


NO ACT

18
2-20-15



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



15005141

DIVISION OF
CORPORATION FINANCE

Memorandum

February 20, 2015

FEB 20 2015

Washington, DC 20549

Sean Edgett
Twitter, Inc.
sedgett@twitter.com

Act: 1934
Section: _____
Rule: 14a-8 (ODS)
Public _____
Availability: 2-20-15

Re: Twitter, Inc.

Dear Mr. Edgett:

This is in regard to your letter dated February 20, 2015 concerning the shareholder proposal submitted by James McRitchie for inclusion in Twitter's proxy materials for its upcoming annual meeting of security holders. Your letter indicates that the proponent has withdrawn the proposal and that Twitter therefore withdraws its request for a no-action letter from the Division received January 16, 2015. Because the matter is now moot, we will have no further comment.

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

Sincerely,

Matt S. McNair
Special Counsel

cc: John Chevedden

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



February 20, 2015

VIA E-MAIL

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

Re: Twitter, Inc.
Withdrawal of Request for No Action Regarding Stockholder Proposal Submitted by
James McRitchie

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen:

On December 9, 2014, by letter dated November 17, 2014, John Chevedden, on behalf of James McRitchie (the "**Proponent**"), submitted to Twitter, Inc. (the "**Company**") a stockholder proposal entitled "Elect Each Director Annually" (the "**Proposal**") for inclusion in the Company's proxy statement (the "**2015 Proxy Statement**") for its 2015 annual meeting of stockholders.

By letter dated January 16, 2015 (the "**No-Action Request**"), the Company requested that the staff of the Division of Corporation Finance of the Securities and Exchange Commission (the "**Commission**") not recommend any enforcement action if the Company omitted the Proposal from its 2015 Proxy Statement in reliance on Rule 14a-8(b) and Rule 14a-8(1).

By letter dated January 28, 2015, John Chevedden, on behalf of the Proponent, advised the Commission and the Company that the Proponent is withdrawing the Proposal. As a result, the Company wishes to withdraw the No-Action Request. For your convenience, we have enclosed a copy of the Proponent's letter withdrawing the Proposal.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to call me at (415) 222-9670 extension 1363. The Company is sending a copy of this letter and enclosures to the Proponent.

Very truly yours,

TWITTER, INC.

Sean Edgett

Enclosures

cc: Lisa L. Stimmell, Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati, Professional Corporation
John Chevedden
PSMA & OMB Memorandum M-07-16 ***

JOHN CHEVEDDEN

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

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

January 28, 2015

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

1 Rule 14a-8 Proposal
Twitter, Inc. (TWTR)
Elect Each Director Annually
James McRitchie

Ladies and Gentlemen:

This is in regard to the January 2015 company request concerning this rule 14a-8 proposal.

This is to withdraw the proposal.

Sincerely,


John Chevedden

cc: James McRitchie

Sean Edgett <sedgett@twitter.com>



VIA E-MAIL

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

Re: Twitter, Inc.
Shareholder Proposal of James McRitchie

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen:

On behalf of Twitter, Inc. (the "**Company**"), we are submitting this letter pursuant to Rule 14a-8(j) under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the "**Exchange Act**") to notify the Securities and Exchange Commission (the "**Commission**") of the Company's intention to exclude from its proxy materials (the "**2015 proxy materials**") for its 2015 annual meeting of stockholders ("**2015 Annual Meeting**") a shareholder proposal and statement in support thereof (the "**Proposal**") received from John Chevedden on behalf of James McRitchie (the "**Proponent**"). We also request confirmation that the staff of the Division of Corporation Finance will not recommend to the Commission that enforcement action be taken if the Company omits the Proposal from its 2015 proxy materials for the reasons discussed below.

Copies of the Proposal and Supporting Statement, the Proponent's cover letter submitting the Proposal, and correspondence relating to the Proposal are attached hereto as Exhibit A.

In accordance with Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14D (November 7, 2008) ("**SLB No. 14D**"), this letter and its exhibits are being delivered by e-mail to shareholderproposals@sec.gov. Pursuant to Rule 14a-8(j), a copy of this letter and its exhibits also is being sent to Mr. Chevedden, in accordance with the Proponent's instruction that all correspondence relating to the Proposal be directed to Mr. Chevedden by e-mail. Rule 14a-8(k) and SLB No. 14D provide that a shareholder proponent is required to send the company a copy of any correspondence which the proponent elects to submit to the Commission or the staff. Accordingly, we hereby inform the Proponent that, if the Proponent elects to submit additional correspondence to the Commission or the staff relating to the Proposal, the Proponent should concurrently furnish a copy of that correspondence to the undersigned.

The Company intends to file its definitive 2015 proxy materials with the Commission more than 80 days after the date of this letter.

THE PROPOSAL

On December 9, 2014, the Company received from the Proponent a letter dated November 17, 2014, which contained the Proposal and requested that it be included in the Company's 2015 Proxy Materials. The Proposal reads as follows:

Proposal 4 – Elect Each Director Annually

RESOLVED, shareholders ask that our Company take the steps necessary to reorganize the Board of Directors into one class with each director subject to election each year. Although our

1355 Market Street | Suite 900 | San Francisco, California | 94103

management is capable of putting forth a management proposal to completely adopt this proposal topic in one-year, management would nonetheless have the option to phase it in over 3-years.

Arthur Levitt, former Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission said, "In my view it's best for the investor if the entire board is elected once a year. Without the annual election of each director shareholders have far less control over who represents them."

A total of 79 S&P 500 and Fortune 500 companies, with aggregate market capitalization of one trillion dollars, adopted this topic in 2012 and 2013. Annual elections are widely viewed as a corporate governance best practice. Annual election of each director could make directors more accountable, and thereby contribute to improved performance and increased company value.

Please vote to protect enhance value:

Elect Each Director Annually – Proposal 4

BASIS FOR EXCLUDING THE PROPOSAL

The Company believes that it may omit the Proposal from its 2015 Proxy Materials in reliance on Rule 14a-8(b) and Rule 14a-8(1) because the Proponent failed to demonstrate that he is eligible to submit the Proposal.

The Requirement to Establish Eligibility

Rule 14a-8(b)(1) provides that, 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 equity securities entitled to vote on the proposal for at least one year as of the date the proposal is submitted and must continue to hold those securities through the date of meeting. Rule 14a-8(b)(2) provides that, if a shareholder does not appear in the company's records as a registered holder of the requisite number or value of the company's securities, the shareholder may prove its ownership by providing a written statement from the record holder of the securities or by submitting a copy of a Schedule 13D, Schedule 13G, Form 4 or Form 5 that evidences the shareholder's ownership. Rule 14a-8(b)(2) also provides that, to be eligible to submit a proposal, a shareholder must submit a written statement that the shareholder intends to continue to hold the securities through the date of the annual meeting.

Rule 14a-8(f) provides that a company may exclude a shareholder proposal if the proponent fails to provide evidence of eligibility under Rule 14a-8, including the beneficial ownership requirements of Rule 14a-8(b), so long as the company timely notifies the proponent of the problem and the proponent fails to correct the deficiency within the required time.

The Proponent 's Submission

When the Company received the Proponent's Proposal on December 9, 2014, the submission contained no documentation regarding Proponent's ownership of Twitter common stock.

The Company's Notice of Deficiency

Rule 14a-8(f) and Section C of Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14G (October 16, 2012) ("**SLB 14G**") states that "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," and that "companies should provide adequate detail about what a proponent must do to remedy all eligibility or procedural defects." On December 18, 2014, after confirming that the Proponent was not a shareholder of record of the Company's common stock, the Company sent a letter

(the “*Deficiency Letter*”) to Mr. Chevedden by e-mail as well as by Federal Express, notifying him of the need to provide proof of the Proponent’s ownership of the requisite amount of the Company’s common stock for at least one year as of the date the proposal was submitted. The Deficiency Letter specified that the Proposal was received on December 9, 2014 and explained the ownership requirement as well as the forms in which the Proponent could submit sufficient proof of ownership. Included with the Deficiency Letter were copies of Rule 14a-8 as well as Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14F (October 18, 2011) and SLB 14G. The Deficiency Letter further noted that the Proponent needed to provide proof of eligibility within 14 calendar days of receipt of the letter. A copy of the Deficiency Letter, including the documents provided therewith, and the e-mail delivering the Deficiency Letter is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

The Proponent’s Response to the Notice of Deficiency

On January 6, 2015, the Proponent submitted a letter from TD Ameritrade (the “*TD Ameritrade Letter*”) dated December 8, 2014, stating that “as of the date of this letter, James McRitchie held, and had held continuously for at least ten months, 40 shares of Twitter Inc. (TWTR) common stock in his account . . .” The TD Ameritrade Letter also notes the date of acquisition as February 7, 2014. We note that the TD Ameritrade Letter was received via e-mail 19 days after the date the Deficiency Letter was e-mailed to Mr. Chevedden, well beyond the 14-day period provided for a response to the Deficiency Letter pursuant to Rule 14a-8(f). A copy of the TD Ameritrade Letter, including the cover e-mail from Mr. Chevedden, which includes the date of receipt by the Company, is attached hereto as Exhibit C.

The Company’s Response to the TD Ameritrade Letter

Although the TD Ameritrade Letter was received well after the 14-day period within which the Proponent was required to respond and unambiguously indicated that the ownership requirements of Rule 14a-8(b)(1) were not satisfied (i.e. there was no ambiguity or technical failure in the TD Ameritrade Letter – Mr. McRitchie’s ownership period was a full 2 months short of the requirement), the Company sent a letter (the “*Follow-Up Letter*”) to Mr. Chevedden via e-mail on January 7, 2015 notifying Mr. Chevedden of the further deficiencies in the TD Ameritrade Letter, including the failure to meet the 12-month holding period requirement as required by Rule 14a-8(b)(1), and notifying him of Twitter’s intent to submit a no-action request. A copy of the Follow-Up Letter is attached hereto as Exhibit D. The Proponent has provided no response to the Follow-Up Letter.

Excludability of the Proposal

In addition to the failure of the Proponent to respond to the Deficiency Letter in a timely manner, the Proponent’s submission fails to demonstrate that the Proponent continuously owned the requisite amount of the Company’s securities for at least one year prior to submission of the Proposal. In Section C.1.c (2) of Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14 (July 13, 2001) (“*SLB No. 14*”), the staff stated that proponent who holds securities in street name “must submit an affirmative written statement from the record holder of his or her securities that specifically verifies that the shareholder owned the securities continuously for a period of one year as of the time of submitting the Proposal.”

The Proponent’s Proposal was received on December 9, 2014, but clearly failed to provide proof of ownership of the requisite amount of the Company’s common stock as of that date. The TD Ameritrade Letter indicates that Mr. McRitchie purchased 40 shares on February 7, 2014 and, on the face of the letter, states that Mr. McRitchie’s shares of Twitter common stock have been held for ten months. We note that the deadline for receipt of stockholder proposals under Rule 14a-8 for the 2015 Annual Meeting was December 10, 2014; therefore, even if Mr. McRitchie delayed submission of the Proposal until the deadline, the 12-month holding period would not be satisfied. The period during which Mr. McRitchie has held Twitter common stock is more than two months short of the 12-month requirement set forth in Rule 14a-8(b)(1).

The Company provided timely notice to the Proponent of his failure to establish eligibility and explained to him how to comply with the rule's requirements. The Deficiency Letter clearly and unambiguously explained how the deficiency could have been cured, even providing the relevant SEC guidance. The Proponent did not respond within 14 days of the Company's delivery of the Deficiency Letter and when the Proponent did respond, evidence that the Proponent had met the ownership requirement was not provided. Accordingly, the Proposal may be excluded pursuant to Rule 14a-8(b)(1) and Rule 14a-8(f).


CONCLUSION

For the reasons discussed above, the Company believes that it may omit the Proposal and Supporting Statement from its 2015 Proxy Materials in reliance on 14a-8(b) and Rule 14a-8(f). We request the staff's concurrence in our view or, alternatively, confirmation that the staff will not recommend any enforcement action to the Commission if the Company excludes the Proposal.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please feel free to contact me at (415) 222-9670, extension 1363. When a written response to this letter is available, I would appreciate your sending it to me by e-mail at sedgett@twitter.com.

Very truly yours,

TWITTER, INC.



Sean Edgett
Director, Legal

Enclosures

cc: Lisa L. Stimmell, Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati, Professional Corporation
John Chevedden

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

Exhibit A

Proposal

Ms. Vijaya Gadde
General Counsel and Secretary
Twitter, Inc. (TWTR)
1355 Market Street
Suite 900
San Francisco, CA 94103
PH: 415-222-9670

Dear Corporate Secretary,

I am pleased to be a shareholder in Twitter, Inc. (TWTR) and appreciate the leadership our company has shown. However, I also believe Twitter has unrealized potential that can be unlocked through low or no cost corporate governance reform.

I am submitting a shareholder proposal for a vote at the next annual shareholder meeting. The proposal meets all Rule 14a-8 requirements, including the continuous ownership of the required stock value for over a year and I pledge to continue to hold the required amount of stock until after the date of the next shareholder meeting. My submitted format, with the shareholder-supplied emphasis, is intended to be used for definitive proxy publication.

This letter confirms that I am delegating John Chevedden to act as my agent regarding this Rule 14a-8 proposal, including its submission, negotiations and/or modification, and presentation at the forthcoming shareholder meeting. Please direct all future communications regarding my rule 14a-8 proposal to John Chevedden .


FISMA & OMB Memorandum M-07-16
to facilitate prompt communication. Please identify me as the proponent of the proposal exclusively.

Your consideration and the consideration of the Board of Directors is appreciated in responding to this proposal. Please acknowledge receipt of my proposal promptly by email to

FISMA & OMB Memorandum M-07-16

FISMA & OMB Memorandum M-07-16

Sincerely,



James McRitchie

November 17, 2014

Date

cc: John Chevedden

[TWTR: 14a-8 Proposal, December 6, 2014]

Proposal 4 – Elect Each Director Annually

RESOLVED, shareholders ask that our Company take the steps necessary to reorganize the Board of Directors into one class with each director subject to election each year. Although our management is capable of putting forth a management proposal to completely adopt this proposal topic in one-year, management would nonetheless have the option to phase it in over 3-years.

Arthur Levitt, former Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission said, “In my view it’s best for the investor if the entire board is elected once a year. Without annual election of each director shareholders have far less control over who represents them.”

A total of 79 S&P 500 and Fortune 500 companies, with aggregate market capitalization of one trillion dollars, adopted this topic in 2012 and 2013. Annual elections are widely viewed as a corporate governance best practice. Annual election of each director could make directors more accountable, and thereby contribute to improved performance and increased company value.

Please vote to protect enhance value:

Elect Each Director Annually – Proposal 4

Notes:

James McRitchie,

FISMA & OMB Memorandum M-07-16

sponsored this proposal.

“Proposal 4” is a placeholder for the proposal number assigned by the company in the final proxy.

Please note that the title of the proposal is part of the proposal.

This proposal is believed to conform with Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14B (CF), September 15, 2004 including (emphasis added):

Accordingly, going forward, we believe that it would not be appropriate for companies to exclude supporting statement language and/or an entire proposal in reliance on rule 14a-8(I)(3) in the following circumstances:

- the company objects to factual assertions because they are not supported;
- the company objects to factual assertions that, while not materially false or misleading, may be disputed or countered;
- the company objects to factual assertions because those assertions may be interpreted by shareholders in a manner that is unfavorable to the company, its directors, or its officers; and/or
- the company objects to statements because they represent the opinion of the shareholder proponent or a referenced source, but the statements are not identified specifically as such.

We believe that it is appropriate under rule 14a-8 for companies to address these objections in their statements of opposition.

See also: Sun Microsystems, Inc. (July 21, 2005).

Stock will be held until after the annual meeting and the proposal will be presented at the annual meeting. Please acknowledge this proposal promptly by email.

FISMA & OMB Memorandum M-07-16

Exhibit B

Deficiency Letter

From: Sean Edgett <sedgett@twitter.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 18, 2014 3:25 PM
To: ***FISMA & OMB Memorandum M-07-16***
Cc: Stimmell, Lisa
Subject: Twitter Shareholder Proposal
Attachments: Letter to J Chevedden - December 18 2014.pdf

Mr. Chevedden:

Attached please find a letter requesting additional information for the shareholder proposal we received from James McRitchie on December 9, 2014.

Best regards,
Sean

Sean J. Edgett
Director, Legal | Twitter, Inc.
1355 Market Street, Suite 900 | San Francisco, CA 94103
sedgett@twitter.com



December 18, 2014

Via Electronic Mail and Federal Express

John Chevedden

FISMA & OMB Memorandum M-07-16

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

Re: Shareholder Proposal

Dear Mr. Chevedden:

On December 9, 2014, Twitter, Inc. ("Twitter") received a letter dated November 17, 2014 from James McRitchie, regarding submission of the stockholder proposal entitled "Elect Each Director Annually" (the "Proposal") for inclusion in Twitter's proxy materials for its 2015 Annual Meeting of Stockholders (the "2015 Annual Meeting"). In accordance with Mr. McRitchie's request, we are directing this response to your attention.

As set forth below, the Proposal contains certain procedural deficiencies that, pursuant to the rules and regulations of the Securities and Exchange Commission (the "SEC"), we are required to bring to your attention.

Rule 14a-8(b) provides that each shareholder proponent must submit sufficient proof that it has continuously held at least \$2,000 in market value, or 1%, of a company's securities entitled to be voted on the proposal at the meeting for at least one year as of the date that the proposal was submitted. Twitter's records do not indicate that Mr. McRitchie is the record owner of a sufficient number of shares of Twitter's stock to satisfy this requirement and no other proof of ownership of Twitter's stock was submitted with the Proposal.

To remedy this defect, Mr. McRitchie must submit sufficient proof of his ownership of Twitter's stock. As explained in Rule 14a-8(b), sufficient proof may be in one of the following forms:

- a written statement from the "record" holder of the shares (usually a broker or a bank that is a Depository Trust Company ("DTC") participant) verifying that, as of the date that the Proposal was submitted, Mr. McRitchie continuously held the requisite number of shares of Twitter's stock for at least one year; or
- if Mr. McRitchie filed a Schedule 13D, Schedule 13G, Form 3, Form 4 and/or Form 5, or amendments to those documents or updated forms, reflecting his ownership of shares of Twitter's stock as of or before the date on which the one-year eligibility period begins, a copy of the schedule and/or form, and any subsequent amendments reporting a change in the ownership level and a written statement that he continuously held the required number of shares for the one-year period as of the date of that statement.

For your reference, a copy of Rule 14a-8 is enclosed.

To help shareholders comply with the requirement to prove ownership by providing a written statement from the "record" holder of the shares, the SEC's Division of Corporation

1355 Market Street | Suite 900 | San Francisco, California | 94103



Finance (the "SEC Staff") has published Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14F ("SLB 14F") and Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14G ("SLB 14G"). In SLB 14F, the SEC Staff stated that only brokers or banks that are DTC participants will be viewed as "record" holders for purposes of Rule 14a-8. Thus, Mr. McRitchie will need to obtain the required written statement from the DTC participant through which his securities are held. If Mr. McRitchie is not certain whether his broker or bank is a DTC participant, he may check DTC's participant list, which is currently available on the Internet at <http://dtcc.com/-/media/Files/Downloads/client-center/DTC/alpha.pdf>.

If the broker or bank that holds Mr. McRitchie's securities is not on DTC's participant list, he will need to obtain proof of ownership from the DTC participant through which his securities are held. You should be able to find out who this DTC participant is by asking the applicable broker or bank. If the DTC participant knows the holdings of the applicable broker or bank, but does not know individual holdings, Mr. McRitchie may satisfy the proof of ownership requirement by obtaining and submitting two proof of ownership statements verifying that, at the time that the Proposal was submitted, the required amount of securities were continuously held by Mr. McRitchie for at least one year—one from the applicable broker or bank confirming the required ownership, and the other from the DTC participant confirming the broker or bank's ownership. Please see the enclosed a copy of each of SLB 14F and SLB 14G for further information.

For the Proposal to be eligible for inclusion in Twitter's proxy materials for the 2015 Annual Meeting, the SEC's rules require that a response to this letter be postmarked or transmitted electronically no later than 14 calendar days from the date that you receive this letter. Please address any response to me at 1355 Market Street, Suite 900, San Francisco, California 94103. Alternatively, you may transmit any response by fax to me at (415) 680-1646 or by email at sedgett@twitter.com. If we do not receive the necessary proof of ownership, we will submit a no-action request to the SEC indicating that Twitter does not intend to include the Proposal in its proxy materials.

Twitter reserves the right to submit a no-action request to exclude the Proposal on other grounds should you remedy the procedural defects in the submission of the Proposal.

If you have any questions with respect to the foregoing, please contact me. Thank you for your interest in Twitter.

Very truly yours,

TWITTER, INC.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Sean J. Edgett", is written over the typed name.

Sean J. Edgett
Director, Legal

Enclosures

cc: Lisa L. Stimmell, Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati, Professional Corporation

James McRitchie,

FISMA & OMB Memorandum M-07-16

ELECTRONIC CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS**e-CFR Data is current as of December 16, 2014**

Title 17 → Chapter II → Part 240 → §240.14a-8

Title 17: Commodity and Securities Exchanges
PART 240—GENERAL RULES AND REGULATIONS, SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

§240.14a-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.

[63 FR 29119, May 28, 1998; 63 FR 50622, 50623, Sept. 22, 1998, as amended at 72 FR 4168, Jan. 29, 2007; 72 FR 70456, Dec. 11, 2007; 73 FR 977, Jan. 4, 2008; 76 FR 6045, Feb. 2, 2011; 75 FR 56782, Sept. 16, 2010]

For questions or comments regarding e-CFR editorial content, features, or design, email ecfr@nara.gov.
For questions concerning e-CFR programming and delivery issues, email webteam@gpo.gov.



[Home](#) | [Previous Page](#)

U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission

**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/cgl-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.⁵ Instead, an introducing broker engages another broker, known as a "clearing broker," to hold custody of client funds and securities, to clear and execute customer trades, and to handle other functions such as issuing confirmations of customer trades and customer account statements. Clearing brokers generally are DTC participants; introducing brokers generally are not. As introducing brokers generally are not DTC participants, and therefore typically do not appear on DTC's securities position listing, *Hain Celestial* has required companies to accept proof of ownership letters from brokers in cases where, unlike the positions of registered owners and brokers and banks that are DTC participants, the company is unable to verify the positions against its own or its transfer agent's records or against DTC's securities position listing.

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

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

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

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

Shareholders and companies can confirm whether a particular broker or bank is a DTC participant by checking DTC's participant list, which is currently available on the Internet at <http://www.dtcc.com/~media/Files/Downloads/client->

center/DTC/alpha.ashx.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Second, many letters fail to confirm continuous ownership of the securities.

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

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

"As of [date the proposal is submitted], [name of shareholder] held, and has held continuously for at least one year, [number of securities] shares of [company name] [class of securities]."¹¹

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

D. The submission of revised proposals

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

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

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

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

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

No. If a shareholder submits revisions to a proposal after the deadline for receiving proposals under Rule 14a-8(e), the company is not required to

accept the revisions. However, if the company does not accept the revisions, it must treat the revised proposal as a second proposal and submit a notice stating its intention to exclude the revised proposal, as required by Rule 14a-8(j). The company's notice may cite Rule 14a-8(e) as the reason for excluding the revised proposal. If the company does not accept the revisions and intends to exclude the initial proposal, it would also need to submit its reasons for excluding the initial proposal.

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

A shareholder must prove ownership as of the date the original proposal is submitted. When the Commission has discussed revisions to proposals,¹⁴ it has not suggested that a revision triggers a requirement to provide proof of ownership a second time. As outlined in Rule 14a-8(b), proving ownership includes providing a written statement that the shareholder intends to continue to hold the securities through the date of the shareholder meeting. Rule 14a-8(f)(2) provides that if the shareholder "fails in [his or her] promise to hold the required number of securities through the date of the meeting of shareholders, then the company will be permitted to exclude all of [the same shareholder's] proposals from its proxy materials for any meeting held in the following two calendar years." With these provisions in mind, we do not interpret Rule 14a-8 as requiring additional proof of ownership when a shareholder submits a revised proposal.¹⁵

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

¹ See Rule 14a-8(b).

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

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

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

⁵ See Exchange Act Rule 17Ad-8.

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

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

⁸ *Techne Corp.* (Sept. 20, 1988).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<http://www.sec.gov/Interps/legal/cfslb14f.htm>

[Home](#) | [Previous Page](#)

Modified: 10/18/2011

[Home](#) | [Previous Page](#)

U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission

**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>

Home | [Previous Page](#)

Modified: 10/16/2012

Exhibit C

TD Ameritrade Letter

From: ***FISMA & OMB Memorandum M-07-16***
Date: January 6, 2015 at 8:09:05 AM PST
To: Sean Edgett <SEdgett@twitter.com>, Sean Edgett <ir@twitter.com>
Subject: Rule 14a-8 Proposal (TWTR) blb

Mr. Edgett,
Attached is the rule 14a-8 proposal stock ownership verification.
Please acknowledge receipt.
Sincerely,
John Chevedden
cc: James McRitchie



Ameritrade

12/08/2014

James Mc

FISMA & OMB Memorandum M-07-16

Re: Your TD Ameritrade Account Ending in B Memorandum M-07-16***

Dear James Mc,

Pursuant to your request, this letter is to confirm that as of the date of this letter, James McRitchie held, and had held continuously for at least ten months, 40 shares of Twitter Inc (TWTR) common stock in his account ending in B at TD Ameritrade. The DTC clearinghouse number for TD Ameritrade is 0188."

Description	Date	Quantity	Price	Amount
BUY TWITTER INC COM	2/7/2014	40	\$ 53.89	\$2,165.59

If we can be of any further assistance, please let us know. Just log in to your account and go to the Message Center to write us. You can also call Client Services at 800-669-3900. We're available 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

Sincerely,

Brandon Schifferdecker
Resource Specialist
TD Ameritrade

This information is furnished as part of a general information service and TD Ameritrade shall not be liable for any damages arising out of any inaccuracy in the information. Because this information may differ from your TD Ameritrade monthly statement, you should rely only on the TD Ameritrade monthly statement as the official record of your TD Ameritrade account.

Market volatility, volume, and system availability may delay account access and trade executions.

TD Ameritrade, Inc., member FINRA/SIPC/NFA (www.finra.org, www.sipc.org, www.nfa.futures.org). TD Ameritrade is a

Exhibit D

Follow-Up Letter

From: Sean Edgett <sedgett@twitter.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 07, 2015 9:06 PM
To: ***FISMA & OMB Memorandum M-07-16***
Cc: Stimmell, Lisa; Twitter Investor Relations
Subject: Re: Rule 14a-8 Proposal (TWTR) blb
Attachments: Twitter - Letter to J. Chevedden re 14a-8 Shareholder Proposal - January 7, 2015.pdf

Mr. Chevedden:

Thank you for your email. Please see our attached response.

Best regards,
Sean

On Tue, Jan 6, 2015 at 8:09 AM, ***FISMA & OMB Memorandum M-07-16*** wrote:
Mr. Edgett,
Attached is the rule 14a-8 proposal stock ownership verification.
Please acknowledge receipt.
Sincerely,
John Chevedden
cc: James McRitchie



January 7, 2015

Via Electronic Mail and Federal Express

John Chevedden

FISMA & OMB Memorandum M-07-16

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

Re: Shareholder Proposal

Dear Mr. Chevedden:

On behalf of Twitter, Inc. ("Twitter"), I am confirming receipt of your email correspondence dated January 6, 2014 pursuant to which you provided an account statement from TD Ameritrade (the "Account Statement"), dated December 8, 2014 for James McRitchie. We understand that the account statement reflecting Mr. McRitchie's ownership of Twitter common stock was provided in response to our letter dated December 18, 2014 (the "December 18 Letter") notifying you of certain procedural deficiencies contained in Mr. McRitchie's stockholder proposal entitled "Elect Each Director Annually" (the "Proposal") for inclusion in Twitter's proxy materials for its 2015 Annual Meeting of Stockholders (the "2015 Annual Meeting").

As you know, and as set forth in the December 18 Letter, Rule 14a-8(b) provides that each shareholder proponent must submit sufficient proof that it has continuously held at least \$2,000 in market value, or 1%, of a company's securities entitled to be voted on the proposal at the meeting for at least one year as of the date that the proposal was submitted. In the December 18 Letter, we noted that Twitter's records do not indicate that Mr. McRitchie is the record owner of a sufficient number of shares of Twitter's stock to satisfy this requirement and no other proof of ownership of Twitter's stock was submitted with the Proposal.

Based on the Account Statement provided, Mr. McRitchie does not hold sufficient shares of Twitter common stock and has not met the required holding period under Rule 14a-8(b) to be eligible to submit a shareholder proposal pursuant to Rule 14a-8. Pursuant the Account Statement, Mr. McRitchie purchased 40 shares of Twitter common stock on or about February 7, 2014, which is less than 12 months prior to his submission of the Proposal on December 9, 2014. We note that the deadline for receipt of stockholder proposals under Rule 14a-8 for the 2015 Annual Meeting was December 10, 2014; therefore, even if Mr. McRitchie delayed submission of his proposal until the deadline, the 12-month holding period would not be satisfied. We further note that based on Mr. McRitchie's ownership of 40 shares of Twitter common stock, Twitter's stock price must be no less than \$50.00 per share in order for Mr. McRitchie to satisfy the requirement to hold \$2,000 in market value of Twitter's common stock. At all times during the 30 day period prior to Mr. McRitchie's submission of the Proposal, Twitter's stock price was below \$50.00 per share and Mr. McRitchie's holdings had a market value of less than \$2,000.

For the foregoing reasons, as well as others, we do not believe that the Proposal is eligible for inclusion in Twitter's proxy materials for the 2015 Annual Meeting. Accordingly, we respectfully request that the Proposal be withdrawn. If we do not receive written notice of withdrawal by January 15, 2015, we will submit a no-action request to the SEC indicating that Twitter does not intend to include the Proposal in its proxy materials.

1355 Market Street | Suite 900 | San Francisco, California | 94103

John Chevedden
January 7, 2015
Page 2



If you have any questions with respect to the foregoing, please contact me. Thank you for your interest in Twitter.

Very truly yours,

TWITTER, INC.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Sean Edgett", is positioned above the printed name.

Sean Edgett

Enclosures

cc: Lisa L. Stimmell, Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati, Professional Corporation

James McRitchie,

FISMA & OMB Memorandum M-07-16