- Kansas City
- London
- Los Angeles
- New York
- Paris
- Phoenix
- San Francisco
- Shanghai
- Singapore
- St. Louis
- Washington, DC

Bryan Cave
 International Consulting
 A TRADE AND CUSTOMS CONSULTANCY
 www.bryancaveconsulting.com

- Bangkok
- Beijing
- Jakarta
- Kuala Lumpur
- Manila
- Shanghai
- Singapore
- Tokyo

Bryan Cave LLP

Office of Chief Counsel
January 9, 2013
Page 2

Enclosures

cc: Mr. Brandon J. Rees (AFL-CIO) (via facsimile)
Keith J. Ebling, Esq. (Express Scripts Holding Company)

Exhibit A

Notice of Voluntary Withdrawal

See attached

American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations



815 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 637-5000
www.aflcio.org

RICHARD L. TRUMKA
PRESIDENT

Michael Sacco
Robert A. Scardelletti
Clyde Rhoads
William Rhee
Nancy Wohlfarth
Matthew Loeb
Diane Woodard
D. Michael Langford
John W. Wehrin
Bob King
Mario Elena Durazo
Citi Guitley
Joseph J. Negro
Laura Reyes

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL
ELIZABETH H. SHULER
SECRETARY-TREASURER

Frank Hunn
R. Thomas Puffenberger
Cecil Roberts
John Gage
James O. Little
Randy Whingarten
Patrick D. Finley
Robert McStrath
Ken Howard
General Hoffeld
Terry O'Sullivan
Lawrence J. Hanley
James Callahan

ARLENE HOLY BAKER
EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT

Michael Goodwin
Harold Schanberger
Leo W. Gerardi
LWV Cohen
Rose Ann DeMoro
Rogelio "Roy" A. Flores
Malcolm B. Fufhey Jr.
Roberta Reardon
James Boland
Leo A. Saunders
Veda Snook
Loretta Johnson
Demaurice Smith

William Lucy
Edwin C. Hill
James Williams
Gregory J. Junemann
Fred Richmond
Fruenka V. Rolando
Newton S. Jones
Saidemar Velazquez
Bruce F. Smith
James Andrews
Walter W. Wise
Capt. Lee Moak
Sean McCarvey

January 8, 2013

Sent via Fax and US Mail

Martin Akins
Vice President & Deputy General Counsel
Express Scripts Holding Company
One Express Way
St. Louis, MO, 63121 United States

Dear Mr. Akins,

On behalf of the AFL-CIO Reserve Fund, I am writing to withdraw our previously submitted shareholder proposal recommending that Express Scripts' Compensation Committee adopt a policy requiring that senior executives retain a significant percentage of the shares they receive through equity compensation programs until they reach normal retirement age.

If you have any questions, please contact Vineeta Anand at 202-637-5182.

Sincerely,

Brandon J. Rees, Acting Director
Office of Investment

BJR/sdw
opelu #2, afl-cio

Attachment



Taavi Annus
Associate
Direct: 314-259-2037
Fax: 314-552-8037
taavi.annus@bryancave.com

Securities Exchange Act of 1934 / Rule 14a-8

January 7, 2013

VIA E-MAIL (shareholderproposals@sec.gov)

Office of Chief Counsel
Division of Corporate Finance
U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission
100 F Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20549

Re: Express Scripts Holding Company – Omission of Stockholder Proposal Submitted by AFL-CIO Reserve Fund.

Ladies and Gentlemen:

This letter is to inform you, in accordance with Rule 14a-8(j) under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (the “Exchange Act”), that our client, Express Scripts Holding Company, a Delaware corporation (the “Company” or “Express Scripts”), intends to omit from its proxy statement (the “2013 Proxy Statement”) for its 2013 annual meeting of stockholders a stockholder proposal submitted by AFL-CIO Reserve Fund (the “Proponent”) under cover of letter dated December 18, 2012 (the “Proposal”). A copy of the Proposal, together with Proponent’s supporting materials, is attached hereto as Exhibit A. Included in Exhibit A is a letter from AmalgaTrust, submitted by the Proponent together with the Proposal, with which the Proponent purported to provide proof of its continuous ownership of Express Scripts Holding Company shares (the “Share Ownership Letter”). Following receipt of the Proposal, the Company advised the Proponent of its failure to satisfy eligibility requirements of Rule 14a-8 by a letter dated December 20, 2012 (the “Deficiency Notice”). The Deficiency Notice further pointed out that the proposed resolution of the Proposal requested action by the stockholders of “Express Scripts Holding Inc.” and not Express Scripts Holding Company. The Company did not receive a response to the Deficiency Notice. All relevant correspondence is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

The Company requests confirmation that the Staff of the Division of Corporation Finance (the “Staff”) of the Securities and Exchange Commission (the

Bryan Cave LLP
One Metropolitan Square
211 North Broadway
Suite 3600
St. Louis, MO 63102-2750
Tel (314) 259-2000
Fax (314) 259-2020
www.bryancave.com

Bryan Cave Offices

Atlanta
Charlotte
Chicago
Dallas
Hamburg
Hong Kong
Irvine
Jefferson City
Kansas City
London
Los Angeles
New York
Paris
Phoenix
San Francisco
Shanghai
Singapore
St. Louis
Washington, DC

Bryan Cave
International Consulting
A TRADE AND CUSTOMS CONSULTANCY
www.bryancaveconsulting.com

Bangkok
Beijing
Jakarta
Kuala Lumpur
Manila
Shanghai
Singapore
Tokyo

Office of Chief Counsel
January 7, 2013
Page 2

“Commission”) will not recommend any enforcement action if the Company omits the Proposal from the 2013 Proxy Statement.

The Company expects to file its definitive 2013 Proxy Statement with the Commission on or about March 29, 2013, and this letter is being submitted more than 80 calendar days before such date in accordance with Rule 14a-8(j). In accordance with Section C of Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14D (Nov. 7, 2008) (“SLB 14D”), this letter and its exhibits are being e-mailed to the Staff at shareholdersproposals@sec.gov. In accordance with Rule 14a-8(j), a copy of this submission is being forwarded simultaneously to the Proponent.

Pursuant to Rule 14a-8(k) and SLB 14D, the Proponent is requested to copy the undersigned on any correspondence it may choose to make to the Staff.

I. The Proposal

The Proposal relates to the retention of shares acquired through equity compensation programs. The full text of the Proposal and the supporting statement is included in Exhibit A hereto.

II. The Proponent Failed to Provide the Information Necessary to Determine Its Eligibility to Submit a Stockholder Proposal in Accordance with Rule 14a-8(b).

The Company may exclude the Proposal under Rule 14a-8(f)(1) because the Proponent failed to provide sufficient information regarding its eligibility to submit the Proposal in accordance with Rule 14a-8(b). Rule 14a-8(b) provides, in part, that “[i]n order to be eligible to submit a proposal, [a stockholder] must have continuously held at least \$2,000 in market value, or 1%, of the Company’s securities entitled to be voted on the proposal at the meeting for at least one year by the date [the stockholder] submit[s] the proposal.” The Staff has stated in Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14 (July 13, 2001) that when a stockholder is not the registered holder of the company’s securities, the stockholder “is responsible for proving his or her eligibility to submit a proposal to the company.”

Express Scripts Holding Company was incorporated, under the name Aristotle Holding, Inc. on July 15, 2011, solely for the purpose of facilitating a series of mergers (the “Mergers”) involving, among other entities, Express Scripts, Inc. and Medco Health Solutions, Inc. (“Medco”), two publicly traded companies at the time. Following the consummation of the Mergers on April 2, 2012, Express Scripts, Inc. and Medco became wholly owned subsidiaries of Express Scripts Holding Company, which remained the sole publicly traded company. The shares of Express Scripts, Inc. were converted into shares of Express Scripts Holding Company, and the shares of Medco were converted into shares of Express Scripts Holding Company and the right to receive a cash payment. The issuance of the Express Scripts Holding Company shares was completed pursuant to a registration statement on Form S-4 filed by Express Scripts Holding Company.

The Proponent submitted the Proposal to the Company on December 18, 2012, together with the Share Ownership Letter. The Share Ownership Letter included the following statements:

“AmalgaTrust, a division of Amalgamated Bank of Chicago, is the record holder of 602 shares of common stock (the “Shares”) of

Office of Chief Counsel
January 7, 2013
Page 3

Express Scripts Holding Company beneficially owned by the AFL CIO Reserve Fund as of December 18, 2012. The AFL-CIO Reserve Fund has continuously held at least \$2,000 in market value of the Shares for over one year as of December 18, 2012.”

In light of the timing of the Mergers, the Company advised the Proponent in the Deficiency Notice that the Proponent could not have held Express Scripts Holding Company stock prior to April 2, 2012. The Company noted in the Deficiency Notice:

We believe the Fund is not itself a record holder of Express Scripts stock. We have received a letter dated December 18, 2012 from AmalgaTrust indicating that as of December 18, 2012, the Fund held 602 shares of Express Scripts Holding Company stock, and has held in excess of \$2,000 worth of such shares continuously for over one year.

As you may know, before the mergers involving Express Scripts, Inc. and Medco Health Solutions, Inc. that were consummated on April 2, 2012 (the “Mergers”), Express Scripts Holding Company was a wholly-owned subsidiary of Express Scripts, Inc. Express Scripts Holding Company was formed in connection with the Mergers and became the publicly traded company on April 2, 2012. Considering that Express Scripts Holding Company was not a publicly traded company until after April 2, 2012, we do not believe that you could have held Express Scripts Holding Company stock from December 18, 2011 until that date.

While we do not acknowledge that the Fund can satisfy the Rule 14a-8 eligibility requirements in light of the timing of the Mergers (which took place less than one year ago), we are asking you to provide proof of eligibility if you believe the Fund can satisfy the requirements of Rule 14a-8. Under Rule 14a-8(b), proof can be provided in one of two ways: (i) submitting to Express Scripts a written statement from the “record” holder of Express Scripts common stock (usually a broker or bank) verifying that the Fund has continuously for one year held the requisite number of shares of Express Scripts Holding Company common stock as of December 18, 2012, or (ii) by submitting to Express Scripts a copy of a Schedule 13D, Schedule 13G, Form 3, Form 4 or Form 5 filed by the Fund with the Securities and Exchange Commission that demonstrates its ownership of the requisite number of shares as of or before December 18, 2012, in each case along with a written statement that (i) the Fund has owned such shares for the one year period prior to and including the date of the statement and (ii) the Fund intends to continue ownership of the shares through the date of the annual

Office of Chief Counsel
January 7, 2013
Page 4

meeting. Our request for proof of eligibility under Rule 14a-8 is not an acknowledgement that, in light of the Mergers, you will be able to satisfy the eligibility requirements.

The Company invited the Proponent to provide additional proof of its eligibility to submit the Proposal under Rule 14a-8(b).

The Proponent has not responded to the Deficiency Notice. The Company has not been provided with any evidence that the Proponent held either Express Scripts, Inc. or Medco shares prior to April 2, 2012 and the Proponent has completely failed to address the fact that Express Scripts Holding Company securities have been trading only since April 2, 2012.

The Staff has consistently concurred that a stockholder proposal may be excluded from a company's proxy materials when the proponent fails to provide satisfactory evidence of eligibility to submit the stockholder proposal in accordance with Rule 14a-8(b). This applies when the proof of ownership references a wrong entity. *See, e.g., International Business Machines Corp.* (Jan. 22, 2010) (proof of ownership letter statement that the proponent held the required number of "Company" shares not sufficient to prove ownership, where the letter references both IBM, the relevant company, and Mylan, an irrelevant company); *Aluminum Company of America* (Mar. 27, 1987) (proof of ownership letter reference to "Alco. Std. Corp." not sufficient to prove ownership of Alcoa or Aluminum Company of America securities); and *Coca-Cola Company* (Feb. 4, 2008) (proof of ownership of "Great Neck Capital Appreciation Investment Partnership, L.P." not sufficient to prove ownership by the entity submitting the proposal, Great Neck Capital Appreciation LTD Partnership). It has been a long-standing position of the Staff that, if, in connection with a merger, a shareholder receives securities of the surviving company in a registered transaction, then the one-year holding period of such securities for purposes of Rule 14a-8(b) begins as of the date when the securities themselves are issued at the closing of the merger. *See, e.g., ConocoPhillips* (several no-action letters dated March 24, 2003) (involving a similar merger structure as the Mergers); *AT&T Inc.* (Jan. 18, 2007); *Exelon* (March 15, 2001); and *Burlington Northern Santa Fe Corporation* (Dec. 28, 1995). However, we believe that there is no need to consider the applicability of such precedents to the present situation. The Proponent did not provide sufficient proof of ownership relating to the securities that were exchanged for the Express Scripts Holding Company securities in connection with the Mergers. Accordingly, there is no need to address the question whether the Proponent could have tacked the holding period of any such formerly held securities to the holding period of Express Scripts Holding Company shares following the consummation of the Mergers on April 2, 2012.

Since the Proponent failed to provide sufficient documentary evidence of ownership of the Company's securities between December 18, 2011 and April 2, 2012, the Proponent has not demonstrated its eligibility to submit a stockholder proposal in accordance with Rule 14a-8.

Accordingly, we ask that the Staff concur that the Company may exclude the Proposal from its 2013 Proxy Statement pursuant to Rule 14a-8(b) and that it will not recommend any enforcement action to the Commission if the Company excludes the Proposal for the reasons stated above.


Office of Chief Counsel
January 7, 2013
Page 5

III. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the Company respectfully requests that the Staff confirm that it would not recommend enforcement action if the Company omits the Proposal from its 2013 Proxy Statement.

If you have any questions or require any additional information, please do not hesitate to call me at 314-259-2037 or R. Randall Wang at 314-259-2149. If the Staff is unable to agree with our conclusions without additional information or discussions, we respectfully request the opportunity to confer with members of the Staff prior to issuance of any written response to this letter.

Sincerely,



Taavi Annus

Enclosures

cc: Mr. Brandon J. Rees (AFL-CIO)
Keith J. Ebling, Esq. (Express Scripts Holding Company)

Exhibit A

Proposal

See attached

American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations



815 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 637-5000
www.aflcio.org

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

RICHARD L. TRUMKA
PRESIDENT

Michael Sacco
Robert A. Scardaleth
Clyde Rivers
William Hite
Nancy Wornforth
Matthew Loeb
Dawn Woodard
D. Michael Langford
John W. Wilhelm
Bob King
Maria Elena Durazo
Cliff Guffy
Joseph J. Nigro
Laura Hayes

ELIZABETH H. SHULER
SECRETARY-TREASURER

Frank Hun
R. Thomas Battenbarger
Cecil Roberts
John Gage
James C. Little
Randy Weingarten
Patrick D. Finley
Robert McElrath
Ken Howard
Geneva Hollifield
Terry O'Sullivan
Lawrence J. Hanley
James Cashan

ARLENE HOLT BAKER
EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT

Michael Goodwin
Harold Scheiberger
Leo W. Gerard
Larry Cohen
Rose Ann DeMoro
Regelia "Roy" A. Flores
Malcolm B. Futhy Jr.
Robert Beardon
James Boland
Lee A. Saunders
Vada Snook
Lynette Johnson
DeMaurice Smith

William Lucy
Edwin D. Hill
James Williams
Gregory J. Junemann
Fred Redmond
Fredric V. Rolando
Newton B. Jones
Balasmer Velazquez
Bruce R. Smith
James Andrews
Walter W. Wise
Capt. Lee Mosk
Sean McGarvey

December 18, 2012

Sent via Fax and UPS

Keith J. Ebling
Executive Vice President, General Counsel and Corporate Secretary
Express Scripts Holding Company
1 Express Way
St. Louis, MO, 63121

Dear Mr. Ebling,

On behalf of the AFL-CIO Reserve Fund (the "Fund"), I write to give notice that pursuant to the 2012 proxy statement of Express Scripts Holding Company (the "Company"), the Fund intends to present the attached proposal (the "Proposal") at the 2013 annual meeting of shareholders (the "Annual Meeting"). The Fund requests that the Company include the Proposal in the Company's proxy statement for the Annual Meeting.

The Fund is the beneficial owner of 602 shares of voting common stock (the "Shares") of the Company. The Fund has held at least \$2,000 in market value of the Shares for over one year, and the Fund intends to hold at least \$2,000 in market value of the Shares through the date of the Annual Meeting. A letter from the Fund's custodian bank documenting the Fund's ownership of the Shares is enclosed.

The Proposal is attached. I represent that the Fund or its agent intends to appear in person or by proxy at the Annual Meeting to present the Proposal. I declare that the Fund has no "material interest" other than that believed to be shared by stockholders of the Company generally. We look forward to the opportunity to discuss the content of the Proposal with you. Please direct all questions or communication regarding the Proposal to Vineeta Anand at 202-637-5182.

Sincerely,

Brandon J. Rees, Acting Director
Office of Investment

BJR/sdw
opelu #2, afl-cio
Attachment

RESOLVED: Shareholders of Express Scripts Holding Inc. (the "Company") urge the Compensation Committee of the Board of Directors (the "Committee") to adopt a policy requiring that senior executives retain a significant percentage of shares acquired through equity compensation programs until reaching normal retirement age. For the purpose of this policy, normal retirement age shall be defined by the Company's qualified retirement plan that has the largest number of plan participants. The shareholders recommend that the Committee adopt a share retention percentage requirement of at least 75 percent of net after-tax shares. The policy should prohibit hedging transactions for shares subject to this policy which are not sales but reduce the risk of loss to the executive. This policy shall supplement any other share ownership requirements that have been established for senior executives, and should be implemented so as not to violate the Company's existing contractual obligations or the terms of any compensation or benefit plan currently in effect.

SUPPORTING STATEMENT:

Equity-based compensation is an important component of senior executive compensation at our Company. While we encourage the use of equity-based compensation for senior executives, we are concerned that our Company's senior executives are generally free to sell shares received from our Company's equity compensation plans. Our proposal seeks to better link executive compensation with long-term performance by requiring a meaningful share retention ratio for shares received by senior executives from the Company's equity compensation plans.

Requiring senior executives to hold a significant percentage of shares obtained through equity compensation plans until they reach retirement age will better align the interests of executives with the interests of shareholders and the Company. A 2009 report by the Conference Board Task Force on Executive Compensation observed that such hold-through-retirement requirements give executives "an ever growing incentive to focus on long-term stock price performance as the equity subject to the policy increases" (http://www.conference-board.org/pdf_free/ExecCompensation2009.pdf).

In our opinion, the Company's current share ownership guidelines for its senior executives do not go far enough to ensure that the Company's equity compensation plans continue to build stock ownership by senior executives over the long-term. We believe that requiring senior executives to only hold shares equal to a set target loses effectiveness over time. After satisfying these target holding requirements, senior executives are free to sell all the additional shares they receive in equity compensation.

For example, our Company's share ownership guidelines require the Chief Executive Officer (the "CEO") to hold shares equal to only five times base salary, or approximately \$5.6 million in 2011. In comparison, in 2011 our Company granted the CEO performance stock, restricted stock units and stock options with an aggregate fair value totaling \$7.2 million. In other words, one year's worth of equity awards may be more than sufficient to satisfy the Company's share ownership guidelines for the CEO.

We urge shareholders to vote **FOR** this proposal.

One West Monroe
Chicago, Illinois 60603-6301
Fax 312/267-8775



December 18, 2012

Keith J. Ebling
Executive Vice President, General Counsel and Corporate Secretary
Express Scripts Holding Company
1 Express Way
St. Louis, MO, 63121 United States

Dear Mr. Ebling,

AmalgaTrust, a division of Amalgamated Bank of Chicago, is the record holder of 602 shares of common stock (the "Shares") of Express Scripts Holding Company beneficially owned by the AFL-CIO Reserve Fund as of December 18, 2012. The AFL-CIO Reserve Fund has continuously held at least \$2,000 in market value of the Shares for over one year as of December 18, 2012. The Shares are held by AmalgaTrust at the Depository Trust Company in our participant account No. 2567.

If you have any questions concerning this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me at (312) 822-3220.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Lawrence M. Kaplan".

Lawrence M. Kaplan
Vice President

cc: Brandon J. Rees
Acting Director, AFL-CIO Office of Investment

Exhibit B

Correspondence Regarding Proposal

See attached.



EXPRESS SCRIPTS®

December 20, 2012

VIA COURIER AND FAX (202-508-6992)

Mr. Brandon J. Rees
Acting Director, Office of Investment
American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations
815 Sixteenth Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20006

Dear Mr. Rees:

We acknowledge receipt on December 18, 2012 of your letter dated December 18, 2012 and accompanying shareholder proposal, submitted on behalf of the AFL-CIO Reserve Fund (the "Fund") to Express Scripts Holding Company, relating to the retention of shares acquired through executive compensation programs by senior executives (the "Proposal"). We note that the Proposal references "Express Scripts Holding, Inc." and ask you to revise the Proposal so that the reference is changed to Express Scripts Holding Company.

Rule 14a-8(b) under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, provides that in order to be eligible to submit a proposal a shareholder "must have continuously held at least \$2,000 in market value, or 1%, of the company's securities entitled to be voted on the proposal at the meeting for at least one year" by the date on which the proposal is submitted. If Rule 14a-8(b)'s eligibility requirements are not met, we may, pursuant to Rule 14a-8(f), exclude the proposal from our proxy statement.

We believe the Fund is not itself a record holder of Express Scripts stock. We have received a letter dated December 18, 2012 from AmalgaTrust indicating that as of December 18, 2012, the Fund held 602 shares of Express Scripts Holding Company stock, and has held in excess of \$2,000 worth of such shares continuously for over one year.

As you may know, before the mergers involving Express Scripts, Inc. and Medco Health Solutions, Inc. that were consummated on April 2, 2012 (the "Mergers"), Express Scripts Holding Company was a wholly-owned subsidiary of Express Scripts, Inc. Express Scripts Holding Company was formed in connection with the Mergers and became a publicly traded company and the parent company of Express Scripts, Inc. on April 2, 2012. Considering that Express Scripts Holding Company was not a publicly traded company until after April 2, 2012, we do not believe that you could have held Express Scripts Holding Company stock from December 18, 2011 until that date.

While we do not acknowledge that the Fund can satisfy the Rule 14a-8 eligibility requirements in light of the timing of the Mergers (which took place less than one year ago), we are asking you to provide proof of eligibility if you believe the Fund can satisfy the requirements of Rule 14a-8. Under Rule 14a-8(b), proof can be provided in one of two ways: (i) submitting to Express Scripts a written statement from the "record" holder of Express Scripts common stock (usually a broker or bank) verifying that the Fund has continuously for one year held the requisite number of shares of Express Scripts Holding Company common stock as of December 18, 2012, or (ii) by submitting to

IMANAGE200820.1-P074596

One Express Way • St. Louis, MO 63121 • 314.996.0900 • www.express-scripts.com

LT#RD310

Express Scripts a copy of a Schedule 13D, Schedule 13G, Form 3, Form 4 or Form 5 filed by the Fund with the Securities and Exchange Commission that demonstrates its ownership of the requisite number of shares as of or before December 18, 2012, in each case along with a written statement that (i) the Fund has owned such shares for the one year period prior to and including the date of the statement and (ii) the Fund intends to continue ownership of the shares through the date of the annual meeting. Our request for proof of eligibility under Rule 14a-8 is not an acknowledgement that, in light of the Mergers, you will be able to satisfy the eligibility requirements.

In light of recent guidance issued by the Staff of the Securities and Exchange Commission, if you intend to verify ownership by a letter from a broker or bank through which the Fund holds its shares, that broker or bank must either be (i) a registered holder of common stock of Express Scripts as reflected in our records or (ii) a participant in the Depository Trust Company ("DTC") or an "affiliate" of such participant. See Staff Legal Bulletins Nos. 14F and 14G. You may obtain a copy of DTC's participant list online at www.dtcc.com.

Unless we receive further evidence that the Fund has satisfied the eligibility requirements of Rule 14a-8, we intend to exclude the Proposal from the proxy statement. Please note that if you intend to submit any such evidence, it must be postmarked, or transmitted electronically, no later than 14 days from the date you receive this letter.

Attached is a copy of Rule 14a-8 on shareholder proposals and Staff Legal Bulletin Nos. 14F and 14G. We thank you for your interest in Express Scripts and please contact us if you have any further questions.

Best regards,



Martin Akins
Vice President and Deputy General Counsel

Attachments

Rule 14a-8 – Shareholder Proposals.

This section addresses when a company must include a shareholder's proposal in its proxy statement and identify the proposal in its form of proxy when the company holds an annual or special meeting of shareholders. In summary, in order to have your shareholder proposal included on a company's proxy card, and included along with any supporting statement in its proxy statement, you must be eligible and follow certain procedures. Under a few specific circumstances, the company is permitted to exclude your proposal, but only after submitting its reasons to the Commission. We structured this section in a question-and-answer format so that it is easier to understand. The references to "you" are to a shareholder seeking to submit the proposal.

(a) Question 1: What is a proposal?

A shareholder proposal is your recommendation or requirement that the company and/or its board of directors take action, which you intend to present at a meeting of the company's shareholders. Your proposal should state as clearly as possible the course of action that you believe the company should follow. If your proposal is placed on the company's proxy card, the company must also provide in the form of proxy means for shareholders to specify by boxes a choice between approval or disapproval, or abstention. Unless otherwise indicated, the word "proposal" as used in this section refers both to your proposal, and to your corresponding statement in support of your proposal (if any).

(b) Question 2: Who is eligible to submit a proposal, and how do I demonstrate to the company that I am eligible?

(1) In order to be eligible to submit a proposal, you must have continuously held at least \$2,000 in market value, or 1% of the company's securities entitled to be voted on the proposal at the meeting for at least one year by the date you submit the proposal. You must continue to hold those securities through the date of the meeting.

(2) If you are the registered holder of your securities, which means that your name appears in the company's records as a shareholder, the company can verify your eligibility on its own, although you will still have to provide the company with a written statement that you intend to continue to hold the securities through the date of the meeting of shareholders. However, if like many shareholders you are not a registered holder, the company likely does not know that you are a shareholder, or how many shares you own. In this case, at the time you submit your proposal, you must prove your eligibility to the company in one of two ways:

(i) The first way is to submit to the company a written statement from the "record" holder of your securities (usually a broker or bank) verifying that, at the time you submitted your proposal, you continuously held the securities

for at least one year. You must also include your own written statement that you intend to continue to hold the securities through the date of the meeting of shareholders; or

(ii) The second way to prove ownership applies only if you have filed a Schedule 13D (§240.13d-101), Schedule 13G (§240.13d-102), Form 3 (§249.103 of this chapter), Form 4 (§249.104 of this chapter) and/or Form 5 (§249.105 of this chapter), or amendments to those documents or updated forms, reflecting your ownership of the shares as of or before the date on which the one-year eligibility period begins. If you have filed one of these documents with the SEC, you may demonstrate your eligibility by submitting to the company:

(A) A copy of the schedule and/or form, and any subsequent amendments reporting a change in your ownership level;

(B) Your written statement that you continuously held the required number of shares for the one-year period as of the date of the statement; and

(C) Your written statement that you intend to continue ownership of the shares through the date of the company's annual or special meeting.

(c) Question 3: How many proposals may I submit?

Each shareholder may submit no more than one proposal to a company for a particular shareholders' meeting.

(d) Question 4: How long can my proposal be?

The proposal, including any accompanying supporting statement, may not exceed 500 words.

(e) Question 5: What is the deadline for submitting a proposal?

(1) If you are submitting your proposal for the company's annual meeting, you can in most cases find the deadline in last year's proxy statement. However, if the company did not hold an annual meeting last year, or has changed the date of its meeting for this year more than 30 days from last year's meeting, you can usually find the deadline in one of the company's quarterly reports on Form 10-Q (§249.308a of this chapter), or in shareholder reports of investment companies under §270.30d-1 of this chapter of the Investment Company Act of 1940. In order to avoid controversy, shareholders should submit their proposals by means, including electronic means, that permit them to prove the date of delivery.

(2) The deadline is calculated in the following manner if the proposal is submitted for a regularly scheduled annual meeting. The proposal must be received at the company's principal executive offices not less than 120 calendar days before the date of the company's proxy statement released to shareholders in connection with the previous year's annual meeting. However, if the company did not hold an annual meeting the previous year, or if the date of this year's annual meeting has been changed by more than 30 days from the date of the previous year's meeting, then the deadline is a

reasonable time before the company begins to print and send its proxy materials.

(3) If you are submitting your proposal for a meeting of shareholders other than a regularly scheduled annual meeting, the deadline is a reasonable time before the company begins to print and send its proxy materials.

(f) Question 6: What if I fail to follow one of the eligibility or procedural requirements explained in answers to Questions 1 through 4 of this section?

(1) The company may exclude your proposal, but only after it has notified you of the problem, and you have failed adequately to correct it. Within 14 calendar days of receiving your proposal, the company must notify you in writing of any procedural or eligibility deficiencies, as well as of the time frame for your response. Your response must be postmarked, or transmitted electronically, no later than 14 days from the date you received the company's notification. A company need not provide you such notice of a deficiency if the deficiency cannot be remedied, such as if you fail to submit a proposal by the company's properly determined deadline. If the company intends to exclude the proposal, it will later have to make a submission under §240.14a-8 and provide you with a copy under Question 10 below, §240.14a-8(j).

(2) If you fail in your promise to hold the required number of securities through the date of the meeting of shareholders, then the company will be permitted to exclude all of your proposals from its proxy materials for any meeting held in the following two calendar years.

(g) Question 7: Who has the burden of persuading the Commission or its staff that my proposal can be excluded?

Except as otherwise noted, the burden is on the company to demonstrate that it is entitled to exclude a proposal.

(h) Question 8: Must I appear personally at the shareholders' meeting to present the proposal?

(1) Either you, or your representative who is qualified under state law to present the proposal on your behalf, must attend the meeting to present the proposal. Whether you attend the meeting yourself or send a qualified representative to the meeting in your place, you should make sure that you, or your representative, follow the proper state law procedures for attending the meeting and/or presenting your proposal.

(2) If the company holds its shareholder meeting in whole or in part via electronic media, and the company permits you or your representative to present your proposal via such media, then you may appear through electronic media rather than traveling to the meeting to appear in person.

(3) If you or your qualified representative fail to appear and present the proposal, without good cause, the company will be permitted to exclude all of your proposals from its proxy materials for any meetings held in the following two calendar years.

(i) Question 9: If I have complied with the procedural requirements, on what other bases may a company rely to exclude my proposal?

(1) *Improper under state law:* If the proposal is not a proper subject for action by shareholders under the laws of the jurisdiction of the company's organization;

Note to paragraph (i)(1): Depending on the subject matter, some proposals are not considered proper under state law if they would be binding on the company if approved by shareholders. In our experience, most proposals that are cast as recommendations or requests that the board of directors take specified action are proper under state law. Accordingly, we will assume that a proposal drafted as a recommendation or suggestion is proper unless the company demonstrates otherwise.

(2) *Violation of law:* If the proposal would, if implemented, cause the company to violate any state, federal, or foreign law to which it is subject;

Note to paragraph (i)(2): We will not apply this basis for exclusion to permit exclusion of a proposal on grounds that it would violate foreign law if compliance with the foreign law would result in a violation of any state or federal law.

(3) *Violation of proxy rules:* If the proposal or supporting statement is contrary to any of the Commission's proxy rules, including §240.14a-9, which prohibits materially false or misleading statements in proxy soliciting materials;

(4) *Personal grievance; special interest:* If the proposal relates to the redress of a personal claim or grievance against the company or any other person, or if it is designed to result in a benefit to you, or to further a personal interest, which is not shared by the other shareholders at large;

(5) *Relevance:* If the proposal relates to operations which account for less than 5 percent of the company's total assets at the end of its most recent fiscal year, and for less than 5 percent of its net earnings and gross sales for its most recent fiscal year, and is not otherwise significantly related to the company's business;

(6) *Absence of power/authority:* If the company would lack the power or authority to implement the proposal;

(7) *Management functions:* If the proposal deals with a matter relating to the company's ordinary business operations;

(8) *Director elections:* If the proposal:

(i) Would disqualify a nominee who is standing for election;

(ii) Would remove a director from office before his or her term expired;

(iii) Questions the competence, business judgment, or character of one or more nominees or directors;

(iv) Seeks to include a specific individual in the company's proxy materials for election to the board of directors; or

(v) Otherwise could affect the outcome of the upcoming election of directors.

(9) *Conflicts with company's proposal*: If the proposal directly conflicts with one of the company's own proposals to be submitted to shareholders at the same meeting;

Note to paragraph (i)(9): A company's submission to the Commission under this section should specify the points of conflict with the company's proposal.

(10) *Substantially implemented*: If the company has already substantially implemented the proposal;

Note to paragraph (i)(10): A company may exclude a shareholder proposal that would provide an advisory vote or seek future advisory votes to approve the compensation of executives as disclosed pursuant to Item 402 of Regulation S-K (§229.402 of this chapter) or any successor to Item 402 (a "say-on-pay vote") or that relates to the frequency of say-on-pay votes, provided that in the most recent shareholder vote required by §240.14a-21(b) of this chapter a single year (i.e., one, two, or three years) received approval of a majority of votes cast on the matter and the company has adopted a policy on the frequency of say-on-pay votes that is consistent with the choice of the majority of votes cast in the most recent shareholder vote required by §240.14a-21(b) of this chapter.

(11) *Duplication*: If the proposal substantially duplicates another proposal previously submitted to the company by another proponent that will be included in the company's proxy materials for the same meeting;

(12) *Resubmissions*: If the proposal deals with substantially the same subject matter as another proposal or proposals that has or have been previously included in the company's proxy materials within the preceding 5 calendar years, a company may exclude it from its proxy materials for any meeting held within 3 calendar years of the last time it was included if the proposal received:

(i) Less than 3% of the vote if proposed once within the preceding 5 calendar years;

(ii) Less than 6% of the vote on its last submission to shareholders if proposed twice previously within the preceding 5 calendar years; or

(iii) Less than 10% of the vote on its last submission to shareholders if proposed three times or more previously within the preceding 5 calendar years; and

(13) *Specific amount of dividends*: If the proposal relates to specific amounts of cash or stock dividends.

(j) **Question 10: What procedures must the company follow if it intends to exclude my proposal?**

(1) If the company intends to exclude a proposal from its proxy materials, it must file its reasons with the Commission no later than 80 calendar days before it files its definitive proxy statement and form of proxy with the Commission. The company must simultaneously provide you with a copy of its submission. The Commission staff may permit the company to make its submission later than 80 days before the company files its definitive proxy statement and form of proxy, if the company demonstrates good cause for missing the deadline.

(2) The company must file six paper copies of the following:

(i) The proposal;

(ii) An explanation of why the company believes that it may exclude the proposal, which should, if possible, refer to the most recent applicable authority, such as prior Division letters issued under the rule; and

(iii) A supporting opinion of counsel when such reasons are based on matters of state or foreign law.

(k) **Question 11: May I submit my own statement to the Commission responding to the company's arguments?**

Yes, you may submit a response, but it is not required. You should try to submit any response to us, with a copy to the company, as soon as possible after the company makes its submission. This way, the Commission staff will have time to consider fully your submission before it issues its response. You should submit six paper copies of your response.

(l) **Question 12: If the company includes my shareholder proposal in its proxy materials, what information about me must it include along with the proposal itself?**

(1) The company's proxy statement must include your name and address, as well as the number of the company's voting securities that you hold. However, instead of providing that information, the company may instead include a statement that it will provide the information to shareholders promptly upon receiving an oral or written request.

(2) The company is not responsible for the contents of your proposal or supporting statement.

(m) **Question 13: What can I do if the company includes in its proxy statement reasons why it believes shareholders should not vote in favor of my proposal, and I disagree with some of its statements?**

(1) The company may elect to include in its proxy statement reasons why it believes shareholders should vote against your proposal. The company is allowed to make arguments reflecting its own point of view, just as you may express your own point of view in your proposal's supporting statement.

(2) However, if you believe that the company's opposition to your proposal contains materially false or misleading statements that may violate our anti-fraud rule, §240.14a-9,

you should promptly send to the Commission staff and the company a letter explaining the reasons for your view, along with a copy of the company's statements opposing your proposal. To the extent possible, your letter should include specific factual information demonstrating the inaccuracy of the company's claims. Time permitting, you may wish to try to work out your differences with the company by yourself before contacting the Commission staff.

(3) We require the company to send you a copy of its statements opposing your proposal before it sends its proxy materials, so that you may bring to our attention any materially false or misleading statements, under the following timeframes:

(i) If our no-action response requires that you make revisions to your proposal or supporting statement as a condition to requiring the company to include it in its proxy materials, then the company must provide you with a copy of its opposition statements no later than 5 calendar days after the company receives a copy of your revised proposal; or

(ii) In all other cases, the company must provide you with a copy of its opposition statements no later than 30 calendar days before it files definitive copies of its proxy statement and form of proxy under §240.14a-6.



**Division of Corporation Finance
Securities and Exchange Commission**

Shareholder Proposals

Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14F (CF)

Action: Publication of CF Staff Legal Bulletin

Date: October 18, 2011

Summary: This staff legal bulletin provides information for companies and shareholders regarding Rule 14a-8 under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

Supplementary Information: The statements in this bulletin represent the views of the Division of Corporation Finance (the "Division"). This bulletin is not a rule, regulation or statement of the Securities and Exchange Commission (the "Commission"). Further, the Commission has neither approved nor disapproved its content.

Contacts: For further information, please contact the Division's Office of Chief Counsel by calling (202) 551-3500 or by submitting a web-based request form at https://tts.sec.gov/cgi-bin/corp_fin_interpretive.

A. The purpose of this bulletin

This bulletin is part of a continuing effort by the Division to provide guidance on important issues arising under Exchange Act Rule 14a-8. Specifically, this bulletin contains information regarding:

- Brokers and banks that constitute "record" holders under Rule 14a-8 (b)(2)(i) for purposes of verifying whether a beneficial owner is eligible to submit a proposal under Rule 14a-8;
- Common errors shareholders can avoid when submitting proof of ownership to companies;
- The submission of revised proposals;
- Procedures for withdrawing no-action requests regarding proposals submitted by multiple proponents; and
- The Division's new process for transmitting Rule 14a-8 no-action responses by email.

You can find additional guidance regarding Rule 14a-8 in the following bulletins that are available on the Commission's website: [SLB No. 14](#), [SLB No. 14A](#), [SLB No. 14B](#), [SLB No. 14C](#), [SLB No. 14D](#) and [SLB No. 14E](#).

B. The types of brokers and banks that constitute "record" holders

under Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i) for purposes of verifying whether a beneficial owner is eligible to submit a proposal under Rule 14a-8

1. Eligibility to submit a proposal under Rule 14a-8

To be eligible to submit a shareholder proposal, a shareholder must have continuously held at least \$2,000 in market value, or 1%, of the company's securities entitled to be voted on the proposal at the shareholder meeting for at least one year as of the date the shareholder submits the proposal. The shareholder must also continue to hold the required amount of securities through the date of the meeting and must provide the company with a written statement of intent to do so.¹

The steps that a shareholder must take to verify his or her eligibility to submit a proposal depend on how the shareholder owns the securities. There are two types of security holders in the U.S.: registered owners and beneficial owners.² Registered owners have a direct relationship with the issuer because their ownership of shares is listed on the records maintained by the issuer or its transfer agent. If a shareholder is a registered owner, the company can independently confirm that the shareholder's holdings satisfy Rule 14a-8(b)'s eligibility requirement.

The vast majority of investors in shares issued by U.S. companies, however, are beneficial owners, which means that they hold their securities in book-entry form through a securities intermediary, such as a broker or a bank. Beneficial owners are sometimes referred to as "street name" holders. Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i) provides that a beneficial owner can provide proof of ownership to support his or her eligibility to submit a proposal by submitting a written statement "from the 'record' holder of [the] securities (usually a broker or bank)," verifying that, at the time the proposal was submitted, the shareholder held the required amount of securities continuously for at least one year.³

2. The role of the Depository Trust Company

Most large U.S. brokers and banks deposit their customers' securities with, and hold those securities through, the Depository Trust Company ("DTC"), a registered clearing agency acting as a securities depository. Such brokers and banks are often referred to as "participants" in DTC.⁴ The names of these DTC participants, however, do not appear as the registered owners of the securities deposited with DTC on the list of shareholders maintained by the company or, more typically, by its transfer agent. Rather, DTC's nominee, Cede & Co., appears on the shareholder list as the sole registered owner of securities deposited with DTC by the DTC participants. A company can request from DTC a "securities position listing" as of a specified date, which identifies the DTC participants having a position in the company's securities and the number of securities held by each DTC participant on that date.⁵

3. Brokers and banks that constitute "record" holders under Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i) for purposes of verifying whether a beneficial owner is eligible to submit a proposal under Rule 14a-8

In *The Hain Celestial Group, Inc.* (Oct. 1, 2008), we took the position that an introducing broker could be considered a "record" holder for purposes of Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i). An introducing broker is a broker that engages in sales and other activities involving customer contact, such as opening customer accounts and accepting customer orders, but is not permitted to maintain

custody of customer funds and securities.⁶ Instead, an introducing broker engages another broker, known as a "clearing broker," to hold custody of client funds and securities, to clear and execute customer trades, and to handle other functions such as issuing confirmations of customer trades and customer account statements. Clearing brokers generally are DTC participants; introducing brokers generally are not. As introducing brokers generally are not DTC participants, and therefore typically do not appear on DTC's securities position listing, *Hain Celestial* has required companies to accept proof of ownership letters from brokers in cases where, unlike the positions of registered owners and brokers and banks that are DTC participants, the company is unable to verify the positions against its own or its transfer agent's records or against DTC's securities position listing.

In light of questions we have received following two recent court cases relating to proof of ownership under Rule 14a-8⁷ and in light of the Commission's discussion of registered and beneficial owners in the Proxy Mechanics Concept Release, we have reconsidered our views as to what types of brokers and banks should be considered "record" holders under Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i). Because of the transparency of DTC participants' positions in a company's securities, we will take the view going forward that, for Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i) purposes, only DTC participants should be viewed as "record" holders of securities that are deposited at DTC. As a result, we will no longer follow *Hain Celestial*.

We believe that taking this approach as to who constitutes a "record" holder for purposes of Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i) will provide greater certainty to beneficial owners and companies. We also note that this approach is consistent with Exchange Act Rule 12g5-1 and a 1988 staff no-action letter addressing that rule,⁸ under which brokers and banks that are DTC participants are considered to be the record holders of securities on deposit with DTC when calculating the number of record holders for purposes of Sections 12(g) and 15(d) of the Exchange Act.

Companies have occasionally expressed the view that, because DTC's nominee, Cede & Co., appears on the shareholder list as the sole registered owner of securities deposited with DTC by the DTC participants, only DTC or Cede & Co. should be viewed as the "record" holder of the securities held on deposit at DTC for purposes of Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i). We have never interpreted the rule to require a shareholder to obtain a proof of ownership letter from DTC or Cede & Co., and nothing in this guidance should be construed as changing that view.

How can a shareholder determine whether his or her broker or bank is a DTC participant?

Shareholders and companies can confirm whether a particular broker or bank is a DTC participant by checking DTC's participant list, which is currently available on the Internet at <http://www.dtcc.com/downloads/membership/directories/dtc/alpha.pdf>.

What if a shareholder's broker or bank is not on DTC's participant list?

The shareholder will need to obtain proof of ownership from the DTC participant through which the securities are held. The shareholder should be able to find out who this DTC participant is by asking the shareholder's broker or bank.⁹

If the DTC participant knows the shareholder's broker or bank's holdings, but does not know the shareholder's holdings, a shareholder could satisfy Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i) by obtaining and submitting two proof of ownership statements verifying that, at the time the proposal was submitted, the required amount of securities were continuously held for at least one year – one from the shareholder's broker or bank confirming the shareholder's ownership, and the other from the DTC participant confirming the broker or bank's ownership.

How will the staff process no-action requests that argue for exclusion on the basis that the shareholder's proof of ownership is not from a DTC participant?

The staff will grant no-action relief to a company on the basis that the shareholder's proof of ownership is not from a DTC participant only if the company's notice of defect describes the required proof of ownership in a manner that is consistent with the guidance contained in this bulletin. Under Rule 14a-8(f)(1), the shareholder will have an opportunity to obtain the requisite proof of ownership after receiving the notice of defect.

C. Common errors shareholders can avoid when submitting proof of ownership to companies

In this section, we describe two common errors shareholders make when submitting proof of ownership for purposes of Rule 14a-8(b)(2), and we provide guidance on how to avoid these errors.

First, Rule 14a-8(b) requires a shareholder to provide proof of ownership that he or she has "continuously held at least \$2,000 in market value, or 1%, of the company's securities entitled to be voted on the proposal at the meeting for at least one year by the date you submit the proposal" (emphasis added).¹⁰ We note that many proof of ownership letters do not satisfy this requirement because they do not verify the shareholder's beneficial ownership for the entire one-year period preceding and including the date the proposal is submitted. In some cases, the letter speaks as of a date *before* the date the proposal is submitted, thereby leaving a gap between the date of the verification and the date the proposal is submitted. In other cases, the letter speaks as of a date *after* the date the proposal was submitted but covers a period of only one year, thus failing to verify the shareholder's beneficial ownership over the required full one-year period preceding the date of the proposal's submission.

Second, many letters fail to confirm continuous ownership of the securities. This can occur when a broker or bank submits a letter that confirms the shareholder's beneficial ownership only as of a specified date but omits any reference to continuous ownership for a one-year period.

We recognize that the requirements of Rule 14a-8(b) are highly prescriptive and can cause inconvenience for shareholders when submitting proposals. Although our administration of Rule 14a-8(b) is constrained by the terms of the rule, we believe that shareholders can avoid the two errors highlighted above by arranging to have their broker or bank provide the required verification of ownership as of the date they plan to submit the proposal using the following format:

"As of [date the proposal is submitted], [name of shareholder]

held, and has held continuously for at least one year, [number of securities] shares of [company name] [class of securities].”¹¹

As discussed above, a shareholder may also need to provide a separate written statement from the DTC participant through which the shareholder’s securities are held if the shareholder’s broker or bank is not a DTC participant.

D. The submission of revised proposals

On occasion, a shareholder will revise a proposal after submitting it to a company. This section addresses questions we have received regarding revisions to a proposal or supporting statement.

1. A shareholder submits a timely proposal. The shareholder then submits a revised proposal before the company’s deadline for receiving proposals. Must the company accept the revisions?

Yes. In this situation, we believe the revised proposal serves as a replacement of the initial proposal. By submitting a revised proposal, the shareholder has effectively withdrawn the initial proposal. Therefore, the shareholder is not in violation of the one-proposal limitation in Rule 14a-8 (c).¹² If the company intends to submit a no-action request, it must do so with respect to the revised proposal.

We recognize that in Question and Answer E.2 of SLB No. 14, we indicated that if a shareholder makes revisions to a proposal before the company submits its no-action request, the company can choose whether to accept the revisions. However, this guidance has led some companies to believe that, in cases where shareholders attempt to make changes to an initial proposal, the company is free to ignore such revisions even if the revised proposal is submitted before the company’s deadline for receiving shareholder proposals. We are revising our guidance on this issue to make clear that a company may not ignore a revised proposal in this situation.¹³

2. A shareholder submits a timely proposal. After the deadline for receiving proposals, the shareholder submits a revised proposal. Must the company accept the revisions?

No. If a shareholder submits revisions to a proposal after the deadline for receiving proposals under Rule 14a-8(e), the company is not required to accept the revisions. However, if the company does not accept the revisions, it must treat the revised proposal as a second proposal and submit a notice stating its intention to exclude the revised proposal, as required by Rule 14a-8(j). The company’s notice may cite Rule 14a-8(e) as the reason for excluding the revised proposal. If the company does not accept the revisions and intends to exclude the initial proposal, it would also need to submit its reasons for excluding the initial proposal.

3. If a shareholder submits a revised proposal, as of which date must the shareholder prove his or her share ownership?

A shareholder must prove ownership as of the date the original proposal is submitted. When the Commission has discussed revisions to proposals,¹⁴ it has not suggested that a revision triggers a requirement to provide proof of ownership a second time. As outlined in Rule 14a-8(b), proving ownership includes providing a written statement that the shareholder intends to continue to hold the securities through the date of the shareholder meeting.

Rule 14a-8(f)(2) provides that if the shareholder "fails in [his or her] promise to hold the required number of securities through the date of the meeting of shareholders, then the company will be permitted to exclude all of [the same shareholder's] proposals from its proxy materials for any meeting held in the following two calendar years." With these provisions in mind, we do not interpret Rule 14a-8 as requiring additional proof of ownership when a shareholder submits a revised proposal.¹⁵

E. Procedures for withdrawing no-action requests for proposals submitted by multiple proponents

We have previously addressed the requirements for withdrawing a Rule 14a-8 no-action request in SLB Nos. 14 and 14C. SLB No. 14 notes that a company should include with a withdrawal letter documentation demonstrating that a shareholder has withdrawn the proposal. In cases where a proposal submitted by multiple shareholders is withdrawn, SLB No. 14C states that, if each shareholder has designated a lead individual to act on its behalf and the company is able to demonstrate that the individual is authorized to act on behalf of all of the proponents, the company need only provide a letter from that lead individual indicating that the lead individual is withdrawing the proposal on behalf of all of the proponents.

Because there is no relief granted by the staff in cases where a no-action request is withdrawn following the withdrawal of the related proposal, we recognize that the threshold for withdrawing a no-action request need not be overly burdensome. Going forward, we will process a withdrawal request if the company provides a letter from the lead filer that includes a representation that the lead filer is authorized to withdraw the proposal on behalf of each proponent identified in the company's no-action request.¹⁶

F. Use of email to transmit our Rule 14a-8 no-action responses to companies and proponents

To date, the Division has transmitted copies of our Rule 14a-8 no-action responses, including copies of the correspondence we have received in connection with such requests, by U.S. mail to companies and proponents. We also post our response and the related correspondence to the Commission's website shortly after issuance of our response.

In order to accelerate delivery of staff responses to companies and proponents, and to reduce our copying and postage costs, going forward, we intend to transmit our Rule 14a-8 no-action responses by email to companies and proponents. We therefore encourage both companies and proponents to include email contact information in any correspondence to each other and to us. We will use U.S. mail to transmit our no-action response to any company or proponent for which we do not have email contact information.

Given the availability of our responses and the related correspondence on the Commission's website and the requirement under Rule 14a-8 for companies and proponents to copy each other on correspondence submitted to the Commission, we believe it is unnecessary to transmit copies of the related correspondence along with our no-action response. Therefore, we intend to transmit only our staff response and not the correspondence we receive from the parties. We will continue to post to the Commission's website copies of this correspondence at the same time that we post our staff no-action response.

¹ See Rule 14a-8(b).

² For an explanation of the types of share ownership in the U.S., see Concept Release on U.S. Proxy System, Release No. 34-62495 (July 14, 2010) [75 FR 42982] ("Proxy Mechanics Concept Release"), at Section II.A. The term "beneficial owner" does not have a uniform meaning under the federal securities laws. It has a different meaning in this bulletin as compared to "beneficial owner" and "beneficial ownership" in Sections 13 and 16 of the Exchange Act. Our use of the term in this bulletin is not intended to suggest that registered owners are not beneficial owners for purposes of those Exchange Act provisions. See Proposed Amendments to Rule 14a-8 under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 Relating to Proposals by Security Holders, Release No. 34-12598 (July 7, 1976) [41 FR 29982], at n.2 ("The term 'beneficial owner' when used in the context of the proxy rules, and in light of the purposes of those rules, may be interpreted to have a broader meaning than it would for certain other purpose[s] under the federal securities laws, such as reporting pursuant to the Williams Act.").

³ If a shareholder has filed a Schedule 13D, Schedule 13G, Form 3, Form 4 or Form 5 reflecting ownership of the required amount of shares, the shareholder may instead prove ownership by submitting a copy of such filings and providing the additional information that is described in Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(ii).

⁴ DTC holds the deposited securities in "fungible bulk," meaning that there are no specifically identifiable shares directly owned by the DTC participants. Rather, each DTC participant holds a pro rata interest or position in the aggregate number of shares of a particular issuer held at DTC. Correspondingly, each customer of a DTC participant – such as an individual investor – owns a pro rata interest in the shares in which the DTC participant has a pro rata interest. See Proxy Mechanics Concept Release, at Section II.B.2.a.

⁵ See Exchange Act Rule 17Ad-8.

⁶ See Net Capital Rule, Release No. 34-31511 (Nov. 24, 1992) [57 FR 56973] ("Net Capital Rule Release"), at Section II.C.

⁷ See *KBR Inc. v. Chevedden*, Civil Action No. H-11-0196, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 36431, 2011 WL 1463611 (S.D. Tex. Apr. 4, 2011); *Apache Corp. v. Chevedden*, 696 F. Supp. 2d 723 (S.D. Tex. 2010). In both cases, the court concluded that a securities intermediary was not a record holder for purposes of Rule 14a-8(b) because it did not appear on a list of the company's non-objecting beneficial owners or on any DTC securities position listing, nor was the intermediary a DTC participant.

⁸ *Techne Corp.* (Sept. 20, 1988).

⁹ In addition, if the shareholder's broker is an introducing broker, the shareholder's account statements should include the clearing broker's identity and telephone number. See Net Capital Rule Release, at Section II.C.(iii). The clearing broker will generally be a DTC participant.

¹⁰ For purposes of Rule 14a-8(b), the submission date of a proposal will generally precede the company's receipt date of the proposal, absent the use of electronic or other means of same-day delivery.

¹¹ This format is acceptable for purposes of Rule 14a-8(b), but it is not mandatory or exclusive.

¹² As such, it is not appropriate for a company to send a notice of defect for multiple proposals under Rule 14a-8(c) upon receiving a revised proposal.

¹³ This position will apply to all proposals submitted after an initial proposal but before the company's deadline for receiving proposals, regardless of whether they are explicitly labeled as "revisions" to an initial proposal, unless the shareholder affirmatively indicates an intent to submit a second, *additional* proposal for inclusion in the company's proxy materials. In that case, the company must send the shareholder a notice of defect pursuant to Rule 14a-8(f)(1) if it intends to exclude either proposal from its proxy materials in reliance on Rule 14a-8(c). In light of this guidance, with respect to proposals or revisions received before a company's deadline for submission, we will no longer follow *Layne Christensen Co.* (Mar. 21, 2011) and other prior staff no-action letters in which we took the view that a proposal would violate the Rule 14a-8(c) one-proposal limitation if such proposal is submitted to a company after the company has either submitted a Rule 14a-8 no-action request to exclude an earlier proposal submitted by the same proponent or notified the proponent that the earlier proposal was excludable under the rule.

¹⁴ See, e.g., Adoption of Amendments Relating to Proposals by Security Holders, Release No. 34-12999 (Nov. 22, 1976) [41 FR 52994].

¹⁵ Because the relevant date for proving ownership under Rule 14a-8(b) is the date the proposal is submitted, a proponent who does not adequately prove ownership in connection with a proposal is not permitted to submit another proposal for the same meeting on a later date.

¹⁶ Nothing in this staff position has any effect on the status of any shareholder proposal that is not withdrawn by the proponent or its authorized representative.

<http://www.sec.gov/interps/legal/cfs1b14f.htm>



**Division of Corporation Finance
Securities and Exchange Commission**

Shareholder Proposals

Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14G (CF)

Action: Publication of CF Staff Legal Bulletin

Date: October 16, 2012

Summary: This staff legal bulletin provides information for companies and shareholders regarding Rule 14a-8 under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

Supplementary Information: The statements in this bulletin represent the views of the Division of Corporation Finance (the "Division"). This bulletin is not a rule, regulation or statement of the Securities and Exchange Commission (the "Commission"). Further, the Commission has neither approved nor disapproved its content.

Contacts: For further information, please contact the Division's Office of Chief Counsel by calling (202) 551-3500 or by submitting a web-based request form at https://tts.sec.gov/cgi-bin/corp_fin_interpretive.

A. The purpose of this bulletin

This bulletin is part of a continuing effort by the Division to provide guidance on important issues arising under Exchange Act Rule 14a-8. Specifically, this bulletin contains information regarding:

- the parties that can provide proof of ownership under Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i) for purposes of verifying whether a beneficial owner is eligible to submit a proposal under Rule 14a-8;
- the manner in which companies should notify proponents of a failure to provide proof of ownership for the one-year period required under Rule 14a-8(b)(1); and
- the use of website references in proposals and supporting statements.

You can find additional guidance regarding Rule 14a-8 in the following bulletins that are available on the Commission's website: [SLB No. 14](#), [SLB No. 14A](#), [SLB No. 14B](#), [SLB No. 14C](#), [SLB No. 14D](#), [SLB No. 14E](#) and [SLB No. 14F](#).

B. Parties that can provide proof of ownership under Rule 14a-8(b)

(2)(i) for purposes of verifying whether a beneficial owner is eligible to submit a proposal under Rule 14a-8

1. Sufficiency of proof of ownership letters provided by affiliates of DTC participants for purposes of Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i)

To be eligible to submit a proposal under Rule 14a-8, a shareholder must, among other things, provide documentation evidencing that the shareholder has continuously held at least \$2,000 in market value, or 1% of the company's securities entitled to be voted on the proposal at the shareholder meeting for at least one year as of the date the shareholder submits the proposal. If the shareholder is a beneficial owner of the securities, which means that the securities are held in book-entry form through a securities intermediary, Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i) provides that this documentation can be in the form of a "written statement from the 'record' holder of your securities (usually a broker or bank)...."

In SLB No. 14F, the Division described its view that only securities intermediaries that are participants in the Depository Trust Company ("DTC") should be viewed as "record" holders of securities that are deposited at DTC for purposes of Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i). Therefore, a beneficial owner must obtain a proof of ownership letter from the DTC participant through which its securities are held at DTC in order to satisfy the proof of ownership requirements in Rule 14a-8.

During the most recent proxy season, some companies questioned the sufficiency of proof of ownership letters from entities that were not themselves DTC participants, but were affiliates of DTC participants.¹ By virtue of the affiliate relationship, we believe that a securities intermediary holding shares through its affiliated DTC participant should be in a position to verify its customers' ownership of securities. Accordingly, we are of the view that, for purposes of Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i), a proof of ownership letter from an affiliate of a DTC participant satisfies the requirement to provide a proof of ownership letter from a DTC participant.

2. Adequacy of proof of ownership letters from securities intermediaries that are not brokers or banks

We understand that there are circumstances in which securities intermediaries that are not brokers or banks maintain securities accounts in the ordinary course of their business. A shareholder who holds securities through a securities intermediary that is not a broker or bank can satisfy Rule 14a-8's documentation requirement by submitting a proof of ownership letter from that securities intermediary.² If the securities intermediary is not a DTC participant or an affiliate of a DTC participant, then the shareholder will also need to obtain a proof of ownership letter from the DTC participant or an affiliate of a DTC participant that can verify the holdings of the securities intermediary.

C. Manner in which companies should notify proponents of a failure to provide proof of ownership for the one-year period required under Rule 14a-8(b)(1)

As discussed in Section C of SLB No. 14F, a common error in proof of

ownership letters is that they do not verify a proponent's beneficial ownership for the entire one-year period preceding and including the date the proposal was submitted, as required by Rule 14a-8(b)(1). In some cases, the letter speaks as of a date *before* the date the proposal was submitted, thereby leaving a gap between the date of verification and the date the proposal was submitted. In other cases, the letter speaks as of a date *after* the date the proposal was submitted but covers a period of only one year, thus failing to verify the proponent's beneficial ownership over the required full one-year period preceding the date of the proposal's submission.

Under Rule 14a-8(f), if a proponent fails to follow one of the eligibility or procedural requirements of the rule, a company may exclude the proposal only if it notifies the proponent of the defect and the proponent fails to correct it. In SLB No. 14 and SLB No. 14B, we explained that companies should provide adequate detail about what a proponent must do to remedy all eligibility or procedural defects.

We are concerned that companies' notices of defect are not adequately describing the defects or explaining what a proponent must do to remedy defects in proof of ownership letters. For example, some companies' notices of defect make no mention of the gap in the period of ownership covered by the proponent's proof of ownership letter or other specific deficiencies that the company has identified. We do not believe that such notices of defect serve the purpose of Rule 14a-8(f).

Accordingly, going forward, we will not concur in the exclusion of a proposal under Rules 14a-8(b) and 14a-8(f) on the basis that a proponent's proof of ownership does not cover the one-year period preceding and including the date the proposal is submitted unless the company provides a notice of defect that identifies the specific date on which the proposal was submitted and explains that the proponent must obtain a new proof of ownership letter verifying continuous ownership of the requisite amount of securities for the one-year period preceding and including such date to cure the defect. We view the proposal's date of submission as the date the proposal is postmarked or transmitted electronically. Identifying in the notice of defect the specific date on which the proposal was submitted will help a proponent better understand how to remedy the defects described above and will be particularly helpful in those instances in which it may be difficult for a proponent to determine the date of submission, such as when the proposal is not postmarked on the same day it is placed in the mail. In addition, companies should include copies of the postmark or evidence of electronic transmission with their no-action requests.

D. Use of website addresses in proposals and supporting statements

Recently, a number of proponents have included in their proposals or in their supporting statements the addresses to websites that provide more information about their proposals. In some cases, companies have sought to exclude either the website address or the entire proposal due to the reference to the website address.

In SLB No. 14, we explained that a reference to a website address in a proposal does not raise the concerns addressed by the 500-word limitation

in Rule 14a-8(d). We continue to be of this view and, accordingly, we will continue to count a website address as one word for purposes of Rule 14a-8(d). To the extent that the company seeks the exclusion of a website reference in a proposal, but not the proposal itself, we will continue to follow the guidance stated in SLB No. 14, which provides that references to website addresses in proposals or supporting statements could be subject to exclusion under Rule 14a-8(i)(3) if the information contained on the website is materially false or misleading, irrelevant to the subject matter of the proposal or otherwise in contravention of the proxy rules, including Rule 14a-9.³

In light of the growing interest in including references to website addresses in proposals and supporting statements, we are providing additional guidance on the appropriate use of website addresses in proposals and supporting statements.⁴

1. References to website addresses in a proposal or supporting statement and Rule 14a-8(i)(3)

References to websites in a proposal or supporting statement may raise concerns under Rule 14a-8(i)(3). In SLB No. 14B, we stated that the exclusion of a proposal under Rule 14a-8(i)(3) as vague and indefinite may be appropriate if neither the shareholders voting on the proposal, nor the company in implementing the proposal (if adopted), would be able to determine with any reasonable certainty exactly what actions or measures the proposal requires. In evaluating whether a proposal may be excluded on this basis, we consider only the information contained in the proposal and supporting statement and determine whether, based on that information, shareholders and the company can determine what actions the proposal seeks.

If a proposal or supporting statement refers to a website that provides information necessary for shareholders and the company to understand with reasonable certainty exactly what actions or measures the proposal requires, and such information is not also contained in the proposal or in the supporting statement, then we believe the proposal would raise concerns under Rule 14a-9 and would be subject to exclusion under Rule 14a-8(i)(3) as vague and indefinite. By contrast, if shareholders and the company can understand with reasonable certainty exactly what actions or measures the proposal requires without reviewing the information provided on the website, then we believe that the proposal would not be subject to exclusion under Rule 14a-8(i)(3) on the basis of the reference to the website address. In this case, the information on the website only supplements the information contained in the proposal and in the supporting statement.

2. Providing the company with the materials that will be published on the referenced website

We recognize that if a proposal references a website that is not operational at the time the proposal is submitted, it will be impossible for a company or the staff to evaluate whether the website reference may be excluded. In our view, a reference to a non-operational website in a proposal or supporting statement could be excluded under Rule 14a-8(i)(3) as irrelevant to the subject matter of a proposal. We understand, however,

that a proponent may wish to include a reference to a website containing information related to the proposal but wait to activate the website until it becomes clear that the proposal will be included in the company's proxy materials. Therefore, we will not concur that a reference to a website may be excluded as irrelevant under Rule 14a-8(i)(3) on the basis that it is not yet operational if the proponent, at the time the proposal is submitted, provides the company with the materials that are intended for publication on the website and a representation that the website will become operational at, or prior to, the time the company files its definitive proxy materials.

3. Potential issues that may arise if the content of a referenced website changes after the proposal is submitted

To the extent the information on a website changes after submission of a proposal and the company believes the revised information renders the website reference excludable under Rule 14a-8, a company seeking our concurrence that the website reference may be excluded must submit a letter presenting its reasons for doing so. While Rule 14a-8(j) requires a company to submit its reasons for exclusion with the Commission no later than 80 calendar days before it files its definitive proxy materials, we may concur that the changes to the referenced website constitute "good cause" for the company to file its reasons for excluding the website reference after the 80-day deadline and grant the company's request that the 80-day requirement be waived.

¹ An entity is an "affiliate" of a DTC participant if such entity directly, or indirectly through one or more intermediaries, controls or is controlled by, or is under common control with, the DTC participant.

² Rule 14a-8(b)(2)(i) itself acknowledges that the record holder is "usually," but not always, a broker or bank.

³ Rule 14a-9 prohibits statements in proxy materials which, at the time and in the light of the circumstances under which they are made, are false or misleading with respect to any material fact, or which omit to state any material fact necessary in order to make the statements not false or misleading.

⁴ A website that provides more information about a shareholder proposal may constitute a proxy solicitation under the proxy rules. Accordingly, we remind shareholders who elect to include website addresses in their proposals to comply with all applicable rules regarding proxy solicitations.

<http://www.sec.gov/interps/legal/cfs1b14g.htm>