




DIVISION OF  
CORPORATION FINANCE

UNITED STATES  
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20549-0402

DC



05052246

March 24, 2005

John Chevedden  
2215 Nelson Avenue, No. 205  
Redondo Beach, CA 90278

Re: Schering-Plough Corporation  
Incoming letter dated January 21, 2005

Act: 1934  
Section: \_\_\_\_\_  
Rule: 14A 8  
Public  
Availability: 3/24/2005

Dear Mr. Chevedden:

This is in response to your letters dated January 21, 2005 and January 28, 2005 concerning the shareholder proposal submitted to Schering-Plough by William Steiner. On January 15, 2005, we issued our response expressing our informal view that Schering-Plough could exclude the proposal from its proxy materials for its upcoming annual meeting.

We received your letters after we issued our response. After reviewing the information contained in your letters, we find no basis to reconsider our position.

Sincerely,

*Jonathan A. Ingram*

Jonathan A. Ingram  
Deputy Chief Counsel

cc: Alan L. Dye  
Hogan & Hartson L.L.P.  
Columbia Square  
555 Thirteenth Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20004-1109

PROCESSED

APR 28 2005 E

THOMSON  
FINANCIAL

JOHN CHEVEDDEN

2215 Nelson Avenue, No. 205  
Redondo Beach, CA 90278

310-371-7872

6 Copies  
7th Copy for Date-Stamp Return

January 21, 2005

Office of Chief Counsel  
Division of Corporation Finance  
Securities and Exchange Commission  
450 Fifth Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20549

**Schering-Plough Corporation (SGP)**  
**Shareholder Position on Company No-Action Request**  
**Rule 14a-8 Proposal: Executive Pay Topic**  
**Shareholder: William Steiner**

Ladies and Gentlemen:

The company has not addressed the fact that it would be possible for the company to reincorporate in Delaware and then adopt per capita voting. Thus this proposal would properly apply to any future time the company would have per capita voting.

Hence, in the worst case the second opinion could only limit the application of the proposal. Additionally the company does not claim that the current board has the power to bind future boards from reincorporating in Delaware and adopting per capita voting.

**Rule 14a-8(i)(6)**

The attached November 24, 2004 "Oracle Press Release" quotes Oracle Chairman Jeff Henley using "majority of the stockholders" interchangeably with majority vote or one share, one vote: "Though a large *majority of the stockholders* have already indicated their desire to sell, the current board appears intent on obstructing the will of the stockholders," Henley said. "We plan to give them a choice (emphasis added)." Oracle is a Delaware corporation.

Additionally the intuitive interchangeably of "majority of the stockholders" with majority vote or one share, one vote is supported by the fact that one company received this proposal in August 2004 and did not question this point until January 2005 – a full two months after its initial no action request.

Sincerely,

  
John Chevedden

cc: William Steiner  
Susan Wolf

**ORACLE**[\(Sign In / Register for a free Oracle Web account\)](#)

BUY DOWNLOAD SUPPORT EVENTS CONTACT US

SEARCH 

PRODUCTS  
SOLUTIONS  
SERVICES  
COMMUNITIES

## Oracle Press Release

Contact(s):

Bob Wynne  
Oracle Corp.  
+1.850.508.5834  
bob.wynne@oracle.com

### PRESS ROOM

Press Room Home  
Press Releases  
Oracle Spokespeople  
Executive Videos  
Download Oracle Logos

### PUBLIC RELATIONS CONTACT

Americas  
Asia Pacific  
Europe, Middle East & Africa  
Corporate Public Relations

### ORACLE INFORMATION

About Oracle  
PeopleSoft Merger  
Analyst Relations  
Investor Relations  
Oracle Executives  
Board of Directors  
Global Offices

## Oracle Announces Slate of Directors for PeopleSoft's Annual Meeting

REDWOOD SHORES, Calif., 24-NOV-2004 Oracle Corporation (Nasdaq: ORCL) announced that it has notified PeopleSoft, Inc. of its intention to nominate four candidates for election to the Board of Directors of PeopleSoft at its 2005 annual stockholders meeting.

"We have notified the PeopleSoft board of our intention to run an alternative slate of directors at the 2005 annual meeting," said Jeff Henley, Oracle's Chairman of the Board. "We believe that the current board of PeopleSoft is not acting in the best interests of stockholders and that a large majority of those stockholders are in favor of a change."

The four candidates are:

- \* Duke K. Bristow, Ph.D, an economist and the director of the Director Training and Certification Program at the UCLA Anderson School of Management; director of Arena Pharmaceuticals, Inc. and Landec Corporation;
- \* Roger Noall, former Senior Executive Vice President and Chief Administrative Officer of KeyCorp, a bank holding company; director of Alleghany Corporation;
- \* Laurence E. Paul, Managing Principal of Laurel Crown Capital, LLC, a private equity investment firm; director of Ampco-Pittsburgh Corporation and Biovail Corporation; and
- \* Artur Raviv, the Alan E. Peterson Distinguished Professor of Finance at the Kellogg School of Management, Northwestern University.

"Though a large majority of the stockholders have already indicated their desire to sell, the current board appears intent on obstructing the will of the stockholders," Henley said. We plan to give them a choice."

The solicitation and the offer to buy PeopleSoft's common stock is only made pursuant to the Offer to Purchase and related materials that Oracle Corporation and Pepper Acquisition Corp. filed on June 9, 2003, as amended and restated on November 3, 2004, and as subsequently amended. Stockholders should read the Amended and Restated Offer to Purchase and related materials carefully because they contain important information, including the terms and conditions of the offer. Stockholders can obtain the Amended and Restated Offer to Purchase and related materials free at the SEC's website at [www.sec.gov](http://www.sec.gov), from Credit Suisse First Boston LLC, the Dealer Manager for the offer, from MacKenzie Partners, the Information Agent for the offer, or from Oracle Corporation.

Oracle Corporation and Messrs. Bristow, Noall, Paul and Raviv will be soliciting proxies

JOHN CHEVEDDEN

2215 Nelson Avenue, No. 205  
Redondo Beach, CA 90278

310-371-7872

6 Copies  
7th Copy for Date-Stamp Return

January 28, 2005

Office of Chief Counsel  
Division of Corporation Finance  
Securities and Exchange Commission  
450 Fifth Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20549

**Schering-Plough Corporation (SGP)**  
**Shareholder Position on Company No-Action Request**  
**Rule 14a-8 Proposal: Executive Pay Topic**  
**Shareholder: William Steiner**

Ladies and Gentlemen:


In a separate no action request another company claims "the majority of the stockholders" text of this proposal could have 3 meanings. One of these meanings includes "approval by a majority of the shares outstanding ..." which does not seem to be per capita voting.

If our company insists on choosing the least workable meaning from 3 meanings for "the majority of stockholders," which it has no need to do, then our company could then concurrently adopt per capita voting under state law.

In Schering-Plough Corporation (January 18, 2005) the Staff appears to have not concurred with a company argument that a company could not do two things concurrently – implement a proposal for a bylaw to destagger the board and concurrently amend its articles of incorporation to be consistent with the bylaw change.

The second opinion is thus believed to be incomplete. It does not argue that it would be impossible to concurrently amend the company's certificate of incorporation for per capita voting.

Sincerely,

  
John Chevedden

cc: William Steiner  
Susan Wolf