UNITED STATES SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION WASHINGTON, D.C. 20549-3010





MAR 3 0 2009

Anne T. Larin Attorney and Assistant Secretary General Motors Corporation Legal Staff MC 482-C23-D24 300 Renaissance Center P.O. Box 300 Detroit, MI 48265-3000

Act:	1934
Section: Rule:	149-8
Public Availability:_	3-30.09

March 30, 2009

Re: General Motors Corporation Incoming letter dated February 3, 2009

Dear Ms. Larin:

This is in response to your letter dated February 3, 2009 concerning the shareholder proposal submitted to General Motors by Mark Seidenberg. Our response is attached to the enclosed photocopy of your correspondence. By doing this, we avoid having to recite or summarize the facts set forth in the correspondence. Copies of all of the correspondence also will be provided to the proponent.

In connection with this matter, your attention is directed to the enclosure, which sets forth a brief discussion of the Division's informal procedures regarding shareholder proposals.

Sincerely,

Heather L. Maples Senior Special Counsel

Enclosures

cc: Mark Seidenberg

*** FISMA & OMB Memorandum M-07-16 ***

Response of the Office of Chief Counsel Division of Corporation Finance

Re: General Motors Corporation Incoming letter dated February 3, 2009

The proposal relates to General Motors' proxy materials.

There appears to be some basis for your view that General Motors may exclude the proposal under rule 14a-8(f). We note that the proponent appears not to have responded to General Motors' request for documentary support indicating that he has satisfied the minimum ownership requirement for the one-year period required by rule 14a-8(b). Accordingly, we will not recommend enforcement action to the Commission if General Motors omits the proposal from its proxy materials in reliance on rules 14a-8(b) and 14a-8(f). In reaching this position, we have not found it necessary to address the alternative basis for omission upon which General Motors relies.

Sincerely,

Matt S. McNair Attorney-Adviser

DIVISION OF CORPORATION FINANCE INFORMAL PROCEDURES REGARDING SHAREHOLDER PROPOSALS

The Division of Corporation Finance believes that its responsibility with respect to matters arising under Rule 14a-8 [17 CFR 240.14a-8], as with other matters under the proxy rules, is to aid those who must comply with the rule by offering informal advice and suggestions and to determine, initially, whether or not it may be appropriate in a particular matter to recommend enforcement action to the Commission. In connection with a shareholder proposal under Rule 14a-8, the Division's staff considers the information furnished to it by the Company in support of its intention to exclude the proposals from the Company's proxy materials, as well as any information furnished by the proponent or the proponent's representative.

Although Rule 14a-8(k) does not require any communications from shareholders to the Commission's staff, the staff will always consider information concerning alleged violations of the statutes administered by the Commission, including argument as to whether or not activities proposed to be taken would be violative of the statute or rule involved. The receipt by the staff of such information, however, should not be construed as changing the staff's informal procedures and proxy review into a formal or adversary procedure.

It is important to note that the staff's and Commission's no-action responses to Rule 14a-8(j) submissions reflect only informal views. The determinations reached in these noaction letters do not and cannot adjudicate the merits of a company's position with respect to the proposal. Only a court such as a U.S. District Court can decide whether a company is obligated to include shareholder proposals in its proxy materials. Accordingly a discretionary determination not to recommend or take Commission enforcement action, does not preclude a proponent, or any shareholder of a company, from pursuing any rights he or she may have against the company in court, should the management omit the proposal from the company's proxy material.



Facsimile (313) 665-4979

Telephone (313) 665-4927

February 3, 2009

BY B-MAIL U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission Division of Corporation Finance Office of Chief Counsel 100 F Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20549

Ladies and Gentlemen:

This is a filing, pursuant to Rule 14a-8(j), to omit the proposal received on October 28, 2008 from Mark Seidenberg (Exhibit A) from the General Motors Corporation proxy materials for the 2009 Annual Meeting of Stockholders. The proposal requests that that for each item of business to be voted on at a stockholder meeting, the company's proxy statement would include the percentage of vote required for approval, the legal effect of stockholder approval (including any other actions necessary for implementation), the means for stockholders to obtain information about actions taken to implement an item that is approved, and the ability of stockholders to require implementing actions, either by action within the corporation or by court action.

General Motors intends to omit the proposal as the amount of GM stock Mr. Seidenberg claims to own would not make him eligible to submit a proposal under Rule 14a-8(1)(b). In addition, Mr. Seidenberg did not respond to our request for evidence of his eligibility to submit a proposal under Rule 14a-8(b) within the 14-day deadline provided in subsection (f)(1) of Rule 14a-8. Finally, we believe that the proposal may be omitted under Rule 14a-8(i)(7) because it relates to ordinary business matters.

The letter accompanying Mr. Seidenberg's proposal stated that he owned 60 shares of GM Common Stock and 2 shares of GM Class H Common Stock (Exhibit B). Rule 14a-8(b)(1) states that to be eligible to submit a proposal, a stockholder must have continuously held at least \$2,000 market value of securities entitled to vote for a least one year. For purposes of determining eligibility, the proponent's investment is valued at the highest selling price (for securities traded on the New York Stock Exchange) during the 60 calendar days before the proposal was submitted. See Department of Corporation Finance Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14 (July 13, 2001). The highest selling price for GM Common Stock during the 60 days prior to October 28, 2008 was \$14.31 per share, on September 12. Based on that price, the stock holdings that Mr. Seidenberg reported do not make him eligible to submit a proposal under Rule

MC 482-C23-D24 300 Renaissance Center P.O. Box 300 Detroit Michigan 48265.1446

February 3, 2009 Page 2

14a-8(b)(1). (GM Class H Common Stock is no longer outstanding, and so would not be entitled to vote.)

General Motors confirmed that Mr. Seidenberg is not listed as a stockholder on our transfer agent's records and by letter dated October 31, 2008 (Exhibit C) informed him that because he was not a stockholder of record we required evidence of his beneficial stock ownership. GM's letter described the types of evidence that would be acceptable and enclosed a copy of Rule 14a-8, noting that under subsection (f)(1) of the Rule he was required to send the evidence to GM within 14 days after receiving our letter. GM's letter was delivered by U.S. Overnight Mail to Mr. Seidenberg's post office box on November 1, 2008 (Exhibit D), so that the deadline for providing evidence of stock ownership was November 15, 2008. We have not received any further communications from Mr. Seidenberg.

GM's transfer agent subsequently informed us that according to its records, Mr. Seidenberg's stock has been escheated. For several years, we have tried to alert Mr. Seidenberg to the need to communicate with our transfer agent. In September 2005, in acknowledging that we had received his proposal for the 2006 Annual Meeting, we informed him that his Class H Common Stock was no longer outstanding and how to contact our transfer agent with regard to that stock (Bxhibit E). In November 2006, in acknowledging that we had received his proposal for the 2006, in acknowledging that we had received his proposal for the 2006 and how to contact our transfer agent with regard to that stock (Bxhibit E). In November 2006, in acknowledging that we had received his proposal for the 2007 Annual Meeting, we told him that we had been informed that, because his dividend checks had not been cashed for several years, some dividends had escheated and again firmished contact information for our transfer agent (Exhibit F).

Because we have not received evidence that Mr. Seidenberg currently owns stock entitled to vote at the 2009 Annual Meeting despite proper notice, GM intends to exclude his proposal. The Staff consistently has granted no-action relief where a proponent failed to respond to a company's proper request for documentary support indicating that the proponent has satisfied Rule 14a-8(b)'s ownership requirements. See, e.g., <u>CSX Corporation</u> (January 25, 2008); <u>AT&T</u> Inc. (December 12, 2007); <u>Occidental Petroleum Corporation</u> (November 21, 2007); <u>Torotel Inc.</u> (August 29, 2007).

Finally, we believe that the proposal may be omitted because of its subject matter. Rule 14a-8(i)(7) permits a company to omit a stockholder proposal from its proxy materials if it deals with a matter relating to the company's ordinary business operations. The general policy underlying the "ordinary business" exclusion is "to confine the resolution of ordinary business problems to management and the board of directors, since it is impracticable for shareholders to decide how to solve such problems at an annual shareholders meeting." The Commission has stated that the general underlying policy of the ordinary business exclusion is "consistent with the policy of most state corporate laws; to confine the resolution of ordinary business problems to management and the board of directors, since it is impracticable for shareholders to decide how to solve such problems at an annual shareholders meeting." The Commission has stated that the general underlying policy of the ordinary business exclusion is "consistent with the policy of most state corporate laws; to confine the resolution of ordinary business problems to management and the board of directors, since it is impracticable for shareholders to decide how" to solve such problems at an annual shareholders meeting." Stockholder proposals may be excluded when they seek to "micro-manage" the company with a proposal that "involves intricate detail, or seeks to impose specific time-frames or methods for implementing complex policies." See Exchange Act Release No. 34-40018 (May 21, 1998). February 3, 2009 Page 3

The fact that the proposal deals with an issue that is related to corporate governance such as such as the handling of stockholder proposals does not prevent it from being considered ordinary business. In <u>IDACORP. Inc.</u> (December 10, 2007), the Staff took a no-action position on the exclusion of a proposal requesting that the proxy statement include a report on "the process of submission, introduction, *presentation*, and approval and *carrying out of shareholder proposals*" (emphasis added) on the basis that it related to ordinary business operations. The Seidenberg proposal deals with the same subject matter—presentation in the proxy statement of information about a stockholder proposal beyond what is required by the proxy rules and state corporation law and treatment of proposals after they are approved. The Staff has found that using the proxy statement to provide information to stockholders about routine operations is related to ordinary business operations; see <u>Alaska Air Group</u> (March 14, 2008); <u>General Motors Corporation</u> (February 22, 2008). The proposal in this case deals with items related to ordinary business operations and may be excluded under Rule 14a-8(i)(7).

Please inform us whether the Staff will recommend any enforcement action if this proposal is omitted from the proxy materials for General Motors' 2009 Annual Meeting of Stockholders. GM plans to begin printing its proxy material in early April. We would appreciate any assistance you can give us in meeting our schedule.

Sincerely yours,

Anne T. Larin Attorney and Assistant Secretary

Enclosures

c: Mark Seidenberg

Exhibit A

Resolution on Significance and Enforceability of Stockowner Votes

Be it resolved by the stockowners to request that for each item of business to be voted on at a stockowner meeting, the proxy statement shall include a statement of:

1. the percentage of the vote required for approval.

2. the legal effect of the approval. This would include stating if an effect automatically occurs of if some specified action (s) would be required to be taken in order to be implemented. If any other specified action (s) would be required, an intended timetable of these actions would be presented.

3. if the item of business is approved, how a stockowner can be informed as to what action the board or management has taken to implement it. This would include whether the board and management will make a report that is distributed to all stockowners, or whether a stockowner would need to make a request (with details on how the request would be made). This would also include an intended timetable for board and management to implement it.

4. if an item of business is approved which requests that the beard or management take (or refrain from taking) some action, and if the beard or management fails to take (or refrains from taking) such actions, the rights of stockowners to enforce the approved item of business (a) by a process within the corporation and (b) by court action.

Supporting Statement

When we stockowners vote on items of business at stockowner meetings, we should know the consequences of all the votes. We should also be informed of the follow-up by the board and management.

The right to know what actions are taken (or the failure to take actions) is important for proper corporate governance. Beards and managements must be accountable for the votes of stockwarers, and promot and full compliance with them.

Perhaps the best argument for this resolution is that the proxy statement you are reading does not include a complete statement about the significance and enforceability of each item of business, as is requested in this resolution.

Vote yes, and future proxy statements may well have this vital information. If this resolution is approved, wouldn't you like to know how and whether it is implemented? If the board opposes this resolution, I think it would be a troubling for corporate governance of our corporation.

Exhip t AUED

OCT 28 2008

MARK SETDENRERG

THCE OF SECHES ...

*** FISMA & OMB Memorandum M-07-16 ***

October 20, 2008

Ms. Nancy E. Polis Secretary of the Corporation General Motors Corporation 300 Renaissance Center P. O. Box 300 Detroit, Michigan 48265

Dear Ms. Polis:

As a stockowner, I am submitting the enclosed "Resolution on Significance and Enforceability of Stockowner Votes" for the upcoming 2009 annual meeting. It and the supporting statement should thus be published in the proxy statement for that meeting.

I am the current owner of 60 shares of GM common stock and 2 shares of class H common. I have owned them continuously for over a year. I intend to own these shares through the upcoming 2009 annual meeting. I intend to present the resolution either personally or by representative.

Please let me know GM management's position.

Sincerely,

k Lei

Mark Seidenberg

Exhibit C



Facsimile (313) 665-4979

October 31, 2008

BY EXPRESS MAIL Mark Seidenberg

*** FISMA & OMB Memorandum M-07-16 ***

Dear Mr. Seidenberg:

On October 28, 2008 General Motors received your letter dated October 20 submitting a stockholder proposal for the 2009 Annual Meeting of Stockholders.

Our stock transfer agent has informed us that you are not listed in the stock ownership records as a registered stockholder of General Motors. Please provide us with evidence that your beneficial stock ownership of GM stock satisfies the requirements of Rule 14a-8 (a copy of which is enclosed for your information). Note that Subsections (2)(i) and (ii) of the answer to Question 2 describe the types of evidence that would be acceptable:

- (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, Schedule 13G, Form 3, Form 4 and/or Form 5, 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 have filed one of those 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;

MC 482-C23-D24 300 Renalssance Center P.O. Box 300 Detroit, Michigan 48265-5000

Me en But 14.3 Auto 14.3 Telephone (313) 665-4927

October 31, 2008 Page 2

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

Subsection (1) of the answer to Question 2 states that you must have held this stock "for at least one year by the date you submit the proposal".

As stated in Question 6(1) of the enclosed Rule, you must send, no later than 14 days after you receive this letter, the evidence of your stock ownership as of the date you submitted the proposal. If you do not send evidence within that period that complies with the Rule, General Motors may choose to omit your proposal from our proxy materials.

Please send your response to my attention at the address at the bottom of the first page of this letter (including the mail code).

Sincerely,

Anne T. Larin Attorney and Assistant Secretary

Baclosure

Exhibit E

Facsimile (313) 665-4978

Telephone (313) 665-4927

October 20, 2005

Mark Seidenberg

** FISMA & OMB Memorandum M-07-16 ***

Dear Mr. Seidenberg:

General Motors has received your stockholder proposal for inclusion in the proxy material for the Annual Meeting of Stockholders in 2006.

In your cover letter you referred to the Class H Common Stock that you hold. As part of the split-off of Hughes Electronics Corporation, the Class H stock was convertible into DIRECTV stock and is no longer outstanding. You may want to contact EquiServe, the transfer agent for that transaction, to ascertain the status of your Class H stock; their toll-free phone number for that information is 1-877-498-8904.

This change in the Class H stock, of course, does not affect your eligibility to submit a stockholder proposal, since you own more than \$2000 worth of GM common stock, \$1-2/3 par value.

Sincerely,

Ani

Anne T. Larin Attorney and Assistant Secretary

MC 482-C23-D24 300 Rettalssance Center P.O. Box 300 Detroit Michigan 48265.566

Exhibit P



Facsimile (313) 665-4978

Telephone (313) 665-4927

November 21, 2006

Mark Seidenberg

*** FISMA & OMB Memorandum M-07-16 ***

Dear Mr. Seidenberg:

General Motors has received your stockholder proposal for inclusion in the proxy material for the Annual Meeting of Stockholders in 2007.

When we checked with our stock transfer agents to confirm your ownership of a qualifying amount of GM stock, they informed us that according to their records your dividend checks have not been cashed for several years, so that the dividends declared before June 2003 have escheated. If you would like to receive replacement checks for the dividends after June 2003, please contact our stock transfer agent Computershare at 800-331-9922.

Sincerely,

Δ 57

Anne T. Larin Attorney and Assistant Secretary

MC 482-C23-D24 300 Renaissance Center P.O. Box 300 Detroit, Michigan 48265-3000