

January 25, 2021

VIA E-MAIL

Office of Chief Counsel
Division of Corporation Finance
Securities and Exchange Commission
100 F Street, NE
Washington, DC 20549

Re: *Amazon.com, Inc.*
Shareholder Proposal of The John Bishop Montgomery Trust, UA 4/4/2019
Securities Exchange Act of 1934—Rule 14a-8

Ladies and Gentlemen:

This letter is to inform you that our client, Amazon.com, Inc. (the “Company”), intends to omit from its proxy statement and form of proxy for its 2021 Annual Meeting of Shareholders (collectively, the “2021 Proxy Materials”) a shareholder proposal (the “Proposal”), including statements in support thereof submitted by The John Bishop Montgomery Trust, UA 4/4/2019 (the “Proponent”).

Pursuant to Rule 14a-8(j), we have:

- filed this letter with the Securities and Exchange Commission (the “Commission”) no later than eighty (80) calendar days before the Company intends to file its definitive 2021 Proxy Materials with the Commission; and
- concurrently sent a copy of this correspondence to the Proponent.

Rule 14a-8(k) and Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14D (Nov. 7, 2008) (“SLB 14D”) provide that shareholder proponents are required to send companies a copy of any correspondence that the proponent elects to submit to the Commission or the staff of the Division of Corporation Finance (the “Staff”). Accordingly, we are taking this opportunity to inform the Proponent that if the Proponent elects to submit additional correspondence to the Commission or the Staff with respect to the Proposal, a copy of that correspondence should be furnished concurrently to the undersigned on behalf of the Company pursuant to Rule 14a-8(k) and SLB 14D.

Office of Chief Counsel
Division of Corporation Finance
January 25, 2021
Page 2

BASIS FOR EXCLUSION

We hereby respectfully request that the Staff concur in our view that the Proposal may be excluded from the 2021 Proxy Materials pursuant to Rule 14a-8(b) and Rule 14a-8(f)(1) because the Proponent failed to provide the requisite proof of continuous share ownership in response to the Company's proper request for that information.

BACKGROUND

The Proposal was submitted to the Company via email December 17, 2020 (the "Submission Date"), which was received by the Company on the same day. *See Exhibit A.* The Proponent's submission did not include with the letter any documentary evidence of his ownership of Company shares. In addition, the Company reviewed its stock records, which did not indicate that the Proponent was a record owner of Company shares. Subsequently, on December 21, 2020, the Company received from the Proponent via email a letter from RBC Wealth Management (the "Original RBC Letter") dated November 30, 2020, verifying the Proponent's ownership of the requisite number of the Company's shares as of and for the thirteen months preceding November 30, 2020. *See Exhibit B.* As discussed in more detail below, the Original RBC Letter contained a procedural deficiency: it did not provide verification of the Proponent's ownership of the requisite number of Company shares for the required one-year period preceding and including the Submission Date.

Accordingly, the Company properly sought verification of share ownership from the Proponent. Specifically, the Company sent the Proponent a letter dated December 24, 2020 identifying the deficiency, notifying the Proponent of the requirements of Rule 14a-8 and explaining how the Proponent could cure the procedural deficiency (the "Deficiency Notice"). The Deficiency Notice, attached hereto as Exhibit C, provided detailed information regarding the "record" holder requirements, as clarified by Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14F (Oct. 18, 2011) ("SLB 14F"), and attached a copy of Rule 14a-8 and SLB 14F. Specifically, the Deficiency Notice stated:

- the ownership requirements of Rule 14a-8(b);
- that, according to the Company's stock records, the Proponent was not a record owner of sufficient shares;
- that the Original RBC Letter was insufficient to demonstrate ownership because it did not cover the requisite dates;
- the type of statement or documentation necessary to demonstrate beneficial ownership under Rule 14a-8(b), including "a written statement from the 'record'

Office of Chief Counsel
Division of Corporation Finance
January 25, 2021
Page 3

holder of the Proponent's shares (usually a broker or a bank) verifying that the Proponent continuously held the required number or amount of Company shares for the one-year period preceding and including December 17, 2020," the date the Proposal was submitted to the Company; and

- that any response had to be postmarked or transmitted electronically no later than 14 calendar days from the date the Proponent received the Deficiency Notice.

The Company's records confirm delivery of the Deficiency Notice at 10:32 a.m. local time on December 26, 2020, within 14 calendar days of the Company's receipt of the Proposal. *See Exhibit C.* The deadline for any response to the Deficiency Notice was January 9, 2021, based on the December 26, 2020 delivery date of the mailed Deficiency Notice. The Company received from the Proponent on December 30, 2020 via email a second letter from RBC Wealth Management, also dated November 30, 2020 (the "Duplicate RBC Letter"). *See Exhibit D.* As discussed in more detail below, the Duplicate RBC Letter is insufficient to cure the procedural deficiency because it appears to be a duplicate of the Original RBC Letter, and therefore also fails to provide verification of the Proponent's ownership of the requisite number of Company shares for the required one-year period preceding and including the Submission Date. As of the date of this letter, the Company has not received any further correspondence or evidentiary proof from the Proponent.

ANALYSIS

The Proposal May Be Excluded Under Rule 14a-8(b) And Rule 14a-8(f)(1) Because The Proponent Failed To Establish The Requisite Eligibility To Submit The Proposal.

The Company may exclude the Proposal under Rule 14a-8(f)(1) because the Proponent failed to substantiate his eligibility to submit the Proposal in compliance with Rule 14a-8. Rule 14a-8(b)(1) provides, in part, that "[i]n 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 the shareholder submit[s] the proposal." Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14 (July 13, 2001) ("SLB 14") specifies that when the shareholder is not the registered holder, the shareholder "is responsible for proving his or her eligibility to submit a proposal to the company," which the shareholder may do by one of the two ways provided in Rule 14a-8(b)(2). *See* Section C.1.c., SLB 14. SLB 14F further provides that proof of ownership letters may fail to satisfy Rule 14a-8(b)(1)'s requirement because they do not verify ownership "for the entire one-year period preceding and including the date the proposal [was] submitted." Rule 14a-8(f)(1) permits a company to exclude a shareholder proposal from the company's proxy materials if the proponent fails to comply with the eligibility or procedural requirements under Rule 14a-8, including failing to provide the

Office of Chief Counsel
Division of Corporation Finance
January 25, 2021
Page 4

beneficial ownership information required under Rule 14a-8(b), provided that the company has timely notified the proponent of the deficiency, and the proponent has failed to correct such deficiency within 14 calendar days of receipt of such notice.

As discussed above, the Proponent did not include with its submission sufficient documentary evidence of the Proponent's ownership of Company shares. See Exhibit A and Exhibit B. The Proponent failed to cure this deficiency within 14 days of the Company's timely Deficiency Notice, and the Proposal may therefore be excluded under Rule 14a-8(b) and Rule 14a-8(f)(1).

Under well-established precedent, the Original RBC Letter and Duplicate RBC Letter are insufficient because they each fail to cover the entire one-year period up to and including the Submission Date. For example, in *Mondelēz International, Inc.* (avail. Feb. 11, 2014), the proponent submitted the proposal on November 29, 2013 with a letter from a broker stating ownership for one year as of November 27, 2013. The Staff concurred in the exclusion of the proposal, noting that "the proponent appears to have failed to supply, within 14 days of receipt of [the company's] request, documentary support sufficiently evidencing that it satisfied the minimum ownership requirement for the one-year period as required by rule 14a-8(b)." See also *Starbucks Corp.* (avail. Dec. 11, 2014) (concurring with the exclusion of a proposal where the proponent's proof established continuous ownership of company securities for one year as of September 26, 2014, but the proponent submitted the proposal on September 24, 2014); *PepsiCo, Inc. (Albert)* (avail. Jan. 10, 2013) (concurring with the exclusion under Rule 14a-8(b) and Rule 14a-8(f) of a proposal where the proponent's purported proof of ownership covered the one-year period up to and including November 19, 2012, but the proposal was submitted on November 20, 2012); *Union Pacific Corp.* (avail. Mar. 5, 2010) (letter from broker stating ownership for one year as of November 17, 2009 was insufficient to prove continuous ownership as of November 19, 2009); *The McGraw Hill Companies, Inc.* (avail. Jan. 28, 2008) (letter from broker stating ownership for one year as of November 16, 2007 was insufficient to prove continuous ownership for one year as of November 19, 2007).

Here, the Proponent submitted the Proposal on December 17, 2020. Therefore, the Proponent had to verify continuous ownership for the one-year period preceding and including this date, *i.e.*, December 17, 2019 through December 17, 2020. The Original RBC Letter, dated November 30, 2020, stated that "as of the date of this letter, [the Proponent's account] held, and had held continuously for at least 13 months, 40 shares of Amazon (AMZN) common stock." Thus, the Original RBC Letter does not confirm continuous ownership of Company stock for the one-year period preceding and including the December 17, 2020 date the Proposal was submitted as it leaves a 17-day gap between December 1, 2020 and December 17, 2020. The Deficiency Notice clearly stated that the Original RBC Letter was insufficient "because it verifies ownership between October 30, 2019 and November 30, 2020 rather than for the one-year period preceding and including December 17, 2020, the date the Proposal was submitted to the Company." See

Office of Chief Counsel
Division of Corporation Finance
January 25, 2021
Page 5

Exhibit C. In response to the Deficiency Notice, the Proponent sent the Duplicate RBC Letter, which appears to be a duplicate of the Original RBC Letter. The Duplicate RBC Letter is also dated November 30, 2020 and states that “as of the date of this letter, [the Proponent’s account] held, and had held continuously for at least 13 months, 40 shares of Amazon (AMZN) common stock.” Like the Original RBC Letter, the Duplicate RBC Letter did not confirm continuous ownership of Company stock for the 17-day gap between December 1, 2020 and December 17, 2020. Therefore, the Duplicate RBC Letter also failed to confirm continuous ownership of Company stock for the entire one-year period preceding and including the Submission Date.

The Staff has consistently concurred in the exclusion of proposals when proponents have failed, following a timely and proper request by a company, to timely furnish evidence of eligibility to submit the shareholder proposal pursuant to Rule 14a-8(b). For example, in *FedEx Corp.* (avail. June 5, 2019), the proponent submitted a proposal without any accompanying proof of ownership and did not provide any documentary support until 15 days following receipt of the company’s deficiency notice. Despite being just one day late, the Staff concurred with the exclusion of the proposal pursuant to Rule 14a-8(b) and Rule 14a-8(f)(1). *See also Time Warner Inc.* (avail. Mar. 13, 2018); *ITC Holdings Corp.* (avail. Feb. 9, 2016); *Prudential Financial, Inc.* (avail. Dec. 28, 2015); *Mondelēz International, Inc.* (avail. Feb. 27, 2015) (each concurring with the exclusion of a shareholder proposal where the proponent supplied proof of ownership 18, 35, 23, and 16 days, respectively, after receiving the company’s timely deficiency notice). This was the outcome even if the evidence ultimately furnished otherwise satisfied Rule 14a-8(b). Here, the Proponent’s only response to the Deficiency Notice was the Duplicate RBC Letter, which, as discussed above, does not satisfy the eligibility requirements of Rule 14a-8(b). Accordingly, the Company may exclude the Proposal pursuant to Rule 14a-8(f)(1) and Rule 14a-8(b).

It is well established that where a company provides proper notice of a procedural defect to a proponent and the proponent’s response fails to cure the defect, the company is not required to provide any further opportunities for the proponent to cure. In fact, Section C.6. of SLB 14 states that a company may exclude a proposal pursuant to Rule 14a-8(b) and Rule 14a-8(f)(1) if “the shareholder timely responds but does not cure the eligibility or procedural defect(s).” For example, in *PDL BioPharma, Inc.* (avail. Mar. 1, 2019), the proponent submitted a proposal without any accompanying proof of ownership, and the broker letter sent in response to the company’s timely deficiency notice failed to establish that the proponent owned the requisite minimum number of shares. The Staff concurred with exclusion under Rule 14a-8(f) even though the company did not send a second deficiency notice to the proponent, who still had several days remaining in the 14-day cure period. *See also American Airlines Group, Inc.* (avail. Feb. 20, 2015) (concurring with the exclusion of a shareholder proposal where the proponent submitted ownership proof seven days following receipt of the company’s deficiency notice that failed to satisfy the ownership requirements of Rule 14a-8(b), and the company did not send a second deficiency notice); *Coca-Cola Co. (McRitchie and Young)* (avail. Dec. 16, 2014) (concurring

Office of Chief Counsel
Division of Corporation Finance
January 25, 2021
Page 6

with the exclusion of a shareholder proposal where the proponents submitted ownership proof nine days following receipt of the company's deficiency notice that failed to satisfy the ownership requirements of Rule 14a-8(b), and the company did not send a second deficiency notice); *Union Pacific Corp.* (avail. Jan. 29, 2010) (concurring with the exclusion of a shareholder proposal where the proponent submitted a broker letter three days following receipt of the company's deficiency notice that failed to satisfy the ownership requirements of Rule 14a-8(b), and the company did not send a second deficiency notice). Likewise, following receipt of the Duplicate RBC Letter, the Company was under no obligation to provide the Proponent with a second deficiency notice nor any additional time to cure the deficiency that remained.

Accordingly, consistent with the precedent cited above, the Proposal is excludable because, despite receiving timely and proper notice pursuant to Rule 14a-8(f)(1), the Proponent failed to supply, within 14 days of receipt of the Company's request, documentary support sufficiently evidencing that the Proponent continuously owned the required number of Company shares for the one-year period preceding and including the date the Proposal was submitted to the Company, as required by Rule 14a-8(b).

CONCLUSION

Based upon the foregoing analysis, the Company intends to exclude the Proposal from its 2021 Proxy Materials, and we respectfully request that the Staff concur that the Proposal may be excluded under Rule 14a-8.

We would be happy to provide you with any additional information and answer any questions that you may have regarding this subject. Correspondence regarding this letter should be sent to shareholderproposals@gibsondunn.com. If we can be of any further assistance in this matter, please do not hesitate to call me at (202) 955-8671, or Mark Hoffman, the Company's Vice President & Associate General Counsel, Corporate and Securities, and Legal Operations, and Assistant Secretary, at (206) 266-2132.

Sincerely,



Ronald O. Mueller

Enclosures

cc: Mark Hoffman, Amazon.com, Inc.
Sarah E. Murphy, The Shareholder Commons

EXHIBIT A

From: Sara Murphy <sara@theshareholdercommons.com>
Date: Thursday, December 17, 2020 at 14:47
To: davidz@amazon.com <davidz@amazon.com>
Cc: amazon-ir@amazon.com <amazon-ir@amazon.com>
Subject: Rule 14a-8 Proposal (AMZN)

Dear Mr. Zapolsky,

Please see the attached rule 14a-8 proposal to improve corporate governance and enhance long-term shareholder value at de minimis up-front cost – especially considering the substantial market capitalization of the company.

I expect to forward a broker letter soon, so if you acknowledge this proposal in an email message, it may save you from requesting a broker letter from me.

Sincerely,
Sara E. Murphy



SUBSCRIBE TO OUR MONTHLY [NEWSLETTER](#)

Sara E. Murphy
Chief Strategy Officer
The Shareholder Commons

sara@theshareholdercommons.com
Follow us on Twitter @universal_owner



December 17, 2020

David A. Zapolsky
Senior Vice President, General Counsel and Secretary
Amazon.com, Inc.
410 Terry Avenue North
Seattle, WA 98109
Via: davidz@amazon.com

Dear Mr. Zapolsky,

I am pleased to be an Amazon.com, Inc. shareholder through my trust, The John Bishop Montgomery Trust of which I am the sole trustee. I appreciate the leadership our company has shown on numerous issues.

My proposal, **Transition to Public Benefit Corporation**, is for the next annual shareholder meeting. I will meet Rule 14a-8 requirements including the continuous ownership of the required stock value until after the date of the respective shareholder meeting. My submitted format, with the shareholder-supplied emphasis, is intended to be used for definitive proxy publication.

This is my delegation to Sara E. Murphy and/or her designee to forward this Rule 14a-8 proposal to the company and to act as my agent regarding this Rule 14a-8 proposal, negotiations and/or modification, and presentation of it for the forthcoming shareholder meeting. This delegation does not cover proposals that are not rule 14a-8 proposals and does not grant the power to vote.


Please direct all future communications regarding my rule 14a-8 proposal to Sara E. Murphy
*** | at:

sara@theshareholdercommons.com to facilitate prompt and verifiable communications.
Please identify this proposal as my proposal exclusively.

We expect to forward a broker letter soon, but if you simply acknowledge our proposal in an email message to: sara@theshareholdercommons.com, it may not be necessary for you to request such evidence of ownership.

Your consideration and the consideration of the Board of Directors is appreciated in responding to this proposal. Of course, I would welcome a dialogue and negotiations over the terms of the proposal.

Sincerely,



John Montgomery, Trustee
John Bishop Montgomery Trust UA 4/4/2019

December 17, 2020

Date

cc: Investor Relations amazon-ir@amazon.com

[Amazon.com, Inc.: Rule 14a-8 Proposal, December 17, 2020]

[This line and any line above it – *Not* for publication.]

ITEM 4* — Transition to Public Benefit Corporation

RESOLVED: Shareholders request that our Board of Directors take steps necessary to amend our certificate of incorporation and, if necessary, bylaws (including presenting such amendments to the shareholders for approval) to become a public benefit corporation (a “PBC”) in light of its adoption of the Business Roundtable Statement on the Purpose of a Corporation (the “Statement”).¹

SUPPORTING STATEMENT: The Statement proclaims “we share a fundamental commitment to all of our stakeholders. . . . We commit to deliver value to all of them, for the future success of our companies, our communities and our country.”

As a conventional corporation, the duties of Company directors emphasize shareholders, not stakeholders (except to the extent they create value for shareholders.) As one Delaware law firm reported to another signatory considering conversion, directors may consider stakeholder interests only if “*any decisions made with respect to such stakeholders are in the best interests of the corporation and its stockholders.*”² In contrast, directors of a PBC must “balance” the interests of shareholders, stakeholders and a specified benefit³, giving legal status to the Statement’s empty promise.

A recent study determined that listed companies create annual social and environmental costs of \$2.2 trillion⁴. These costs have many sources, including pollution, climate change and employee stress.⁵ The company has received a “significant controversy” ESG score 76% higher than its peers’ average,⁶ ranking a dismal 447 out of 448 rated retailers⁷ and suggesting a significant contribution to these costs; assessed shortcomings included accounting and taxation practices, anti-competitive practices, data privacy and security, and human rights and labor relations.⁸ A company required to balance stakeholder interests could prioritize lowering these costs, even if doing so sacrificed higher return.

This distinction matters to our shareholders, the vast majority of whom are diversified. Indeed, as of the 2020 proxy statement, the top five holders of our shares were mutual fund companies Vanguard, State Street, BlackRock, Fidelity and T Rowe Price, which are generally indexed or otherwise broadly diversified. Such shareholders and beneficial owners suffer when corporations follow the “shareholder primacy” model and impose costs on the economy that lower GDP, which reduces overall equity value.⁹

¹ <https://s3.amazonaws.com/brt.org/BRT-StatementonthePurposeofaCorporationOctober2020.pdf>.

² <https://www.sec.gov/divisions/corpfin/cf-noaction/14a-8/2020/harringtonwellsfargo021220-14a8.pdf>

³ 8 Del C, §365.

⁴

<https://www.schroders.com/en/sysglobalassets/digital/insights/2019/pdfs/sustainability/sustainex/sustainex-short.pdf>

⁵ *Id.*

⁶ <https://finance.yahoo.com/quote/AMZN/sustainability?p=AMZN>

⁷ <https://www.sustainalytics.com/esg-rating/amazon-com-inc/1007896995/>

⁸ <https://www.sustainalytics.com/esg-rating/amazon-com-inc/1007896995/>

⁹ See *Universal Ownership: Why Environmental Externalities Matter to Institutional Investors*, Appendix IV (demonstrating linear relationship between GDP and a diversified portfolio) available at https://www.unepfi.org/fileadmin/documents/universal_ownership_full.pdf; cf. <https://www.advisorperspectives.com/dshort/updates/2020/11/05/market-cap-to-gdp-an-updated-look-at-the-buffett-valuation-indicator> (total market capitalization to GDP “is probably the best single measure of where valuations stand at any given moment”) (quoting Warren Buffet).

While the Company may profit by ignoring costs it externalizes, diversified shareholders will ultimately pay these costs. As a PBC, the Company could prioritize reducing these costs.

Shareholders are entitled to vote on a change that would serve their interests and ensure the commitment made to stakeholders is authentic and lasting.

Please vote for: Transition to Public Benefit Corporation – Proposal [4*]

[This line and any below are *not* for publication]

Number 4* to be assigned by the Company

EXHIBIT B

From: John Montgomery <JMontgomery@lexultima.com>
Sent: Monday, December 21, 2020 1:19 PM
To: 'David.Zapolsky@amazon.com' <David.Zapolsky@amazon.com>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Broker Letter

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you can confirm the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear David,

Attached please find the requisite broker letter in connection with the shareholder proposal I submitted recently.

Please don't hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

John Montgomery
President
Lex Ultima
65 3rd Street, Suite 25
Point Reyes Station, CA 94956

650-430-4732
jmontgomery@lexultima.com
www.lexultima.com



**Wealth
Management**

One PPG Place
Suite 2900
Pittsburgh, PA 15222

Office: 412.201.7200
Fax: 412.201.7279

November 30, 2020

John Montgomery
President
Lex Ultima
65 3rd Street, Suite 25
P.O. Box 1270
Point Reyes Station, CA 94956

Dear Mr. Montgomery:

Pursuant to your request, this letter is to confirm that as of the date of this letter, The John Bishop Montgomery Trust, UA 4/4/2019 held, and had held continuously for at least 13 months, 40 shares of Amazon (AMZN) common stock in his account ending in *** at RBC Wealth Management, a division of RBC Capital Markets, LLC. The DTC clearinghouse number for RBC Wealth Management, a division of RBC Capital Markets, LLC is 0235.

Sincerely,



Tammy Graybill
Assistant Complex Manager

Investment and insurance products: • Not insured by the FDIC or any other federal government agency
• Not a deposit of, or guaranteed by, the bank or an affiliate of the bank • May lose value

EXHIBIT C

December 24, 2020

VIA OVERNIGHT MAIL

Sarah E. Murphy
The Shareholder Commons

Dear Ms. Murphy:

I am writing on behalf of Amazon.com, Inc. (the “Company”), which received on December 17, 2020, the shareholder proposal you submitted on behalf of the John Bishop Montgomery Trust UA 4/4/2019 (the “Proponent”) entitled “Transition to Public Benefit Corporation” pursuant to Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC”) Rule 14a-8 for inclusion in the proxy statement for the Company’s 2021 Annual Meeting of Shareholders (the “Proposal”).

The Proposal contains certain procedural deficiencies, which SEC regulations require us to bring to your attention. Rule 14a-8(b) under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, provides that shareholder proponents must submit sufficient proof of their continuous ownership of at least \$2,000 in market value, or 1%, of a company’s shares entitled to vote on the proposal for at least one year as of the date the shareholder proposal was submitted. The Company’s stock records do not indicate that the Proponent is the record owner of sufficient shares to satisfy this requirement. In addition, to date we have not received adequate proof that the Proponent has satisfied Rule 14a-8’s ownership requirements as of the date that the Proposal was submitted to the Company. The November 30, 2020 letter from RBC Capital Markets, LLC that was provided is insufficient because it verifies ownership between October 30, 2019 and November 30, 2020 rather than for the one-year period preceding and including December 17, 2020, the date the Proposal was submitted to the Company.

To remedy this defect, the Proponent must obtain a new proof of ownership letter verifying the Proponent’s continuous ownership of the required number or amount of Company shares for the one-year period preceding and including December 17, 2020, the date the Proposal was submitted to the Company. As explained in Rule 14a-8(b) and in SEC staff guidance, sufficient proof must be in the form of:

- (1) a written statement from the “record” holder of the Proponent’s shares (usually a broker or a bank) verifying that the Proponent continuously held the required number or amount of Company shares for the one-year period preceding and including December 17, 2020; or

Sarah E. Murphy
December 24, 2020
Page 2

- (2) if the Proponent has filed with the SEC a Schedule 13D, Schedule 13G, Form 3, Form 4 or Form 5, or amendments to those documents or updated forms, reflecting the Proponent's ownership of the required number or amount of Company shares as of or before the date on which the one-year eligibility period begins, a copy of the schedule and/or form, and any subsequent amendments reporting a change in the ownership level and a written statement that the Proponent continuously held the required number or amount of Company shares for the one-year period.

If the Proponent intends to demonstrate ownership by submitting a written statement from the "record" holder of the Proponent's shares as set forth in (1) above, please note that 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 that acts as a securities depository (DTC is also known through the account name of Cede & Co.). Under SEC Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14F, only DTC participants are viewed as record holders of securities that are deposited at DTC. You can confirm whether the Proponent's broker or bank is a DTC participant by asking the Proponent's broker or bank or by checking DTC's participant list, which is available at <http://www.dtcc.com/~media/Files/Downloads/client-center/DTC/alpha.ashx>. In these situations, shareholders need to obtain proof of ownership from the DTC participant through which the securities are held, as follows:

- (1) If the Proponent's broker or bank is a DTC participant, then the Proponent needs to submit a written statement from the Proponent's broker or bank verifying that the Proponent continuously held the required number or amount of Company shares for the one-year period preceding and including December 17, 2020.
- (2) If the Proponent's broker or bank is not a DTC participant, then the Proponent needs to submit proof of ownership from the DTC participant through which the shares are held verifying that the Proponent continuously held the required number or amount of Company shares for the one-year period preceding and including December 17, 2020. You should be able to find out the identity of the DTC participant by asking the Proponent's broker or bank. If the Proponent's broker is an introducing broker, you may also be able to learn the identity and telephone number of the DTC participant through the Proponent's account statements, because the clearing broker identified on the account statements will generally be a DTC participant. If the DTC participant that holds the Proponent's shares is not able to confirm the Proponent's individual holdings but is able to confirm the holdings of the Proponent's broker or bank, then the Proponent needs to satisfy the proof of ownership requirements by obtaining and submitting two proof of ownership statements verifying that, for the one-year period preceding and including December 17, 2020, the required number or amount of Company shares were continuously held: (i) one from the Proponent's broker or

Sarah E. Murphy
December 24, 2020
Page 3

bank confirming the Proponent's ownership, and (ii) the other from the DTC participant confirming the broker or bank's ownership.

The SEC's rules require that any response to this letter be postmarked or transmitted electronically no later than 14 calendar days from the date you receive this letter. Please address any response to me at Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP, 1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20036. Alternatively, you may transmit any response by email to me at RMueller@gibsondunn.com.

If you have any questions with respect to the foregoing, please contact me at (202) 955-8671. For your reference, I enclose a copy of Rule 14a-8 and Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14F.

Sincerely,



Ronald O. Mueller

Enclosures

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 its 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/~media/Files/Downloads/client-center/DTC/alpha.ashx>.

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/interp/leg/cfs14f.htm>

Proof of Delivery

Dear Customer,

This notice serves as proof of delivery for the shipment listed below.

Tracking Number

1Z975463PG95985411

Service

UPS Next Day Air®
Saturday Delivery

Shipped / Billed On

12/24/2020

Delivered On

12/26/2020 10:32 A.M.

Delivered To

SAVANNAH, GA, US

Received By

DRIVER RELEASE

Left At

Front Door

Thank you for giving us this opportunity to serve you. Details are only available for shipments delivered within the last 120 days. Please print for your records if you require this information after 120 days.

Sincerely,

UPS

Tracking results provided by UPS: 12/28/2020 1:38 P.M. EST

EXHIBIT D

From: Sara Murphy <sara@theshareholdercommons.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 30, 2020 12:00 PM
To: Zapolsky, David <davidz@amazon.com>; Mueller, Ronald O. <RMueller@gibsondunn.com>
Cc: amazon-ir <amazon-ir@amazon.com>
Subject: Proof of Ownership - Rule 14a-8 Proposal (AMZN)

Dear Mr. Mueller,

I have attached the broker letter proving ownership. Please acknowledge receipt.

Sincerely,
Sara



[SUBSCRIBE TO OUR MONTHLY NEWSLETTER](#)

Sara E. Murphy
Chief Strategy Officer
The Shareholder Commons

sara@theshareholdercommons.com
Follow us on Twitter @universal_owner



**Wealth
Management**

One PPG Place
Suite 2900
Pittsburgh, PA 15222

Office: 412.201.7200
Fax: 412.201.7279

November 30, 2020

John Montgomery
President
Lex Ultima
65 3rd Street, Suite 25
P.O. Box 1270
Point Reyes Station, CA 94956

Dear Mr. Montgomery:

Pursuant to your request, this letter is to confirm that as of the date of this letter, The John Bishop Montgomery Trust, UA 4/4/2019 held, and had held continuously for at least 13 months, 40 shares of Amazon (AMZN) common stock in his account ending in *** at RBC Wealth Management, a division of RBC Capital Markets, LLC. The DTC clearinghouse number for RBC Wealth Management, a division of RBC Capital Markets, LLC is 0235.

Sincerely,



Tammy Graybill
Assistant Complex Manager

Investment and insurance products: • Not insured by the FDIC or any other federal government agency
• Not a deposit of, or guaranteed by, the bank or an affiliate of the bank • May lose value