


PE
01/07/2013

NO ACT



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



13000336

DIVISION OF
CORPORATION FINANCE

Received SEC

FEB 12 2013

February 12, 2013

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

Washington, DC 20549

Act: 1934
Section: _____
Rule: 14a-8
Public
Availability: 2/12/13

Re: Express Scripts Holding Company
Incoming letter dated January 7, 2013

Dear Mr. Annus:

This is in response to your letter dated January 7, 2013 concerning the shareholder proposal submitted to Express Scripts by the Miami Firefighters' Relief and Pension Fund and the City of Philadelphia Public Employees Retirement System. Copies of all of the correspondence on which this response is based will be made available on our website at <http://www.sec.gov/divisions/corpfin/cf-noaction/14a-8.shtml>. For your reference, a brief discussion of the Division's informal procedures regarding shareholder proposals is also available at the same website address.

Sincerely,

Ted Yu
Senior Special Counsel

Enclosure

cc: Erik Pace
Miami Firefighters' Relief and Pension Fund
office@miami175.org

Sumit Handa
The City of Philadelphia Public Employees Retirement System
Board of Pensions & Retirement
Sixteenth Floor
Two Penn Center Plaza
Philadelphia, PA 19102-1721

February 12, 2013

**Response of the Office of Chief Counsel
Division of Corporation Finance**

Re: Express Scripts Holding Company
Incoming letter dated January 7, 2013

The proposal relates to political contributions and expenditures.

There appears to be some basis for your view that Express Scripts may exclude the proposal under rule 14a-8(f). Accordingly, we will not recommend enforcement action to the Commission if Express Scripts 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 Express Scripts relies.

Sincerely,

Charles Lee
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 no-action 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.



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

Securities Exchange Act of 1934 / Rule 14a-8

January 7, 2013

VIA E-MAIL (shareholderproposals@sec.gov)

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

Re: Express Scripts Holding Company – Omission of Stockholder Proposals Submitted by Philadelphia Public Employees Retirement System and Miami Fire Fighters’ Relief & Pension Fund.

Ladies and Gentlemen:

This letter is to inform you, in accordance with Rule 14a-8(j) under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (the “Exchange Act”), that our client, Express Scripts Holding Company, a Delaware corporation (the “Company” or “Express Scripts”), intends to omit from its proxy statement (the “2013 Proxy Statement”) for its 2013 annual meeting of stockholders (the “2013 Annual Meeting”) stockholder proposals submitted, as co-proponents, by Philadelphia Public Employees Retirement System (the “Philadelphia Fund”) and Miami Fire Fighters’ Relief & Pension Fund (the “Miami Fund,” and together with the Philadelphia Fund, the “Proponents”). The proposal in question was originally submitted by a third co-proponent, who subsequently withdrew its submission.

The Miami Fund

The Miami Fund submitted its proposal under cover of letter dated December 7, 2012 (the “Miami Proposal”) to Express Scripts, Inc. (a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Company). A copy of the Proposal, together with Proponent’s supporting materials, is attached hereto as Exhibit A. Included in Exhibit A is a letter from State Street Bank dated December 10, 2012, with which the Proponent purported to provide proof of its continuous ownership of the Company’s shares (the “Miami Share Ownership Letter”). Following receipt of the Proposal, the

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

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

Bryan Cave International Consulting
 A TRADE AND CUSTOMS CONSULTANCY
 www.bryancaveconsulting.com
 Bangkok
 Beijing
 Jakarta
 Kuala Lumpur
 Manila
 Shanghai
 Singapore
 Tokyo

Office of Chief Counsel
January 7, 2013
Page 2

Company advised the Miami Fund of its failure to satisfy eligibility requirements of Rule 14a-8 by a letter dated December 17, 2012 (the "Miami Deficiency Notice") and requested the Miami Fund to provide support for certain statements contained in the proposed supporting statement to the Miami Proposal. The Miami Deficiency Notice further pointed out that the Miami Proposal was sent to, and requested action by, the stockholders of the Company's wholly owned-subsiary and not the stockholders of the Company. The Company did not receive a response to the Miami Deficiency Notice and there has been no further correspondence with the Miami Fund. The Miami Deficiency Notice is attached hereto as **Exhibit B**.

The Philadelphia Fund

The Philadelphia Fund originally submitted its proposal under cover of letter dated December 7, 2012 (the "Initial Philadelphia Proposal") to Express Scripts, Inc. The submission was received on December 11, 2012. A copy of the Initial Philadelphia Proposal, together with Philadelphia Fund's supporting materials, is attached hereto as **Exhibit C**. Following receipt of the Initial Philadelphia Proposal, the Company advised the Philadelphia Fund of its failure to satisfy eligibility requirements of Rule 14a-8 by a letter dated December 17, 2012 (the "Philadelphia Deficiency Notice") and requested the Philadelphia Fund to provide support for certain statements contained in the proposed supporting statement to the Initial Philadelphia Proposal. The Philadelphia Deficiency Notice further pointed out that the Initial Philadelphia Proposal was sent to, and requested action by, the stockholders of the Company's wholly owned-subsiary and not the stockholders of the Company.

The Philadelphia Fund subsequently provided three letters (the "Philadelphia Share Ownership Letters") purporting to establish the eligibility of the Philadelphia Fund to submit a stockholder proposal to the Company pursuant to Rule 14a-8, as follows:

- On December 19, 2012 (after the Philadelphia Deficiency Notice had been delivered to the Philadelphia Fund), the Company received a letter from State Street Bank, dated December 19, 2012. Such letter purported to provide evidence of Philadelphia Fund's ownership of shares of Express Scripts, Inc. from December 18, 2011 through April 30, 2012.
- By letter dated December 31, 2012 from J.P. Morgan Chase & Co., proof was provided of the Philadelphia Fund's ownership of a sufficient number of shares of Express Scripts Holding Company (or Express Scripts, Inc.) from May 1, 2012 through December 31, 2012.
- By letter dated December 31 2012 from State Street Bank, proof was provided of the Philadelphia Fund's ownership of a sufficient number of shares of Express Scripts Holding Company (or Express Scripts, Inc.) from December 18, 2011 through April 30, 2012.

Copies of the Philadelphia Deficiency Notice and the Philadelphia Share Ownership Letters are attached hereto as **Exhibit D**.

By letter dated January 2, 2013, the Philadelphia Fund submitted a revised proposal correctly addressed to Express Scripts Holding Company and requesting action by the stockholders of the Company (the "Philadelphia Proposal," and together with the Miami Proposal, the "Proposals").

Office of Chief Counsel
January 7, 2013
Page 3

The Philadelphia Proposal included certain changes to the proposed resolution and supporting statement to reflect the current entity structure of the Company and its affiliates. Although the Philadelphia Proposal was submitted after the deadline for submitting stockholder proposals under Rule 14a-8, the Company would not reject the Philadelphia Proposal solely based on the late submission, in light of its responsiveness to the Company's request to correct inaccurate references to Express Scripts, Inc. in the Initial Philadelphia Proposal. The Philadelphia Proposal is attached hereto as Exhibit E.

Requests

The Company requests confirmation that the Staff of the Division of Corporation Finance (the "Staff") of the Securities and Exchange Commission (the "Commission") will not recommend any enforcement action if the Company omits both the Miami Proposal and the Philadelphia Proposal from the 2013 Proxy Statement.

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

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

I. The Proposals

The Proposals relate to a report on political contributions by the Company. The full text of the Miami Proposal and the Philadelphia Proposal and respective supporting statements are included in Exhibit A and Exhibit E, respectively.

II. Grounds for Exclusion

1. The Miami Proposal is directed to Express Scripts, Inc., a company no longer subject to Rule 14a-8 under the Exchange Act. The Miami Proposal further inappropriately requests action by the stockholders of the Company's wholly-owned subsidiary and not the stockholders of the Company.

2. Pursuant to Rule 14a-8(f) and Rule 14a-8(b), a company may properly exclude a proposal and supporting statement if the proponent has not continuously held at least \$2,000 in market value, or 1%, of the company's securities for at least one year as of the date the proposal is submitted. Neither the Miami Fund nor the Philadelphia Fund has provided sufficient proof of ownership of the Company's securities.

3. To the extent the Staff finds that the Miami Proposal may not be excluded from the 2013 Proxy Statement, the Philadelphia Proposal, which contains different language from the Miami Proposal, may be excluded pursuant to Rule 14a-8(i)(11) as substantially duplicative of a previously

Office of Chief Counsel
January 7, 2013
Page 4

submitted proposal.

A. The Miami Proposal Is Not Directed to the Company, but to Express Scripts, Inc., a Company no Longer Subject to Rule 14a-8 under the Exchange Act

Regulation 14A under the Exchange Act applies to the solicitation of proxies with respect to securities registered pursuant to Section 12 of the Exchange Act. The current publicly traded company, Express Scripts Holding Company, was incorporated, under the name Aristotle Holding, Inc. on July 15, 2011, solely for the purpose of facilitating a series of mergers (the "Mergers") involving, among other entities, Express Scripts, Inc. and Medco Health Solutions, Inc. ("Medco"), two publicly traded companies at the time. Following the consummation of the Mergers on April 2, 2012, Express Scripts, Inc. and Medco became wholly owned subsidiaries of Express Scripts Holding Company, which remained the sole publicly traded company. The shares of Express Scripts, Inc. were converted into shares of Express Scripts Holding Company, and the shares of Medco were converted into shares of Express Scripts Holding Company and the right to receive a cash payment. The issuance of the Express Scripts Holding Company shares was completed pursuant to a registration statement on Form S-4 filed by Express Scripts Holding Company. In connection with the Mergers, Express Scripts, Inc. filed on May 9, 2012 a Form 15 with the Commission to de-register its securities registered pursuant to Section 12(g) of the Exchange Act. As a result, Express Scripts, Inc. is no longer subject to Regulation 14A under the Exchange Act.

The Miami Proposal was addressed to Keith J. Ebling, Executive Vice President, General Counsel and Corporate Secretary of Express Scripts, Inc. Further, the proposed resolution of the Miami Proposal begins with a reference to Express Scripts, Inc.: "Resolved, that the shareholders of Express Scripts, Inc. ("Company") hereby request that the Company provide a report"

As of April 2, 2012, all of the outstanding capital stock of Express Scripts, Inc. was held by the Company. Accordingly, the Miami Fund could not have been an Express Scripts, Inc. stockholder on the date it submitted the Miami Proposal. Further, as a wholly owned subsidiary of the Company, Express Scripts, Inc. has no need to solicit proxies or file a proxy statement in connection with any annual meeting for 2013. The Company believes that the Miami Proposal may be omitted from its 2013 Proxy Statement because the Miami Fund did not submit it to the Company, but instead to its wholly-owned subsidiary, a company that is no longer subject to Regulation 14A, and the Proposal itself requests action by the stockholders of Express Scripts, Inc., the Company's wholly-owned subsidiary.

In the Miami Deficiency Notice, the Company requested the Miami Fund to confirm that it intended to address the Miami Proposal to, and seek inclusion in the proxy statement of, Express Scripts Holding Company. To date, the Miami Fund has not confirmed that this was its intent. Accordingly, the Miami Proposal continues to be addressed to Express Scripts, Inc., and the proposed resolutions is drafted as a resolution of Express Scripts, Inc. stockholders, a deficiency that was not remedied by the Miami Fund despite being explicitly asked to do so. Accordingly, the Company respectfully requests the Staff to confirm that the Miami Proposal may be excluded from the 2013 Proxy Statement.

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

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

The Miami Fund

The Miami Fund submitted the Miami Proposal on December 7, 2012 to Express Scripts, Inc. No proof of ownership of the Company’s securities was provided at that time. The Miami Fund purported to prove its ownership of the Company shares by submitting the Miami Share Ownership Letter. However, such letter was addressed to Express Scripts, Inc. and provides evidence of the Miami Fund’s ownership of only Express Scripts, Inc. shares.¹

In light of the fact that Express Scripts, Inc. ceased to be a publicly traded company on April 2, 2012, and that Express Scripts Holding Company has been a publicly traded company only since April 2, 2012, the Company requested in the Miami Deficiency Notice that the Miami Fund confirm that the proposal was intended to be submitted to Express Scripts Holding Company. The Miami Deficiency Notice further requested that, in light of the Mergers and the fact that Express Scripts, Inc. ceased to be a publicly traded company on April 2, 2012, the Proponent provide appropriate proof of its continuous ownership, if the Miami Fund believed it could satisfy such ownership requirements. The Miami Deficiency Notice contained explicit references to the fact that the Company has been a publicly traded company since April 2, 2012, and that prior to that date, Express Scripts, Inc. was a publicly traded company. The Miami Deficiency Notice invited the Miami Fund to provide proof of ownership in light of those facts.

The Miami Fund has not provided any response to the Miami Deficiency Notice. Accordingly, the Miami Fund has not provided any proof of ownership of Express Scripts Holding Company shares. Furthermore, the Miami Fund has failed to completely address the fact, pointed out in the Miami Deficiency Notice, that Express Scripts Holding Company securities have been publicly trading only since April 2, 2012.

The Staff has consistently concurred that a stockholder proposal may be excluded from a

¹ The letter states “As custodian of the Miami Firefighters’ Relief and Pension Fund, we are writing to report that as of the close of business December 7, 2012 the Fund held 3200 shares of Express Scripts, Inc. (“Company”) stock in our account at State Street and registered in its nominee name of Cede & Co. The Fund has held in excess of \$2,000 worth of shares in your Company continuously since December 7, 2011.”

Office of Chief Counsel
January 7, 2013
Page 6

company's proxy materials when the proponent failed to provide satisfactory evidence of eligibility to submit the stockholder proposal in accordance with Rule 14a-8(b). This applies when the proof of ownership references a wrong entity. See *International Business Machines Corp.* (Jan. 22, 2010) (proof of ownership letter statement that the proponent held the required number of "Company" shares not sufficient to prove ownership, where the letter references both IBM, the relevant company, and Mylan, an irrelevant company); *Aluminum Company of America* (Mar. 27, 1987) (proof of ownership letter reference to "Alco. Std. Corp." not sufficient to prove ownership of Alcoa or Aluminum Company of America securities); *Coca-Cola Company* (Feb. 4, 2008) (proof of ownership letter reference to "Great Neck Capital Appreciation Investment Partnership, L.P." not sufficient to prove ownership by the entity submitting the proposal, Great Neck Capital Appreciation LTD Partnership). It has been a long-standing position of the Staff that, if, in connection with a merger, a stockholder receives securities of the surviving company in a registered transaction, then the one-year holding period of such securities for purposes of Rule 14a-8(b) begins as of the date when the securities themselves are issued at the closing of the merger. See, e.g., *ConocoPhillips* (several no-action letters dated March 24, 2003) (involving a similar merger structure as the Mergers); *AT&T Inc.* (Jan. 18, 2007); *Exelon* (March 15, 2001); and *Burlington Northern Santa Fe Corporation* (Dec. 28, 1995). However, we believe that there is no need to consider the applicability of such precedents to the present situation. Neither the Miami Fund nor the Philadelphia Fund provided sufficient proof of ownership relating to Express Scripts, Inc. or Medco securities prior to the Mergers, and Express Scripts Holding Company securities issued in connection with the Mergers. Accordingly, there is no need to address the question whether the Proponent could have tacked the holding period of any such formerly held securities to the holding period of Express Scripts Holding Company shares following the consummation of the Mergers on April 2, 2012.

The Philadelphia Fund

Rule 14a-8(b) requires a stockholder to provide proof of ownership that such stockholder 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 [the stockholder] submit[s] the proposal" (emphasis added). In accordance with Section D.3. of the Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14F (Oct. 18, 2011) ("SLB 14F"), when a stockholder submits a revised proposal, the stockholder must still prove required share ownership as of the date the original proposal is submitted. Accordingly, the Philadelphia Fund was required to provide proof of its share ownership for one year as of December 11, 2012, the date on which the Initial Philadelphia Proposal was submitted. The Company explicitly pointed this requirement out in the Philadelphia Deficiency Notice, which stated, among other things (emphasis added):

We believe the Fund is not itself a record holder of Express Scripts stock. You have also not provided any evidence that the Fund satisfies the share ownership requirement. While we do not acknowledge that the Fund can satisfy the Rule 14a-8 eligibility requirements in light of the timing of the Mergers (which took place less than one year ago), we are asking you to provide proof of eligibility if you believe the Fund can satisfy the requirements of Rule 14a-8. Under Rule 14a-8(b), proof can

Office of Chief Counsel
January 7, 2013
Page 7

be provided in one of two ways: (i) submitting to Express Scripts a written statement from the "record" holder of Express Scripts common stock (usually a broker or bank) verifying that the Fund has continuously for one year held the requisite number of shares of Express Scripts Holding Company common stock as of December 11, 2012 or (ii) submitting to Express Scripts a copy of a Schedule 13D, Schedule 13G, Form 3, Form 4 or Form 5 filed by the Fund with the Securities and Exchange Commission that demonstrates its ownership of the requisite number of shares as of or before December 11, 2012, in each case along with a written statement that (i) the Fund has owned such shares for the one year period prior to and including the date of the statement and (ii) the Fund intends to continue ownership of the shares through the date of the annual meeting. Our request for proof of eligibility under Rule 14a-8 is not an acknowledgement that, in light of the Mergers, you will be able to satisfy the eligibility requirements.

The Philadelphia Share Ownership Letters correctly reference the fact that the Philadelphia Fund's share ownership relates to either Express Scripts Holding Company or Express Scripts, Inc. However, the Philadelphia Share Ownership Letters do not provide any evidence of the Philadelphia Fund's ownership of Express Scripts Holding Company or Express Scripts, Inc. shares for the period between December 11, 2011 and December 18, 2011, which is within the one-year period prior to the submission of the Initial Philadelphia Proposal. The Philadelphia Share Ownership Letters cover the periods from December 18, 2011 through April 30, 2012 (by State Street Bank) and May 1, 2012 through December 31, 2012 (by J.P. Morgan & Chase Co.). As noted in Section C of SLB 14F, the proof of ownership may not leave a gap in the one-year holding period, which the Philadelphia Share Ownership Letters have clearly left.

Conclusion

Since neither the Miami Fund nor the Philadelphia Fund is a registered stockholder of Express Scripts Holding Company, and they failed to provide documentary evidence of ownership of Express Scripts Holding Company securities for one year in accordance with Rule 14a-8(b), the Proponents have not demonstrated their eligibility to submit a stockholder proposal in accordance with Rule 14a-8. Accordingly, we ask that the Staff concur that the Company may exclude the Proposals from its 2013 Proxy Statement pursuant to Rule 14a-8(b) and therefore that it will not recommend any enforcement action to the Commission if the Company excludes the Proposals for the reasons stated above.

Furthermore, in the Miami Deficiency Notice, the Company requested the Miami Fund to confirm that it intended to address the Miami Proposal to, and seek inclusion in the proxy statement of, Express Scripts Holding Company. To date, the Miami Fund has not confirmed that this was its intent. Accordingly, the Miami Proposal continues to be addressed to Express Scripts, Inc., and the proposed resolutions is drafted as a resolution of Express Scripts, Inc. stockholders, a deficiency that was not remedied by the Miami Fund despite being explicitly asked to do so. Accordingly, the

Office of Chief Counsel
January 7, 2013
Page 8

Company respectfully requests the Staff to confirm that the Miami Proposal may be excluded from the 2013 Proxy Statement.

C. If the Miami Proposal May not be Excluded from the 2013 Proxy Statement, the Philadelphia Proposal May Be Excluded Under Rule 14a-8(i)(11) Because It Substantially Duplicates Another Proposal Previously Submitted by Another Proponent.

In the event that the Staff does not concur with the Company's view that the Miami Proposal may be excluded for the reasons set forth above, the Company believes that the Philadelphia Proposal may be excluded under Rule 14a-8(i)(11).

The Company received the Miami Proposal on December 7, 2012 and the Initial Philadelphia Proposal on December 11, 2012. Accordingly, the Miami Proposal was submitted before the Philadelphia Proposal (including the Initial Philadelphia Proposal).

Rule 14a-8(i)(11) permits the exclusion from a company's proxy materials of a stockholder proposal that substantially duplicates another proposal previously submitted by another proponent that will be included in the proxy materials for the same meeting. Proposals do not need to be identical to be excluded pursuant to Rule 14a-8(i)(11), although co-proponents are permitted to submit identical proposals.

The Miami Proposal and the Philadelphia Proposal are nearly identical, but the Philadelphia Proposal contains certain language in the proposed resolution and the supporting statement that differs from the Miami Proposal, relating to references to Express Scripts, Inc. and Express Scripts Holding Company. Accordingly, if the Company is required to include the Miami Proposal, as submitted, in the 2013 Proxy Statement, the Philadelphia Proposal may be excluded pursuant to Rule 14a-8(i)(11) because it is substantially duplicative of the Miami Proposal that was previously submitted to the Company.

III. Conclusion


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

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

Bryan Cave LLP

Office of Chief Counsel
January 7, 2013
Page 9

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Taavi Annus". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "T" and a long, sweeping tail.

Taavi Annus

Enclosures

cc: Mr. Sumit Handa (Philadelphia Public Employees Retirement System)
Mr. Erik Pace (Miami Fire Fighters' Relief & Pension Fund)
Keith J. Ebling, Esq. (Express Scripts Holding Company)

Exhibit A

The Miami Proposal

See attached

**MIAMI FIRE FIGHTERS' RELIEF & PENSION FUND**

2980 N.W. South River Drive, Miami, Florida 33125-1146

(305) 633-3442 Fax (305) 633-3935

office@miami175.org

December 7, 2012

BY US MAIL DELIVERY AND FAX
(866-230-8345)Mr. Keith J. Ebling
Executive VP/General Counsel/Corporate Secretary
Express Scripts, Inc.
One Express Way
St. Louis, Missouri 63121

Re: The Miami Firefighters' Relief and Pension Fund

Dear Mr. Ebling:

In my capacity as Chairman of the Board of the Miami Firefighters' Relief and Pension Fund (the "Fund"), I write to give notice that pursuant to the 2012 proxy statement of Express Scripts, Inc. (the "Company"), the Fund intends to present the attached proposal (the "Proposal") at the 2013 annual meeting of shareholders (the "Annual Meeting") as a co-filer with The Firefighters' Pension System of the City of Kansas City, Missouri, Trust and The City of Philadelphia Public Employees Retirement System. The Fund requests that the Company include the Proposal in the Company's proxy statement for the Annual Meeting.

A letter from the Fund's custodian documenting the Fund's continuous ownership of the requisite amount of the Company's stock for at least one year prior to the date of this letter is being sent under separate cover. The Fund also intends to continue its ownership of at least the minimum number of shares required by the SEC regulations through the date of the Annual Meeting.

I represent that the Fund or its agent intends to appear in person or by proxy at the Annual Meeting to present the attached Proposal. I declare the Fund has no "material interest" other than that believed to be shared by stockholders of the Company generally.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Erik Pace". The signature is stylized and cursive.

Erik Pace
Chairman

Resolved, that the shareholders of Express Scripts, Inc. ("Company") hereby request that the Company provide a report, updated semiannually, disclosing the Company's:

1. Policies and procedures for making, with corporate funds or assets, contributions and expenditures (direct or indirect) to (a) participate or intervene in any political campaign on behalf of (or in opposition to) any candidate for public office, or (b) influence the general public, or any segment thereof, with respect to an election or referendum.
2. Monetary and non-monetary contributions and expenditures (direct and indirect) used in the manner described in section 1 above, including:
 - a. The identity of the recipient as well as the amount paid to each; and
 - b. The title(s) of the person(s) in the Company responsible decision-making.

The report shall be presented to the board of directors or relevant board committee and posted on the Company's website.

Stockholder Supporting Statement

As long-term shareholders of Express Scripts, we support transparency and accountability in corporate spending on political activities. These include any activities considered intervention in any political campaign under the Internal Revenue Code, such as direct and indirect political contributions to candidates, political parties, or political organizations; independent expenditures; or electioneering communications on behalf of federal, state or local candidates.

Disclosure is consistent with good public policy, in the best interest of the company and its shareholders, and critical for compliance with federal ethics laws. Moreover, the Supreme Court's *Citizens United* decision recognized the importance of political spending disclosure for shareholders when it said, "[D]isclosure permits citizens and shareholders to react to the speech of corporate entities in a proper way. This transparency enables the electorate to make informed decisions and give proper weight to different speakers and messages." Gaps in transparency and accountability may expose the company to reputational and business risks that could threaten long-term shareholder value.

Express Scripts contributed at least \$1.7 million in corporate funds since the 2002 election cycle. (CQ: <http://moneyline.cq.com> and National Institute on Money in State Politics: <http://www.followthemoney.org>)

However, relying on publicly available data does not provide a complete picture of the Company's political spending. For example, the Company's payments to trade associations used for political activities are undisclosed and unknown. In some cases, even management does not know how trade associations use their company's money politically. The proposal asks the Company to disclose all of its political spending, including payments to trade associations and other tax exempt organizations used for political purposes. This would bring our Company in line with a growing number of leading companies, including Exelon, Merck and Microsoft that support political disclosure and accountability and present this information on their websites.

The Company's Board and its shareholders need comprehensive disclosure to be able to fully evaluate the political use of corporate assets. We urge your support for this critical governance reform.

Exhibit B

Correspondence Regarding the Miami Proposal

See attached.



STATE STREET.

Specialized Trust Services

STATE STREET BANK
Crown Colony Office Park
1200 Crown Colony Drive CC17
Quincy, Massachusetts 02169

Facsimile +1 617 769 6695

www.statestreet.com

December 10 , 2012

BY OVERNIGHT DELIVERY AND FAX
(866-230-8345)

Mr. Keith J. Ebling
Executive VP/General Counsel/Corporate Secretary
Express Scripts, Inc.
One Express Way
St. Louis, Missouri 63121


Re: The Miami Firefighters' Relief and Pension Fund

Dear Mr. Ebling:

As custodian of the Miami Firefighters' Relief and Pension Fund, we are writing to report that as of the close of business December 7, 2012 the Fund held 3200 shares of Express Scripts, Inc. ("Company") stock in our account at State Street and registered in its nominee name of Cede & Co. The Fund has held in excess of \$2,000 worth of shares in your Company continuously since December 7, 2011.

If there are any other questions or concerns regarding this matter, please feel free to contact me at _617-985-7150.

Sincerely,


Eileen Hayes
Vice President



EXPRESS SCRIPTS®

December 17, 2012

VIA COURIER

Mr. Erik Pace
Chairman
Miami Fire Fighters' Relief & Pension Fund
2980 N.W. South River Drive
Miami, Florida 33125-1146

Dear Mr. Pace:

We acknowledge receipt of your letter dated December 7, 2012 and accompanying shareholder proposal, submitted on behalf of the Miami Firefighters' Relief and Pension Fund (the "Fund"), relating to a report on political activities (the "Proposal"). You addressed the letter to, and advised us that the Proposal was intended for inclusion in the next proxy statement of, Express Scripts, Inc. We acknowledge that the letter was submitted by fax, and according to our records, was received on December 7, 2012. We have also received a letter dated December 10, 2012 from State Street Bank ("State Street"), in which State Street indicated that as of the close of business on December 7, 2012, the Fund held 3200 shares of Express Scripts, Inc. stock, and has held in excess of \$2,000 worth of shares continuously since December 7, 2011.

As you may know, following the mergers involving Express Scripts, Inc. and Medco Health Solutions, Inc. that were consummated on April 2, 2012 (the "Mergers"), Express Scripts, Inc. is no longer a publicly traded company and, instead, is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Express Scripts Holding Company. Express Scripts Holding Company was formed in connection with the Mergers and became the publicly traded company on April 2, 2012. Accordingly, the Proposal as currently drafted is not a proper proposal for inclusion in our proxy statement or for consideration by the stockholders of Express Scripts Holding Company. We ask you to confirm that you intended to address the Proposal to, and seek inclusion in the proxy statement of, Express Scripts Holding Company ("Express Scripts"). We also ask you to revise the Proposal itself so that the references to Express Scripts, Inc. are changed to Express Scripts Holding Company.

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

We believe the Fund is not itself a record holder of Express Scripts stock. We have received a letter from State Street indicating that the Fund has held shares of Express Scripts, Inc. common stock from December 7, 2011 until December 7, 2012; however, you have not provided any evidence that the Fund has held any shares of Express Scripts Holding Company. Considering that beginning April 2, 2012, Express Scripts, Inc. has been a wholly-owned subsidiary of Express Scripts Holding Company, you could not have held Express Scripts, Inc. shares from that date through December 7, 2012.

While we do not acknowledge that the Fund can satisfy the Rule 14a-8 eligibility requirements in light of the timing of the Mergers (which took place less than one year ago), we are asking you to provide proof of eligibility if you believe the Fund can satisfy the requirements of Rule 14a-8. Under Rule 14a-8(b), proof can be provided in one of two ways: (i) submitting to Express Scripts a written statement from the "record" holder of Express Scripts common stock (usually a broker or bank) verifying that the Fund has continuously for one year held the requisite number of shares of Express Scripts Holding Company common stock as of December 7, 2012 or (ii) submitting to Express Scripts a copy of a Schedule 13D, Schedule 13G, Form 3, Form 4 or Form 5 filed by the Fund with the Securities and Exchange Commission that demonstrates its ownership of the requisite number of shares as of or before December 7, 2012, in each case along with a written statement that (i) the Fund has owned such shares for the one year period prior to and including the date of the statement and (ii) the Fund intends to continue ownership of the shares through the date of the annual meeting. Our request for proof of eligibility under Rule 14a-8 is not an acknowledgement that, in light of the Mergers, you will be able to satisfy the eligibility requirements.

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

In addition to the foregoing deficiencies relating to your eligibility to submit shareholder proposals under Rule 14a-8 to Express Scripts Holding Company, we ask you to clarify one particular statement in the supporting statement of the Proposal. Namely, we are unable to confirm from the websites cited in the supporting statements (<http://moneyline.cq.com> and <http://www.followthemoney.org>) that Express Scripts has indeed contributed \$1.7 million in corporate funds since 2002 election cycle, as alleged in the supporting statement. We ask you to clarify this statement and explain how to confirm this statement from the referenced websites.

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

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

Best regards,



Christopher A. McGinnis
Vice President and Associate General Counsel

Attachments

Rule 14a-8 – Shareholder Proposals.

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

(a) Question 1: What is a proposal?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(i) The proposal;

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(ii) In all other cases, the company must provide you with a copy of its opposition statements no later than 30 calendar days before 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/downloads/membership/directories/dtc/alpha.pdf>.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

D. The submission of revised proposals

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

¹ See Rule 14a-8(b).

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

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

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

⁵ See Exchange Act Rule 17Ad-8.

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

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

⁸ *Techne Corp.* (Sept. 20, 1988).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

Shareholder Proposals

Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14G (CF)

Action: Publication of CF Staff Legal Bulletin

Date: October 16, 2012

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

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

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

A. The purpose of this bulletin

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

D. Use of website addresses in proposals and supporting statements

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Exhibit C

The Initial Philadelphia Proposal

See attached.

**BOARD OF PENSIONS AND RETIREMENT****PHILADELPHIA PUBLIC EMPLOYEES
RETIREMENT SYSTEM**

BOARD MEMBERS
ROB DUBOW, *Chairperson*
ALAN BUTKOVITZ, *Esq.*
SHELLY SMITH, *Esq.*
RICHARD NEGRIN, *Esq.*
ALBERT L. D'ATTILIO, *Esq.*
RONALD STAGLIANO, *Vice Chal.*
CAROL G. STUKES - BAYLOR
VERONICA M. PANKEY
ANDREW P. THOMAS

SUMIT HANDA
Chief Investment Officer

Board of Pensions & Retirement
Sixteenth Floor
Two Penn Center Plaza
Philadelphia, PA 19102-1721
(215) 496 - 7400
FAX (215) 496 -7420

December 7, 2012

BY OVERNIGHT DELIVERY AND FAX
(866-230-8345)

Mr. Keith J. Ebling
Executive VP/General Counsel/Corporate Secretary
Express Scripts, Inc.
One Express Way
St. Louis, Missouri 63121


Re: The City of Philadelphia Public Employees Retirement System

Dear Mr. Ebling:

In my capacity as the Chief Investment Officer of The City of Philadelphia Public Employees Retirement System (the "Fund"), I write to give notice that pursuant to the 2012 proxy statement of Express Scripts Inc. (the "Company"), the Fund intends to present the attached proposal (the "Proposal") at the 2013 annual meeting of shareholders (the "Annual Meeting") as a co-filer with The Miami Firefighters' Relief and Pension Fund. The Fund requests that the Company include the Proposal in the Company's proxy statement for the Annual Meeting.

A letter from the Fund's custodians documenting the Fund's continuous ownership of the requisite amount of the Company's stock for at least one year prior to the date of this letter is being sent under separate cover. The Fund also intends to continue its ownership of at least the minimum number of shares required by the SEC regulations through the date of the Annual Meeting.

I represent that the Fund or its agent intends to appear in person or by proxy at the Annual Meeting to present the attached Proposal. I declare the Fund has no "material interest" other than that believed to be shared by stockholders of the Company generally.

Sincerely,

Sumit Handa
Chief Investment Officer

Resolved, that the shareholders of Express Scripts, Inc. ("Company") hereby request that the Company provide a report, updated semiannually, disclosing the Company's:

1. Policies and procedures for making, with corporate funds or assets, contributions and expenditures (direct or indirect) to (a) participate or intervene in any political campaign on behalf of (or in opposition to) any candidate for public office, or (b) influence the general public, or any segment thereof, with respect to an election or referendum.
2. Monetary and non-monetary contributions and expenditures (direct and indirect) used in the manner described in section 1 above, including:
 - a. The identity of the recipient as well as the amount paid to each; and
 - b. The title(s) of the person(s) in the Company responsible decision-making.

The report shall be presented to the board of directors or relevant board committee and posted on the Company's website.

Stockholder Supporting Statement

As long-term shareholders of Express Scripts, we support transparency and accountability in corporate spending on political activities. These include any activities considered intervention in any political campaign under the Internal Revenue Code, such as direct and indirect political contributions to candidates, political parties, or political organizations; independent expenditures; or electioneering communications on behalf of federal, state or local candidates.

Disclosure is consistent with good public policy, in the best interest of the company and its shareholders, and critical for compliance with federal ethics laws. Moreover, the Supreme Court's *Citizens United* decision recognized the importance of political spending disclosure for shareholders when it said, "[D]isclosure permits citizens and shareholders to react to the speech of corporate entities in a proper way. This transparency enables the electorate to make informed decisions and give proper weight to different speakers and messages." Gaps in transparency and accountability may expose the company to reputational and business risks that could threaten long-term shareholder value.

Express Scripts contributed at least \$1.7 million in corporate funds since the 2002 election cycle. (CQ: <http://moneyline.cq.com> and National Institute on Money in State Politics: <http://www.followthemoney.org>)

However, relying on publicly available data does not provide a complete picture of the Company's political spending. For example, the Company's payments to trade associations used for political activities are undisclosed and unknown. In some cases, even management does not know how trade associations use their company's money politically. The proposal asks the Company to disclose all of its political spending, including payments to trade associations and other tax exempt organizations used for political purposes. This would bring our Company in line with a growing number of leading companies, including Exelon, Merck and Microsoft that support political disclosure and accountability and present this information on their websites.

The Company's Board and its shareholders need comprehensive disclosure to be able to fully evaluate the political use of corporate assets. We urge your support for this critical governance reform.

Exhibit D

Correspondence Regarding the Initial Philadelphia Proposal

See attached.



EXPRESS SCRIPTS®

December 17, 2012

VIA COURIER

Mr. Sumit Handa
Chief Investment Officer
The City of Philadelphia Public Employees Retirement System
Board of Pensions & Retirement
Sixteenth Floor
Two Penn Center Plaza
Philadelphia, PA 19102-1721

Dear Mr. Handa:

We acknowledge receipt on December 11, 2012 of your letter dated December 7, 2012 and accompanying shareholder proposal, submitted on behalf of The City of Philadelphia Public Employees Retirement System (the "Fund"), relating to a report on political activities (the "Proposal"). You addressed the letter to, and advised us that the Proposal was intended for inclusion in the next proxy statement of, Express Scripts, Inc. We acknowledge that the letter was submitted by fax, and according to our records, was received on December 11, 2012.

As you may know, following the mergers involving Express Scripts, Inc. and Medco Health Solutions, Inc. that were consummated on April 2, 2012 (the "Mergers"), Express Scripts, Inc. is no longer a publicly traded company and, instead, is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Express Scripts Holding Company. Express Scripts Holding Company was formed in connection with the Mergers and became the publicly traded company on April 2, 2012. Accordingly, the Proposal as currently drafted is not a proper proposal for inclusion in our proxy statement or for consideration by the stockholders of Express Scripts Holding Company. We ask you to confirm that you intended to address the Proposal to, and seek inclusion in the proxy statement of, Express Scripts Holding Company ("Express Scripts"). We also ask you to revise the Proposal itself so that the references to Express Scripts, Inc. are changed to Express Scripts Holding Company.

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

We believe the Fund is not itself a record holder of Express Scripts stock. You have also not provided any evidence that the Fund satisfies the share ownership requirement. While we do not acknowledge that the Fund can satisfy the Rule 14a-8 eligibility requirements in light of the timing of the Mergers (which took place less than one year ago), we are asking you to provide proof of eligibility if you believe the Fund can satisfy the requirements of Rule 14a-8. Under Rule 14a-8(b), proof can be provided in one of two ways: (i) submitting to Express Scripts a written statement

IMANAGE200727.1-P074596

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

LTHD310

from the "record" holder of Express Scripts common stock (usually a broker or bank) verifying that the Fund has continuously for one year held the requisite number of shares of Express Scripts Holding Company common stock as of December 11, 2012 or (ii) submitting to Express Scripts a copy of a Schedule 13D, Schedule 13G, Form 3, Form 4 or Form 5 filed by the Fund with the Securities and Exchange Commission that demonstrates its ownership of the requisite number of shares as of or before December 11, 2012, in each case along with a written statement that (i) the Fund has owned such shares for the one year period prior to and including the date of the statement and (ii) the Fund intends to continue ownership of the shares through the date of the annual meeting. Our request for proof of eligibility under Rule 14a-8 is not an acknowledgement that, in light of the Mergers, you will be able to satisfy the eligibility requirements.

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

In addition to the foregoing deficiencies relating to your eligibility to submit shareholder proposals under Rule 14a-8 to Express Scripts Holding Company, we ask you to clarify one particular statement in the supporting statement of the Proposal. Namely, we are unable to confirm from the websites cited in the supporting statements (<http://moneyline.cq.com> and <http://www.followthemoney.org>) that Express Scripts has indeed contributed \$1.7 million in corporate funds since 2002 election cycle, as alleged in the supporting statement. We ask you to clarify this statement and explain how to confirm this statement from the referenced websites.

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

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

Best regards,



Christopher A. McGinnis
Vice President and Associate General Counsel

Attachments

Rule 14a-8 -- Shareholder Proposals.

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

(a) Question 1: What is a proposal?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(i) The proposal;

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

Shareholder Proposals

Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14F (CF)

Action: Publication of CF Staff Legal Bulletin

Date: October 18, 2011

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

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

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

A. The purpose of this bulletin

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. The role of the Depository Trust Company

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

D. The submission of revised proposals

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

¹ See Rule 14a-8(b).

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

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

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

⁵ See Exchange Act Rule 17Ad-8.

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

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

⁸ *Techne Corp.* (Sept. 20, 1988).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<http://www.sec.gov/interps/legal/cfs/b14f.htm>



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

Shareholder Proposals

Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14G (CF)

Action: Publication of CF Staff Legal Bulletin

Date: October 16, 2012

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

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

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

A. The purpose of this bulletin

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

D. Use of website addresses in proposals and supporting statements

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<http://www.sec.gov/interps/legal/cfs14g.htm>



STATE STREET.

Sean E. Quigley
Vice President, Client Services

State Street Bank and Trust Company
Public Funds Services
2 Avenue de LaFayette, 6th Floor
Boston, MA 02111

Telephone: (617) 664-9404
Facsimile: (617) 662-1704
sequigley@statestreet.com

December 19, 2012

BY OVERNIGHT DELIVERY AND FAX
(866-230-8345)

Mr. Keith J. Ebling
Executive VP/General Counsel/Corporate Secretary
Express Scripts, Inc.
One Express Way
St. Louis, Missouri 63121

Re: The City of Philadelphia Public Employees Retirement System


Dear Mr. Ebling:

State Street Bank was the custodian of The City of Philadelphia Public Employees Retirement System ("the Fund") during the December 18, 2011 through April 30, 2012 time period.

We are writing to report that during that time period the Fund continuously held 13,526 shares in Express Scripts, Inc., in State Street Bank's account and registered in its nominee name of Benchboat +Co. The Fund's new custodian will be sending you a separate verification letter for the post-April 30, 2012 time period.

If there are any other questions or concerns regarding this matter, please feel free to contact Laura Callahan at (617) 664-9415.

Sincerely,



Sean E. Quigley
Vice President

J.P.Morgan

December 31, 2012

**BY OVERNIGHT DELIVERY AND FAX
(866-230-8345)**

**Mr. Keith J. Ebling
Executive VP/General Counsel/Corporate Secretary
Express Scripts
One Express Way
St. Louis, Missouri 63121**

Re: The City of Philadelphia Public Employees Retirement System

Dear Mr. Ebling:

JPMorgan Chase & Co. has been the custodian of The City of Philadelphia Public Employees Retirement System ("the Fund") since May 1, 2012.

We are writing to report that the Fund has continuously held 49,349 shares (insert lowest amount held) in Express Scripts Holding Company or its predecessor Express Scripts, Inc. in our account and registered in its nominee name of Kane & Co. from May 1, 2012 through the present. The Fund's previous custodian will be sending you a separate verification letter for the pre-May 1, 2012 time period.

If there are any other questions or concerns regarding this matter, please feel free to contact me at 121-499-2802.

Sincerely,



**Mark Pensec
Vice President**



STATE STREET.

December 31, 2012

BY OVERNIGHT DELIVERY AND FAX
(866-230-8345)

Mr. Keith J. Ebling
Executive VP/General Counsel/Corporate Secretary
Express Scripts
One Express Way
St. Louis, Missouri 63121

Re: The City of Philadelphia Public Employees Retirement System

Dear Mr. Ebling:

State Street Bank was the custodian of The City of Philadelphia Public Employees Retirement System ("the Fund") during the December 18, 2011 through April 30, 2012 time period.

We are writing to report that during that time period the Fund continuously held 13,526 shares in Express Scripts Holding Company or its predecessor Express Scripts, Inc., in State Street Bank's account and registered in its nominee name of Benchboat + Co. The Fund's new custodian will be sending you a separate verification letter for the post-April 30, 2012 time period.

If there are any other questions or concerns regarding this matter, please feel free to contact me at (617) 664-9415.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Laura A. Callahan".
Laura A. Callahan
Assistant Vice President

Exhibit E

The Philadelphia Proposal

See attached.



BOARD OF PENSIONS AND RETIREMENT

PHILADELPHIA PUBLIC EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT SYSTEM

BOARD MEMBERS
ROB DUBOW, *Chairperson*
ALAN BUTKOVITZ, Esq.
SHELLY SMITH, Esq.
RICHARD NEGRIN, Esq.
ALBERT L. D'ATTILIO, Esq.
RONALD STAGLIANO, *Vice Chair*
CAROL G. STUKES - BAYLOR
VERONICA M. PANKEY
ANDREW P. THOMAS

SUMIT HANDA
Chief Investment Officer

Board of Pensions & Retirement
Sixteenth Floor
Two Penn Center Plaza
Philadelphia, PA 19102-1721
(215) 496 - 7400
FAX (215) 496 -7420

January 2, 2013

BY OVERNIGHT DELIVERY AND FAX
(866-230-8345)

Mr. Keith J. Ebling
Executive VP/General Counsel/Corporate Secretary
Express Scripts Holding Company.
One Express Way
St. Louis, Missouri 63121

Re: The City of Philadelphia Public Employees Retirement System


Dear Mr. Ebling:

In my capacity as the Chief Investment Officer of The City of Philadelphia Public Employees Retirement System (the "Fund"), I write to give notice that pursuant to the 2012 proxy statement of Express Scripts Holding Company. (the "Company"), the Fund intends to present the attached proposal (the "Proposal") at the 2013 annual meeting of shareholders (the "Annual Meeting") as a co-filer with The Firefighters' Pension System of the City of Kansas City, Missouri, and The Miami Firefighters' Relief and Pension Fund. The Fund requests that the Company include the Proposal in the Company's proxy statement for the Annual Meeting.

A letter from the Fund's custodians documenting the Fund's continuous ownership of the requisite amount of the Company's stock for at least one year prior to the date of this letter is being sent under separate cover. The Fund also intends to continue its ownership of at least the minimum number of shares required by the SEC regulations through the date of the Annual Meeting.

I represent that the Fund or its agent intends to appear in person or by proxy at the Annual Meeting to present the attached Proposal. I declare the Fund has no "material interest" other than that believed to be shared by stockholders of the Company generally.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Sumit Handa". The signature is written in a cursive style with a prominent initial 'S'.

Sumit Handa
Chief Investment Officer

Resolved, that the shareholders of Express Scripts Holding Company ("Company") hereby request that the Company provide a report, updated semiannually, disclosing the Company's:

1. Policies and procedures for making, with corporate funds or assets, contributions and expenditures (direct or indirect) to (a) participate or intervene in any political campaign on behalf of (or in opposition to) any candidate for public office, or (b) influence the general public, or any segment thereof, with respect to an election or referendum.
2. Monetary and non-monetary contributions and expenditures (direct and indirect) used in the manner described in section 1 above, including:
 - a. The identity of the recipient as well as the amount paid to each; and
 - b. The title(s) of the person(s) in the Company responsible decision-making.

The report shall be presented to the board of directors or relevant board committee and posted on the Company's website.

Stockholder Supporting Statement

As long-term shareholders of the Company, we support transparency and accountability in corporate spending on political activities. These include any activities considered intervention in any political campaign under the Internal Revenue Code, such as direct and indirect political contributions to candidates, political parties, or political organizations; independent expenditures; or electioneering communications on behalf of federal, state or local candidates.

Disclosure is consistent with good public policy, in the best interest of the company and its shareholders, and critical for compliance with federal ethics laws. Moreover, the Supreme Court's *Citizens United* decision recognized the importance of political spending disclosure for shareholders when it said, "[D]isclosure permits citizens and shareholders to react to the speech of corporate entities in a proper way. This transparency enables the electorate to make informed decisions and give proper weight to different speakers and messages." Gaps in transparency and accountability may expose the company to reputational and business risks that could threaten long-term shareholder value.

The Company's predecessor, Express Scripts, Inc., contributed at least \$1.7 million in corporate funds since the 2002 election cycle. (CQ: <http://moneyline.cq.com> and National Institute on Money in State Politics: <http://www.followthemoney.org>)

However, relying on publicly available data does not provide a complete picture of the Company's political spending. For example, the Company's payments to trade associations used for political activities are undisclosed and unknown. In some cases, even management does not know how trade associations use their company's money politically. The proposal asks the Company to disclose all of its political spending, including payments to trade associations and other tax exempt organizations used for political purposes. This would bring our Company in line with a growing number of leading companies, including Exelon, Merck and Microsoft that support political disclosure and accountability and present this information on their websites.

The Company's Board and its shareholders need comprehensive disclosure to be able to fully evaluate the political use of corporate assets. We urge your support for this critical governance reform.