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

DIVISION OF
CORPORATION FINANCE

March 25, 2024

Sean Mersten
Quest Diagnostics Incorporated

Re: Quest Diagnostics Incorporated (the "Company")
Incoming letter dated January 16, 2024

Dear Sean Mersten:

This letter is in response to your correspondence concerning the shareholder proposal (the "Proposal") submitted to the Company by the North Atlantic States Carpenters Pension Fund for inclusion in the Company's proxy materials for its upcoming annual meeting of security holders.

The Proposal asks that the board of directors take the necessary action to adopt specific revisions to the director election resignation provisions in the Company's bylaws.

There appears to be some basis for your view that the Company may exclude the Proposal under Rule 14a-8(i)(2). Refer to our response in *Verizon Communications Inc.* (Mar. 15, 2024). Accordingly, we will not recommend enforcement action to the Commission if the Company omits the Proposal from its proxy materials in reliance on Rule 14a-8(i)(2).

Copies of all of the correspondence on which this response is based will be made available on our website at https://www.sec.gov/corpfin/2023-2024-shareholder-proposals-no-action.

Sincerely,

Rule 14a-8 Review Team

cc: Edward J. Durkin
United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America

January 16, 2024

SUBMITTED VIA STAFF ONLINE FORM
Office of Chief Counsel
Division of Corporation Finance
Securities and Exchange Commission
100 F Street, NE
Washington, DC 20549

Re: *Quest Diagnostics Incorporated*
Stockholder Proposal from the North Atlantic States Carpenters Pension Fund
Securities Exchange Act of 1934—Rule 14a-8

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Quest Diagnostics Incorporated, a Delaware corporation (the "Company"), pursuant to Rule 14a-8(j) under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (the "Exchange Act"), submits this letter to inform the Staff of the Division of Corporation Finance (the "Staff") of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (the "Commission") of the Company's intention to omit from its proxy statement and form of proxy (collectively, the "2024 Proxy Materials") the stockholder proposal (the "Proposal") and the statement in support thereof submitted by the North Atlantic States Carpenters Pension Fund (the "Proponent") in a letter dated December 5, 2023. A copy of the Proposal and all related correspondence with the Proponent are attached to this letter as **Exhibit A**. The Company respectfully requests that the Staff concur with the Company's view that the Proposal may properly be excluded from the Company's 2024 Proxy Materials pursuant to Rule 14a-8.

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

- filed this letter with the Commission no later than eighty (80) calendar days before the Company intends to file its definitive 2024 Proxy Materials with the Commission; and
- concurrently sent a copy of this correspondence to the Proponent.

We are submitting this request for no-action relief under Rule 14a-8 through the Commission's intake system for Rule 14a-8 submissions and related correspondence, https://www.sec.gov/forms/shareholder-proposal (in lieu of providing six additional copies of this letter pursuant to Rule 14a-8(j)), and the undersigned has included his name, telephone number and e-mail address in this letter.

Rule 14a-8(k) under the Exchange Act and Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14D (Nov. 7, 2008) ("SLB 14D") provide that shareholder proponents are required to send the company a copy of any correspondence that the proponents elect to submit to the Commission or Staff. Accordingly, we are taking this opportunity to inform the Proponent that if the Proponent elects to submit additional correspondence to the Commission or Staff with respect to the Proposal, a copy of that

correspondence should concurrently be furnished to the undersigned on behalf of the Company pursuant to Rule 14a-8(k) and SLB 14D.

THE PROPOSAL

The Proposal states:

> Resolved: That the shareholders of Quest Diagnostics, Inc. ("Company") hereby request that the board of directors take the necessary action to amend its director election resignation bylaw that requires each director nominee to submit an irrevocable conditional resignation to the Company to be effective upon the director's failure to receive the required shareholder majority vote support in an uncontested election. The proposed amended resignation bylaw shall require the Board to accept a tendered resignation absent the finding of a compelling reason or reasons to not accept the resignation. Further, if the Board does not accept a tendered resignation and the director remains as a "holdover" director, the resignation bylaw shall stipulate that should a "holdover" director not be re-elected at the next annual election of directors, that director's new tendered resignation will be automatically effective 30 days after the certification of the election vote. The Board shall report the reasons for its actions to accept or reject a tendered resignation in a Form 8-K filing with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission.

BASIS FOR EXCLUSION

The Company believes that the Proposal may be properly excluded from the 2024 Proxy Materials under Rule 14a-8(i)(2) under the Exchange Act, because implementing the Proposal would cause the Company to violate state law.

ANALYSIS

A. Rule 14a-8(i)(2) Overview

Rule 14a-8(i)(2) provides for the exclusion of a stockholder proposal if implementation of the proposal would "cause the company to violate any state, federal, or foreign law to which it is subject." As discussed below and for the reasons set forth in the legal opinion delivered by Richards, Layton & Finger, P.A., the Company's Delaware counsel, attached hereto as **Exhibit B** (the "RLF Opinion"), we believe that the Proposal is excludable under Rule 14a-8(i)(2) because implementation of the Proposal would cause the Company to violate Delaware law.

On a number of occasions, the Staff has concurred with the exclusion of a stockholder proposal where the proposal, if implemented, would cause a company to violate state law. For example, in Johnson & Johnson (avail. Feb. 16, 2012), the proposal sought to limit the ability of the board of directors to appoint directors to the compensation committee if such directors received a certain

number of "no" or "withhold" votes in a director election. The Staff concurred that the proposal could be excluded because its implementation would violate New Jersey law by limiting the decision-making authority of the board to select such committee members in the exercise of its fiduciary duties. In *Oshkosh Corp.* (avail. Nov. 21, 2019), the proposal requested that the company amend its bylaws to require that a director who received less than a majority vote be removed from the board "immediately." The Staff concurred with the proposal's exclusion under Rule 14a-8(i)(2) because its implementation would cause the company to violate Wisconsin law, which provided two methods for the removal of directors—by a stockholder vote or by a judicial proceeding—and neither was immediate or an action the company or its board could unilaterally take. *See also IDACORP, Inc.* (avail. Mar. 13, 2012) (concurring with the exclusion under Rule 14a-8(i)(2) of a stockholder proposal requesting that the company amend its bylaws to implement majority voting for director elections where Idaho law provided for plurality voting unless a company's certificate of incorporation provided otherwise); *Ball Corp.* (avail. Jan. 25, 2010, recon. denied Mar. 12, 2010) (concurring with the exclusion under Rule 14a-8(i)(2) of a stockholder proposal that would cause the company to violate Indiana law relating to board classification); and *Bank of America Corp.* (avail. Feb. 11, 2009) (concurring with the exclusion under Rule 14a-8(i)(2) of a stockholder proposal to amend the company's bylaws to establish a board committee and authorize the board chairman to appoint members of the committee that would cause the company to violate Delaware law).

B. Implementation of the Proposal Would Cause the Company to Violate Delaware Law

The Bylaws of the Company (the "Bylaws") require any incumbent director to submit an irrevocable resignation in order to become a nominee of the Board of Directors (the "Board") for further service on the Board, which resignation shall become effective if (a) that person does not receive a majority of the votes cast in an uncontested election, and (b) the Board accepts the resignation in accordance with its policies and procedures. The Proposal requests that the Board amend the applicable provision of the Bylaws to require the Board (a) to accept such a tendered resignation unless the Board finds "a compelling reason or reasons to not accept the resignation," and (b) in situations where the Board finds compelling reasons not to accept a director's tendered resignation and the director thus continues as a "holdover" director, if such director is not re-elected at the next annual meeting of stockholders, such director's resignation "will be automatically effective 30 days after the certification of the election vote." The supporting statement to the Proposal provides that the proposed amendment is intended to ensure that the stockholder vote is the "final word when a continuing 'holdover' director is not re-elected." Thus, the clear purpose and intent of such provision is to end the holdover term of the director and remove the holdover director from office if such director does not receive a majority of the votes cast at the second annual meeting.

Accordingly, the Proposal would impose a "compelling reasons" standard on decisions made by the Board with respect to resignations tendered by directors and, in the case of a holdover director, a majority of the votes cast at a stockholder meeting voting standard for the removal of such a director. Both of the provisions would violate Delaware law.

(i) Implementation of the Proposal Would Cause the Company to Violate Delaware Law Because It Would Limit the Board's Decision-Making Authority in Contravention of Its Fiduciary Duties

The Company is incorporated in Delaware and is governed by Delaware corporate law. As discussed in detail in the RLF Opinion, in accordance with Section 141(a) of the Delaware General Corporation Law (the "DGCL"), the Board possesses the full power and authority to manage the business and affairs of the Company. In making business decisions consistent with this authority, directors owe duties of care and loyalty to the corporation and all of its stockholders, which requires directors to base their decisions on what they reasonably believe to be in the best interests of the corporation and its stockholders. The decision of whether to accept a director's resignation is, therefore, one such decision that directors are required to make. In making such a decision, directors are required to exercise their fiduciary duties.

As outlined in the RLF Opinion, the Delaware courts have held that a bylaw that purports to mandate a substantive decision on the part of the board of directors without regard to the application of the directors' fiduciary duties violates Section 141(a) of the DGCL. The Proposal requires amendments to the Bylaws that would mandate directors of the Company to make a decision about whether to accept a director's tendered resignation based on a "compelling reasons" standard. The compelling reasons standard could require the directors to accept such a resignation in circumstances where proper application of their fiduciary duties would cause them to decide otherwise. As such, the RLF Opinion concludes that, "[b]ecause the bylaw provision contemplated by the Proposal mandates the Company's current and future directors accept director resignations based on a compelling reasons standard that does not take into account the director's fiduciary duties, it violates Delaware law."

(ii) Implementation of the Proposal Would Cause the Company to Violate Delaware Law Because It Would Permit Stockholders to Effect the Removal of a Director Without the Statutorily Required Vote

In addition, Section 141(k) of the DGCL provides that, other than with respect to certain exceptions that are not applicable to the Company, "any director or the entire board of directors may be removed, with or without cause, by the holders of *a majority of the shares then entitled to vote* at an election of directors" (emphasis added). The Proposal would require a director to be removed upon the failure of such director at a meeting of stockholders to receive a *majority of votes cast* at such meeting for such director's election. If implemented, the Proposal would impermissibly lower the *majority of the shares entitled to vote at the meeting* standard required under Section 141(k) of the DGCL to *a majority of the votes cast* at the stockholders meeting standard. As discussed in the RLF Opinion, a bylaw provision may not override such a statutory requirement. Therefore, implementing the Proposal would therefore violate Delaware law.

We understand that in *Genzyme Corporation* (avail. Feb. 8, 2007), the Staff did not concur with the exclusion of a proposal under Rule 14a-8(i)(2) where the company asserted that implementing a proposal requesting a majority voting standard in uncontested elections would

violate state law because the proposed requirement for directors to submit an irrevocable resignation would operate to remove directors in a manner inconsistent with Massachusetts state law requiring continued service of a director until a successor is qualified or a decrease in the number of directors. The Proposal is distinguishable because the resignation requirement in *Genzyme* was still conditioned on the board's acceptance of the resignation. In the Proposal, the amendments contemplated do not provide for any review or consideration by the Board as the director's resignation "will be automatically effective 30 days after" a holdover director fails to receive a majority of the votes cast at the next annual meeting. As discussed in detail above and in the RLF Opinion, the Proposal impermissibly seeks both to limit the Board's ability to exercise its fiduciary duties and to permit stockholders to effect a director's removal with a vote that does not meet the standard required by the DGCL, neither of which was at issue in the proposal in *Genzyme*.

Accordingly, just as in *Johnson & Johnson*, *Oshkosh* and the other precedents cited above, the Proposal may properly be excluded under Rule 14a-8(i)(2) because, as supported by the RLF Opinion, implementing the Proposal would cause the Company to violate state law.

CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis above, the Company respectfully requests the Staff's concurrence with its decision to omit the Proposal from the 2024 Proxy Materials and further requests the confirmation that the Staff will not recommend any enforcement action in connection with such omission.

In the event the Staff disagrees with any conclusion expressed herein, or should any information in support or explanation of the Company's position be required, we would appreciate an opportunity to confer with the Staff before issuance of its response. If the Staff has any questions regarding this request or requires additional information, please contact the undersigned at Sean.D.Mersten@questdiagnostics.com or 917-692-6311.

Sincerely,

Sean Mersten
Vice President and Corporate Secretary

cc: David Minasian, North Atlantic States Carpenters Pension Fund
Lona Nallengara, Shearman & Sterling LLP
Erika Kent, Shearman & Sterling LLP
John Mark Zeberkiewicz, Richards, Layton & Finger, P.A.

ЕХНІВІТ A

NORTH ATLANTIC STATES REGIONAL COUNCIL OF CARPENTERS

United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America

750 DORCHESTER AVENUE
BOSTON, MA 02125-1132

TELEPHONE (617) 268-3400
FAX (617) 268-0442

JOSEPH BYRNE
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY - TREASURER

SENT VIA OVERNIGHT USPS

December 5, 2023

William J. O'Shaughnessy, Jr.
Corporate Secretary
Quest Diagnostics, Inc.
500 Plaza Drive
Secaucus, NJ 07094

Dear Mr. O'Shaughnessy:

I hereby submit the enclosed shareholder proposal ("Proposal") on behalf of the North Atlantic States Carpenters Pension Fund ("Fund"), for inclusion in the Quest Diagnostics, Inc. ("Company") proxy statement to be circulated in conjunction with the next annual meeting of shareholders. The Proposal relates to the issue of director resignations and is submitted under Rule 14(a)-8 (Proposals of Security Holders) of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission proxy regulations.

The Fund is the beneficial owner of shares of the Company's common stock, with a market value of at least $25,000, which shares have been held continuously for more than a year prior to and including the date of the submission of the Proposal. Verification of this ownership by the record holder of the shares, State Street Bank and Trust Company, will be sent under separate cover. The Fund intends to hold the shares through the date of the Company's next annual meeting of shareholders. Either the undersigned or a designated representative will present the Fund's Proposal for consideration at the annual meeting of shareholders.

If you would like to discuss the Proposal, please contact David Minasian at Dminasian@nasrcc.org. Mr. Minasian will be available to discuss the proposal on Tuesday, December 19, or Tuesday, December 26, from 1:00PM to 5:00PM (ET) either day or other mutually agreeable date and time. Please forward any correspondence related to the proposal to Mr. Minasian, North Atlantic States Regional Council, 29 Endicott Street, Worcester, MA 01610 or at the email address above.

Sincerely,

Joseph Bryne
Fund Trustee

cc. David Minasian
Edward J. Durkin

Enclosure

Director Election Resignation Bylaw Proposal

Resolved: That the shareholders of Quest Diagnostics, Inc. ("Company") hereby request that the board of directors take the necessary action to amend its director election resignation bylaw that requires each director nominee to submit an irrevocable conditional resignation to the Company to be effective upon the director's failure to receive the required shareholder majority vote support in an uncontested election. The proposed amended resignation bylaw shall require the Board to accept a tendered resignation absent the finding of a compelling reason or reasons to not accept the resignation. Further, if the Board does not accept a tendered resignation and the director remains as a "holdover" director, the resignation bylaw shall stipulate that should a "holdover" director not be re-elected at the next annual election of directors, that director's new tendered resignation will be automatically effective 30 days after the certification of the election vote. The Board shall report the reasons for its actions to accept or reject a tendered resignation in a Form 8-K filing with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission.

Supporting Statement: The Proposal requests that the Board amend its director resignation bylaw to enhance director accountability. The Company has established in its bylaws a majority vote standard for use in an uncontested director election, an election in which the number of nominees equal the number of open board seats. Under applicable state corporate law, a director's term extends until his or her successor is elected and qualified, or until he or she resigns or is removed from office. Therefore, an incumbent director who fails to receive the required vote for election under a majority vote standard continues to serve as a "holdover" director until the next meeting of shareholders. A Company resignation bylaw addresses the continued status of an incumbent director who fails to be re-elected by requiring such director to tender his or her resignation for Board consideration.

The proposed new director resignation bylaw will set a more demanding standard of review for addressing director resignations then that contained in the Company's current resignation bylaw. The resignation bylaw will require the reviewing directors to articulate a compelling reason or reasons for not accepting a tendered resignation and allowing an un-elected director to continue to serve as a "holdover" director. Importantly, if a director's resignation is not accepted and he or she continues as a "holdover" director but again fails to be elected at the next annual meeting of shareholders, that director's new tendered resignation will be automatically effective 30 days following the election vote certification. While providing the Board latitude to accept or not accept the initial resignation of an incumbent director that fails to receive majority vote support, the amended bylaw will establish the shareholder vote as the final word when a continuing "holdover" director is not re-elected. The Proposal's enhancement of the director resignation process will establish shareholder director election voting as a more consequential governance right.

Sean D. Mersten
VP, Corporate Secretary
Sean.D.Mersten@QuestDiagnostics.com
Direct Line: 917-692-6311

December 12, 2023

David Minasian
North Atlantic States Regional Council of Carpenters
United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America
29 Endicott Street
Worcester, MA 01610
Dminasian@nasrcc.org

Subject: **Stockholder Proposal**

Dear Mr. Minasian:

On December 8, 2023 (the "Submission Date"), we received the stockholder proposal dated December 5, 2023 (the "Proposal") that Mr. Joseph Bryne, Fund Trustee, submitted on behalf of the North Atlantic States Carpenters Pension Fund (the "Fund") to Quest Diagnostics Incorporated ("Quest Diagnostics") via mail. Mr. Bryne requested that any correspondence related to the Proposal be directed to you.

The Proposal contains certain procedural deficiencies, which Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC") regulations require us to bring to your attention.

Proof of Ownership

Rule 14a-8(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (the "Exchange Act"), requires that in order to be eligible to submit a proposal for inclusion in Quest Diagnostics' proxy statement for its annual meeting of stockholders, each stockholder proponent must, among other things, have continuously held such common stock of Quest Diagnostics in the amount that satisfies at least one of the following Ownership Requirements (defined below):

- at least $2,000 in market value of Quest Diagnostics' common stock entitled to vote on the proposal for at least three years preceding and including the Submission Date;
- at least $15,000 in market value of Quest Diagnostics' common stock entitled to vote on the proposal for at least two years preceding and including the Submission Date; or
- at least $25,000 in market value of Quest Diagnostics' common stock entitled to vote on the proposal for at least one year preceding and including the Submission Date (each, an "Ownership Requirement," and collectively, the "Ownership Requirements").

Each stockholder submitting a proposal must also continue to hold such common stock through the date of the Quest Diagnostics annual meeting. Our stock records indicate that the

Fund is not currently the registered holder of any shares of Quest Diagnostics' common stock, and you have not provided proof of the Fund's ownership of Quest Diagnostics' common stock.

Accordingly, Rule 14a-8(b) requires that a proponent of a proposal prove eligibility as a beneficial stockholder of the company that is the subject of the proposal by submitting either:

- a written statement from the "record" holder of the shares (usually a bank or broker) verifying that, at the time the proponent submitted the proposal (in your case, December 8, 2023), the proponent had continuously held the requisite amount of shares to satisfy at least one of the Ownership Requirements above and that the proponent intends to continue to hold such common stock through the date of the Quest Diagnostics annual meeting; or

- a copy of a filed Schedule 13D, Schedule 13G, Form 3, Form 4, Form 5, or amendments to those documents or updated forms demonstrating that the proponent met at least one of the Ownership Requirements above, a copy of the schedules, forms and any subsequent amendments reporting a change in the proponent's ownership of shares and a written statement that the proponent continuously held the requisite number of shares to satisfy at least one of the Ownership Requirements above and that the proponent intends to continue ownership of the shares through the date of the Quest Diagnostics annual meeting.

To help stockholders comply with the requirements when submitting proof of ownership to companies, the SEC's Division of Corporation Finance published Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14F ("SLB 14F"), dated October 18, 2011, and Staff Legal Bulletin No. 14G ("SLB 14G"), dated October 16, 2012, a copy of both of which are attached for your reference. SLB 14F and SLB 14G provide that for securities held through The Depository Trust Company ("DTC"), only DTC participants should be viewed as "record" holders of securities that are deposited at DTC. You can confirm whether the Fund's bank or broker is a DTC participant by checking DTC's participant list, which is currently available on the Internet at: *https://www.dtcc.com/client-center/dtc-directories.*

If the Fund holds shares through a bank or broker that is not a DTC participant, you will need to obtain proof of ownership from the DTC participant through which the bank or broker holds the shares, or an affiliate of such DTC participant. You should be able to find the name of the DTC participant by asking the Fund's bank or broker. If the DTC participant that holds the Fund's shares knows the holdings of the Fund's bank or broker, but does not know the Fund's holdings, you may satisfy the proof of ownership requirements by submitting two proof of ownership statements — one from the Fund's bank or broker confirming the Fund's ownership and the other from the DTC participant confirming the bank's or broker's ownership. Please review SLB 14F carefully before submitting proof of ownership to ensure that it is compliant.

We acknowledge that Mr. Bryne's statement identified specific dates and times that you are available to meet with Quest Diagnostics to discuss the Proposal in accordance with Exchange Act Rule 14a-8(b)(1). Following the Fund's satisfaction of the eligibility requirements to submit the Proposal, Quest Diagnostics will coordinate with you to determine a mutually convenient date and time to discuss the Proposal.

In order to meet the eligibility requirements for submitting a stockholder proposal, the SEC rules require that any response to this letter be postmarked or transmitted electronically to us no later than 14 calendar days from the date you receive this letter. Please address any response to me at the mailing address or e-mail address provided above. Copies of Rule 14a-8, which applies to stockholder proposals submitted for inclusion in proxy statements, and SLB 14F and SLB 14G, which apply to stockholders' compliance with requirements when submitting proof of ownership to companies, are enclosed for your reference.

If you have any questions, please contact me using the email address noted above.

Very truly yours,

Sean D. Mersten
VP, Corporate Secretary

Attachments

17 CFR § 240.14a-8 - Shareholder proposals.

§ 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) To be eligible to submit a proposal, you must satisfy the following requirements:

(i) You must have continuously held:

(A) At least $2,000 in market value of the company's securities entitled to vote on the proposal for at least three years; or

(B) At least $15,000 in market value of the company's securities entitled to vote on the proposal for at least two years; or

(C) At least $25,000 in market value of the company's securities entitled to vote on the proposal for at least one year; or

(D) The amounts specified in paragraph (b)(3) of this section. This paragraph (b)(1)(i)(D) will expire on the same date that § 240.14a-8(b)(3) expires; and

(ii) You must provide the company with a written statement that you intend to continue to hold the requisite amount of securities, determined in accordance with paragraph (b)(1)(i)(A) through (C) of this section, through the date of the shareholders' meeting for which the proposal is submitted; and

(iii) You must provide the company with a written statement that you are able to meet with the company in person or via teleconference no less than 10 calendar days, nor more than 30 calendar days, after submission of the shareholder proposal. You must include your contact information as well as business days and specific times that you are available to discuss the proposal with the company. You must identify times that are within the regular business hours of the company's principal executive offices. If these hours are not disclosed in the company's proxy statement for the prior year's annual meeting, you must identify times that are between 9 a.m. and 5:30 p.m. in the time zone of the company's principal executive offices. If you elect to co-file a proposal, all co-filers must either:

(A) Agree to the same dates and times of availability, or

(B) Identify a single lead filer who will provide dates and times of the lead filer's availability to engage on behalf of all co-filers; and

(iv) If you use a representative to submit a shareholder proposal on your behalf, you must provide the company with written documentation that:

(A) Identifies the company to which the proposal is directed;

(B) Identifies the annual or special meeting for which the proposal is submitted;

(C) Identifies you as the proponent and identifies the person acting on your behalf as your representative;

(D) Includes your statement authorizing the designated representative to submit the proposal and otherwise act on your behalf;

(E) Identifies the specific topic of the proposal to be submitted;

(F) Includes your statement supporting the proposal; and

(G) Is signed and dated by you.

(v) The requirements of paragraph (b)(1)(iv) of this section shall not apply to shareholders that are entities so long as the representative's authority to act on the shareholder's behalf is apparent and self-evident such that a reasonable person would understand that the agent has authority to submit the proposal and otherwise act on the shareholder's behalf.

(vi) For purposes of paragraph (b)(1)(i) of this section, you may not aggregate your holdings with those of another shareholder or group of shareholders to meet the requisite amount of securities necessary to be eligible to submit a proposal.

(2) One of the following methods must be used to demonstrate your eligibility to submit a proposal:

(i) 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 requisite amount of securities, determined in accordance with paragraph (b)(1)(i)(A) through (C) of this section, through the date of the meeting of shareholders.

(ii) 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:

(A) 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 at least $2,000, $15,000, or $25,000 in market value of the company's securities entitled to vote on the proposal for at least three years, two years, or one year, respectively. You must also include your own written statement that you intend to continue to hold the requisite amount of securities, determined in accordance with paragraph (b)(1)(i)(A) through (C) of this section, through the date of the shareholders' meeting for which the proposal is submitted; or

(B) The second way to prove ownership applies only if you were required to file, and 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, demonstrating that you meet at least one of the share ownership requirements under paragraph (b)(1)(i)(A) through (C) of this section. If you have filed one or more of these documents with the SEC, you may demonstrate your eligibility to submit a proposal by submitting to the company:

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

(2) Your written statement that you continuously held at least $2,000, $15,000, or $25,000 in market value of the company's securities entitled to vote on the proposal for at least three years, two years, or one year, respectively; and

(3) Your written statement that you intend to continue to hold the requisite amount of securities, determined in accordance with paragraph (b)(1)(i)(A) through (C) of this section, through the date of the company's annual or special meeting.

(3) If you continuously held at least $2,000 of a company's securities entitled to vote on the proposal for at least one year as of January 4, 2021, and you have continuously maintained a minimum investment of at least $2,000 of such securities from January 4, 2021 through the date the proposal is submitted to the

company, you will be eligible to submit a proposal to such company for an annual or special meeting to be held prior to January 1, 2023. If you rely on this provision, you must provide the company with your written statement that you intend to continue to hold at least $2,000 of such securities through the date of the shareholders' meeting for which the proposal is submitted. You must also follow the procedures set forth in paragraph (b)(2) of this section to demonstrate that:

(i) You continuously held at least $2,000 of the company's securities entitled to vote on the proposal for at least one year as of January 4, 2021; and

(ii) You have continuously maintained a minimum investment of at least $2,000 of such securities from January 4, 2021 through the date the proposal is submitted to the company.

(iii) This paragraph (b)(3) will expire on January 1, 2023.

(c) ***Question 3:*** How many proposals may I submit? Each person may submit no more than one proposal, directly or indirectly, to a company for a particular shareholders' meeting. A person may not rely on the securities holdings of another person for the purpose of meeting the eligibility requirements and submitting multiple proposals 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 (l)(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 (l)(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 addresses substantially the same subject matter as a proposal, or proposals, previously included in the company's proxy materials within the preceding five calendar years if the most recent vote occurred within the preceding three calendar years and the most recent vote was:

(i) Less than 5 percent of the votes cast if previously voted on once;

(ii) Less than 15 percent of the votes cast if previously voted on twice; or

(iii) Less than 25 percent of the votes cast if previously voted on three or more times.

(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; 85 FR 70294, Nov. 4, 2020]

Effective Date Note:
At 85 FR 70294, Nov. 4, 2020, § 240.14a-8 was amended by adding paragraph (b)(3), effective Jan. 4, 2021 through Jan. 1, 2023.

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://www.sec.gov/forms/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-8[7] 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.

Modified: Oct. 18, 2011

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://www.sec.gov/forms/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.

Modified: Oct. 16, 2012

Sent Via Electronic Mail (Sean.D.Mersten@QuestDiagnostics.com)

December 19, 2023

Sean D. Mersten
VP, Corporate Secretary
Quest Diagnostics Inc.
500 Plaza Drive,
Secaucus, NJ 07094

RE: Shareholder Proposal Ownership Verification Letter

Dear Mr. Mersten:

State Street Bank and Trust Company ("State Street"), a Depository Trust & Clearing Corporation participant, serves as custodian for the North Atlantic States Carpenters Pension Fund ("Fund"). At the request and instruction of the Fund, State Street confirms that as custodian it is the record holder of shares of Quest Diagnostics Inc. common stock (CUSIP#74834L100) held for the benefit of the Fund.

As of December 5, 2023, the date of the submission of the Fund's Director Election Resignation Bylaw shareholder proposal, the Fund held, and has held continuously for at least one year, at least 1600 shares of Quest Diagnostics Inc. common stock.

If there are any questions concerning this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me directly at (617) 985-2024 or at wccollins@statestreet.com.

Sincerely,

William C. Collins
Vice President
State Street Bank and Trust Company

cc. Joseph Byrne, Fund Trustee
David Minasian
Edward J. Durkin

ЕХНІВІТ B

RICHARDS LAYTON & FINGER

January 16, 2024

Quest Diagnostics Incorporated
500 Plaza Drive
Secaucus, NJ 07094

Re: Stockholder Proposal on behalf of New York City Carpenters Pension Fund

Ladies and Gentlemen:

We have acted as special Delaware counsel to Quest Diagnostics Incorporated, a Delaware corporation (the "Company"), in connection with a stockholder proposal (the "Proposal") on behalf of the North Atlantic States Carpenters Pension Fund (the "Proponent"), dated December 5, 2023, for the 2024 annual meeting of stockholders of the Company (the "Annual Meeting"). In this connection, you have requested our opinion as to certain matters under the laws of the State of Delaware.

For the purpose of rendering our opinion as expressed herein, we have been furnished with and have reviewed the following documents: (i) the Restated Certificate of Incorporation of the Company as filed with the Secretary of State of the State of Delaware (the "Secretary of State") on August 10, 2022 (the "Certificate of Incorporation"); (ii) the Amended and Restated By-laws of the Company, effective as of November 14, 2022 (the "Bylaws"); and (iii) the Proposal.

With respect to the foregoing documents, we have assumed: (i) the authenticity of all documents submitted to us as originals; (ii) the conformity to authentic originals of all documents submitted to us as copies; (iii) the genuineness of all signatures and the legal capacity of natural persons; and (iv) that the foregoing documents, in the forms thereof submitted to us for our review, have not been and will not be altered or amended in any respect material to our opinion as expressed herein. We have not reviewed any document other than the documents listed above for purposes of rendering this opinion, and we assume that there exists no provision of any such other document that bears upon or is inconsistent with our opinion as expressed herein. In addition, we have conducted no independent factual investigation of our own but rather have relied solely on the foregoing documents, the statements and information set forth therein and the additional factual matters recited or assumed herein, all of which we assume to be true, complete and accurate in all material respects.

THE PROPOSAL

The Proposal states the following:

Resolved: That the shareholders of Quest Diagnostics, Inc. ("Company") hereby request that the board of directors take the

> necessary action to amend its director election resignation bylaw that requires each director nominee to submit an irrevocable conditional resignation to the Company to be effective upon the director's failure to receive the required shareholder majority vote support in an uncontested election. The proposed amended resignation bylaw shall require the Board to accept a tendered resignation absent the finding of a compelling reason or reasons to not accept the resignation. Further, if the Board does not accept a tendered resignation and the director remains as a "holdover" director, the resignation bylaw shall stipulate that should a "holdover" director not be re-elected at the next annual election of directors, that director's new tendered resignation will be automatically effective 30 days after the certification of the election vote. The Board shall report the reasons for its actions to accept or reject a tendered resignation in a Form 8-K filing with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission.

We have been advised that the Company is considering excluding the Proposal from the Company's proxy statement for the Annual Meeting under, among other reasons, Rule 14a-8(i)(2) promulgated under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended. Rule 14a-8(i)(2) provides that a registrant may omit a proposal from its proxy statement when "the proposal would, if implemented, cause the company to violate any state, federal, or foreign law to which it is subject." In this connection, you have requested our opinion as to whether, under Delaware law, the implementation of the Proposal, if adopted by the Company's stockholders, would violate Delaware law.

For the reasons set forth below, to the extent the Proposal, if implemented, (i) requires the board of directors of the Company (the "Board") to accept a resignation in circumstances where doing so would violate its fiduciary duties or (ii) effects the removal of a director without the statutorily required vote, the Proposal, in our opinion, would violate Delaware law.

DISCUSSION

The Proposal would violate Delaware law if implemented.

The Proposal requests that the Board amend the provision of the Bylaws that requires each incumbent director, as a condition to becoming a nominee for further service on the Board, to submit an irrevocable resignation that becomes effective only if (i) the person shall not receive a majority of the votes cast in an election that is not a Contested Election (as defined in the Bylaws) and (ii) the Board shall accept that resignation in accordance with policies and procedures adopted by the Board for such purpose. The amendments to the bylaw provision contemplated by the Proposal would require the Board to accept a tendered resignation unless the Board finds a "compelling reason or reasons" not to accept the resignation. The amendments to the bylaw provision contemplated by the Proposal thus would impose a "compelling reasons" standard on

decisions made by the Boards with respect to accepting resignations tendered by directors in accordance with the bylaw provision.

For the reasons set forth below, in our opinion, because the Proposal, if adopted, would require the Board as composed at any time to accept a director's resignation unless there were "compelling reasons" not to accept it, the Proposal appears designed to require the Board to accept a resignation even in circumstances where the Board believes, in the good faith exercise of its fiduciary duties under Delaware law, that accepting the resignation is not in the best interests of the Company and its stockholders. To the extent the Proposal is designed to require that the Board accept resignations in circumstances where proper application of the Board's fiduciary duties would preclude it from doing so, the Proposal violates Delaware law.

Section 141(a) of the General Corporation Law provides that the "business and affairs of every corporation organized under this chapter shall be managed by or under the direction of a board of directors, except as may be otherwise provided in this chapter or in its certificate of incorporation." 8 *Del. C.* § 141(a). Significantly, if there is to be any variation from the mandate of Section 141(a), it can only be as "otherwise provided in this chapter or in its certificate of incorporation." *See*, *e.g.*, *Lehrman v. Cohen*, 222 A.2d 800, 808 (Del. 1966). The Certificate of Incorporation does not provide for management of the Company by persons other than directors, and the phrase "except as otherwise provided in this chapter" does not include bylaws adopted pursuant to Section 109(b) of the General Corporation Law. Thus, the Board possesses the full power and authority to manage the business and affairs of the Company. *Aronson v. Lewis*, 473 A.2d 805, 811 (Del. 1984); *see also In re CNX Gas Corp. S'holders Litig*., 2010 WL 2705147, at *10 (Del. Ch. July 5, 2010) ("the premise of board-centrism animates the General Corporation Law"); *McMullin v. Beran*, 765 A.2d 910, 916 (Del. 2000) ("One of the fundamental principles of the Delaware General Corporation Law statute is that the business affairs of a corporation are managed by or under the direction of its board of directors.") (citing 8 *Del. C.* § 141(a)); *Quickturn Design Sys., Inc. v. Shapiro*, 721 A.2d 1281, 1291 (Del. 1998) ("One of the most basic tenets of Delaware corporate law is that the board of directors has the ultimate responsibility for managing the business and affairs of a corporation.") (footnote omitted). In making business decisions, directors owe duties of care and loyalty to the corporation and all of its stockholders which requires them to base their decisions on what they reasonably believe to be in the best interests of the corporation and its stockholders. *Mills Acq. Co. v. Macmillan, Inc.*, 559 A.2d 1261,1280 (Del. 1989).

The Delaware courts have held that a bylaw that purports to mandate a substantive decision on the part of the board of directors without regard to the application of the directors' fiduciary duties violates Section 141(a). *CA, Inc. v. AFSCME Employees Pension Plan*, 953 A.2d 227, 235-338 (Del. 2008). For example, in *CA, Inc.*, the Delaware Supreme Court held that a proposed stockholder adopted bylaw that mandated that the board of directors reimburse a stockholder for its expenses in running a proxy contest to elect a minority of the members of the board of directors would violate Delaware law because it mandated reimbursement of proxy expenses even in circumstances where a proper application of fiduciary principles would preclude doing so. *Id*. Thus, a corporation's board or its stockholders may not bind future directors on matters

involving the management of the company. *Id.*; *see also Carmody v. Toll Bros., Inc.*, 723 A.2d 1180, 1191 (Del. Ch. 1998) (refusing to dismiss claims that the "deadhand" provision in the company's rights plan which would limit a future board's ability to redeem the rights plan was invalid under Delaware law); *Quickturn Design Sys., Inc.*, 721 A.2d at 1281 (invalidating a provision that, under certain circumstances, would have prevented newly-elected directors from redeeming a rights plan for a six-month period); *Paramount Communications, Inc. v. QVC Network, Inc.*, 637 A.2d 34, 51 (Del. 1994) (invalidating a provision in a merger agreement that prevented the directors from communicating with competing bidders); *Abercrombie v. Davies,* 123 A.2d 893, 899 (Del. Ch. 1956) (invalidating a provision in an agreement that required the directors to act as directed by an arbitrator in certain circumstances where the board was deadlocked), *rev'd on other grounds*, 130 A.2d 338 (Del. 1957).

The decision whether to accept a resignation is a business decision for the Board in which it is required to exercise its fiduciary duties. *Louisiana Mun. Police Emps. Ret. Sys. v. Morgan Stanley & Co. Inc.*, 2011 WL 773316, at *6 (Del. Ch. Mar. 4, 2011). The board must consider multiple factors in deciding whether to accept a resignation that an incumbent director has tendered after failing to receive a majority of the votes cast for his or her election, including, without limitation, the underlying reasons for the director failing to receive such vote, the tenure and qualifications of the director, the director's past and expected future contributions to the Board and the overall composition of the Board (including whether accepting the resignation would cause the Company to fail to meet the requirements of any law, rule or regulation applicable to the Company). The Proposal requests amendments to the Bylaws that would mandate current and future directors of the Company to make determinations based on a "compelling reasons" standard that has meaning only if it would require the directors to accept a resignation in circumstances where proper application of its fiduciary duties would cause it to decide otherwise. Because the bylaw provision contemplated by the Proposal mandates the Company's current and future directors accept director resignations based on a compelling reasons standard that does not take into account the directors' fiduciary duties, it violates Delaware law.

In addition, the bylaw contemplated by the Proposal would require that, if the Board finds there are compelling reasons not to accept the resignation of a director who did not receive a majority of the votes cast for such director's election (and thus continues as a holdover director) *and* such director fails to receive a majority of the votes cast for such director's election at the next annual meeting of stockholders, such director's resignation "will be automatically effective 30 days after the certification of the election vote." The supporting statement to the Proposal provides that the foregoing provision is intended to ensure that the stockholder vote is the "final word when a continuing 'holdover' director is not re-elected." Thus, the apparent purpose and intent of such provision is to end the holdover term of the director and remove the holdover director from office if such director does not receive a majority of the votes cast at the second annual meeting. The bylaw contemplated by the Proposal would thus establish, for the removal of any such holdover director, a voting standard based on the votes cast for such director's election at the second annual meeting. To the extent such bylaw purports to fix the stockholder vote required to end the term of a holdover director and remove the holdover director from office as less than a majority in voting power of the outstanding shares entitled to vote at an election of directors – which the Proposal, if adopted as

proposed, would do because it would provide for automatic termination of the director's service based solely on whether the director has failed to receive a majority of votes cast, a lower standard than a majority in voting power of the outstanding shares entitled to vote in an election – it violates Delaware law.

Section 141(k) of the General Corporation Law provides that, other than with respect to two exceptions that are not applicable to the Company,[1] "any director or the entire board of directors may be removed, with or without cause, by the holders of a majority of the shares then entitled to vote at an election of directors." 8 *Del. C.* § 141(k). A bylaw may not override a statutory mandate. *See* 8 *Del. C.* § 109(b); *Kerbs v. California Eastern Airways*, 90 A.2d 652, 658-59 (Del. 1952) (finding that a bylaw purporting to allow establishment of a quorum with fewer directors than the minimum required by statute to be void and stating that "a by-law which is repugnant to the statute must always give way to the statute's superior authority"). A bylaw that is contrary to statute is void. *Sinchareonkul v. Fahnemann*, 2015 WL 292314, at *8 (Del. Ch. Jan. 22, 2015) (observing, in finding that a bylaw that purported to provide a specified director additional votes qua director was invalid in light of statute, Section 141(d) of the General Corporation Law, requiring any such provision to appear in the certificate of incorporation, that "[u]nder Section 109(b), a bylaw that conflicts with the DGCL is void."). The Delaware courts have held that a bylaw provision that purports to permit the stockholders to remove directors by a lesser voting standard than required by Section 141(k) is invalid under Delaware law. *Cf. Frechter v. Zier*, 2017 WL 345142, at *4 (Del Ch. Jan. 24, 2017) (invalidating a provision of the bylaws purporting to change the statutory default for the election of directors). The Delaware courts have also held that a bylaw may not impose a requirement that disqualifies a director and terminates the director's service. *See, e.g. Kurz v. Holbrook*, 989 A.2d 140, 157 (Del. Ch. 2010) ("In light of the three procedural means for ending a director's term in Section 141(b), I do not believe a bylaw could impose a requirement that would disqualify a director and terminate his service."); *see also Rohe v. Reliance Training Network, Inc.*, 2000 WL 1038190, at *12 (Del.Ch. July 21, 2000). Thus, to the extent such bylaw purports to fix the stockholder vote required to end the term of a holdover director and remove the holdover director from office as less than a majority in voting power of the shares entitled to vote at an election of directors – which the Proposal, if adopted as proposed, would do because it would provide for automatic termination of the director's service based solely on whether the director has failed to receive a majority of votes cast, a lower standard than the majority in voting power of the outstanding shares entitled to vote generally at an election of directors – it violates Section 141(k) of the General Corporation Law and is therefore invalid.

CONCLUSION

Based upon and subject to the foregoing and subject to the limitations stated herein, it is our opinion that the Proposal, if implemented, would violate Delaware law.

---

[1] The two exceptions relate to the removal of directors from a classified board or where cumulative voting in the election of directors is permitted. 8 *Del. C.* § 141(k). The Company does not have a classified board and does not permit cumulative voting the election of directors.

The foregoing opinion is limited to the laws of the State of Delaware. We have not considered and express no opinion on the laws of any other state or jurisdiction, including federal laws regulating securities or any other federal laws, or the rules and regulations of stock exchanges or of any other regulatory body.

The foregoing opinion is rendered solely for your benefit in connection with the matters addressed herein. We understand that you may furnish a copy of this opinion letter to the Securities and Exchange Commission and to the Proponent in connection with the matters addressed herein, and we consent to your doing so. Except as stated in this paragraph, this opinion letter may not be furnished or quoted to, nor may the foregoing opinion be relied upon by, any other person or entity for any purpose without our prior written consent.

Very truly yours,

Richards, Layton & Finger, P.A.

JMZ

UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS AND JOINERS OF AMERICA

VIA ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION

February 26, 2024

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

Re: *Quest Diagnostics Incorporated*
Response of the New York City Carpenters Pension Fund to Quest Diagnostics Incorporated's No-Action Request

Ladies and Gentlemen:

On December 5, 2023, the North Atlantic States Carpenters Pension Fund ("Fund") submitted to Quest Diagnostics Incorporated ("Company") a Director Election Resignation Bylaw shareholder proposal ("Proposal") pursuant to Rule 14(a)-8 (Proposals of Security Holders) of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission") proxy regulations. On January 16, 2024, the Company filed with the Commission a request for the Staff's concurrence in their view that the Proposal may be excluded from the Company's 2024 Proxy Materials. A copy of this response to the Company's request is being sent to the Company. For the reasons outlined below, we believe that the Company has failed to state any proper bases for omitting the Proposal from its Proxy Materials to be circulated in conjunction with its 2024 annual meeting of shareholders. Rather than limiting the Company's board of directors' rights to manage the operations of the Company, the Proposal simply fortifies the fundamental right of shareholders, as the owners of the Company, to exercise their most important right of ownership, the right to vote in the election of Company directors.

THE PROPOSAL

The text of the Fund's Proposal submitted for inclusion in the Company's 2024 Proxy Materials is set forth below.

> **Resolved:** That the shareholders of Quest Diagnostics, Inc. ("Company") hereby request that the board of directors take the necessary action to amend its director

election resignation bylaw that requires each director nominee to submit an irrevocable conditional resignation to the Company to be effective upon the director's failure to receive the required shareholder majority vote support in an uncontested election. The proposed amended resignation bylaw shall require the Board to accept a tendered resignation absent the finding of a compelling reason or reasons to not accept the resignation. Further, if the Board does not accept a tendered resignation and the director remains as a "holdover" director, the resignation bylaw shall stipulate that should a "holdover" director not be re-elected at the next annual election of directors, that director's new tendered resignation will be automatically effective 30 days after the certification of the election vote. The Board shall report the reasons for its actions to accept or reject a tendered resignation in a Form 8-K filing with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission.

OPPOSITION TO THE COMPANY'S REQUEST FOR NO-ACTION RELIEF

The Fund believes that the arguments against the Proposal by the Company and its Delaware counsel are unpersuasive and do not establish grounds for the omission of the Proposal from the Company's Proxy Materials to be distributed in conjunction with its 2024 annual meeting of shareholders. Specifically, Company arguments on the following basis for relief are not persuasive:

The Proposal May be Excluded Under Rule 14a-8(i)(2) Because implementing the Proposal Would Cause the Company to Violate State Law

PROPOSAL BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

It is instructive to review the voting rights that corporate shareholders in Delaware incorporated corporations possess in evaluating the Company's no-action letter arguments. Section 211(b) of the Delaware General Corporation Law ("DGCL") establishes that an annual meeting of stockholders shall be held for the election of directors on a date and time designated by or in the manner provided in a corporation's bylaws. In addition to the shareholders' right to elect directors at the annual meeting, "any other proper business" may be transacted. The election of directors by shareholders is a foundational right in the corporate governance system established in the DGCL. "The shareholder franchise is the ideological underpinning upon which the legitimacy of directorial power rests." *Blasius Indus., Inc. v. Atlas Corp*., 564 A.2d 651, 659 (Del.Ch. 1988).

A plurality vote standard[1] in the election of directors was set as the default vote standard in 1987 when the DGCL was amended to replace the majority vote standard that was in place for all matters voted upon at an annual meeting of shareholders. The DGCL election vote standard change was prompted by the growing number of contested elections in an era of hostile takeover activity and

[1] A plurality vote standard in a director election holds that the director nominees that receive the highest number of "For" votes corresponding to the number of open board seats are elected. Further, "Against" votes are not permitted; the option is to "Withhold." Thus, a single "For" vote assures election.

the incompatibility of a majority vote standard with contested elections.[2] The new plurality default standard applied to both contested and uncontested director elections. While a plurality vote standard is the appropriate vote standard in a contested director election,[3] the use of the plurality standard in an uncontested director election virtually ensures that board-sponsored nominees are elected. To address this issue, a shareholder private-ordering campaign[4] using precatory shareholder proposals began in 2003 to advance the adoption of a majority vote standard in uncontested director elections. This decades-long governance activism resulted in the broad market adoption of a majority vote standard by most large and mid-cap publicly traded companies.[5] The majority vote standard in an uncontested election provides shareholders the opportunity to vote "for" or "against" board nominees, raising the possibility that director nominees, both new nominees and incumbent directors running for reelection, might fail to be elected, or in the case of incumbent directors reelected.

For the first time, uncontested director elections could result in director nominees, both new nominees and incumbents, failing to be elected. DGCL Section 141(b) states in part that an elected director shall hold office until "such director's successor is elected and qualified or until such director's earlier resignation or removal." Thus, under DGCL an incumbent director nominee that is not re-elected in an uncontested director election with a majority vote standard continues to serve as a director, a "holdover" director, absent his or her resignation. With increasing corporate adoption of a majority vote standard for uncontested elections and the possibility of an incumbent director losing a reelection vote, it was necessary to construct a post-election process to address the continued status of an unelected "holdover" director. Director election resignation policies and bylaws developed as a necessary and important complementary component to the majority vote standard in uncontested director elections.

Pfizer Inc. advanced the first director election resignation policy, proposing it as an alternative to the adoption of a majority vote bylaw. The Pfizer model became known as the "plurality plus" model as it combined the plurality vote standard with a conditional director resignation. Under the "plurality plus" model, an incumbent board nominee who received more so-called "withhold" votes than "for" votes was required to submit a resignation letter even though the director had been reelected.[6] The market ultimately rejected the "plurality plus" model as an alternative to majority voting, but the conditional resignation was embraced as a complementary component of the majority vote regime.

---

[2] The use of a majority vote standard in a contested election can result in a "failed election". A "failed election" occurs when a non-management board nominee receives more votes than an incumbent director but short of a majority resulting in the incumbent directors continuing in office as a "holdover" director.

[3] In a contested election with more board nominees than available board seats, the nominees receiving the highest number of votes corresponding to the number of available board seats are elected.

[4] A private-ordering campaign by the United Brotherhood of Carpenter Pension Funds and other Trades Fund that used precatory shareholder proposals to urge the adoption of a majority vote standard bylaw spanned multiple years beginning in 2003 and transformed the vote standard in the common uncontested director election (an election in which the number of board-sponsored nominees equals the number of open board seats).

[5] The plurality vote standard remains the default standard under the DGCL.

[6] A Commission rulemaking in 1979 instituted the use of so-called "withhold" votes in director elections under the plurality vote standard. The "withhold" vote is an abstention and has no legal effect on an election outcome. Securities Exchange Act Release 34-16356 (November 21, 1979) 44FR68764 (November 29, 1979).

In 2006, DGCL Section 141(b) was amended to add a new provision that a director resignation may be made effective upon the happening of a future event or events, coupled with authority granted in the same section to make certain resignations irrevocable. By permitting a corporation to enforce a director resignation conditioned upon the director's failure to achieve a specified vote for reelection, e.g., more votes "For" than "Against", coupled with board acceptance of the resignation, these provisions permit corporations and individual directors to agree voluntarily, and give effect in a manner subsequently enforceable by the corporation, to voting standards for the election of directors which differ from the plurality default standard in Section 216. A director resignation could now be conditioned upon the happening of a future event (failure to be reelected) and could be made irrevocable. The legislature took the additional step in 2006 to amend DGCL Section 216 to support the majority vote standard by providing that a bylaw adopted by a vote of stockholders that prescribes the required vote for the election of directors may not be unilaterally altered or repealed by the board of directors.

Following the 2006 DGCL amendments, majority vote corporations adopted "director resignation" governance policies or bylaw provisions to address the status of an unelected "holdover" director. The typical resignation policy or bylaw sets a process for board review of the tendered resignation, with the board deciding whether the resignation is accepted or rejected. The resignation provisions outline a timeline and process for review of a tendered resignation by the board, or some subset thereof, such as a board's governance committee. Typically included is a statement that the board's decision will be made in the best interests of the company. Most companies commit to inform shareholders of the board's decision by means of a Commission Form 8-K filing. In the event a tendered resignation is not accepted, the disclosure will usually include the rationale for the board's decision and possible alternative action to be taken.

THE COMPANY'S RESIGNATION BYLAW AND THE PROPOSAL

The Company has in place a director resignation bylaw. The bylaw reads as follows:

> Section 2.03. Election of Directors. Except as otherwise provided by these By-Laws, each director shall be elected by the vote of the majority of the votes cast with respect to that director's election at any meeting for the election of directors at which a quorum is present, provided that if, as of the tenth (10^{th}) day preceding the date the Corporation first mails its notice of meeting for such meeting to the stockholders of the Corporation, the number of nominees exceeds the number of directors to be elected (a "Contested Election"), the directors shall be elected by the vote of a plurality of the votes cast. For purposes of this Section 2.03 of the By-Laws, a majority of votes cast shall mean that the number of votes cast "for" a director's election exceeds the number of votes cast "against" that director's election (with "abstentions" and "broker nonvotes" not counted as a vote cast either "for" or "against" that director's election).
>
> In order for any incumbent director to become a nominee of the Board of Directors for further service on the Board of Directors, such person must submit an irrevocable resignation, provided that such resignation shall be effective only if (i) that person shall note receive a majority of the votes cast in an election that is not

> a Contested Election, and (ii) the Board of Directors shall accept that resignation in accordance with the policies and procedures adopted by the Board of Directors for such purpose. In the event an incumbent director fails to receive a majority of the votes cast in an election that is not a Contested Election, the Governance Committee, or such other Committee designated by the Board of Directors pursuant to these By-Laws, shall make a recommendation to the Board of Directors as to whether to accept or reject the resignation of such incumbent director, or whether other action should be taken. The Board of Directors shall act on the resignation, taking into account the Committee's recommendation, and publicly disclose (by a press release and filing an appropriate disclosure with the Securities and Exchange Commission) its decision regarding the resignation and, if such resignation is rejected, the rationale behind the decision within one hundred twenty (120) days following certification of the election results. The Committee in making its recommendation and the Board of Directors in making its decision each may consider any factors and other information that they consider appropriate and relevant.

The Fund's precatory Proposal requests that the Board revise the Company's unilaterally adopted resignation bylaw that empowers the Board to address the legal status of an unelected "holdover" director. Importantly, the Proposal advances a bylaw amendment that calls on the Board in the exercise of its fiduciary duties to articulate a "compelling reason or reasons" should it not accept the tendered resignation of a director opposed by a majority vote of shareholders. Further, the Proposal urges that the Company's new bylaw crafted by the Board hold that the conditional and irrevocable resignation of a "holdover" director not elected at a second consecutive meeting be effective 30 days after the certification of election results. As used in the Proposal, we define a "compelling reason or reasons" consistent with the ordinary meaning of the words, that is a reason that convinces someone that something should be done, in this case not to accept a resignation despite the director failing to receive majority shareholder support. The reason or reasons to reject a resignation must be "compelling," as determined by the Board in its business judgment, which requires the directors to make all decisions with due care and in good faith under Delaware corporation law. The requirement that a "holdover" director's second consecutive election defeat result in the acceptance of his or her tendered resignation comports with the importance of shareholder voting rights in director elections. Board action to amend the bylaw as requested would simply bind it to give effect to shareholders' director election voting rights. A board's failure to adequately address the individual director or company performance issue or issues that prompted a director's initial election loss justifies the proposed heightened accountability. Limiting Board discretion in this context is appropriate and a measured toughening of the consequences of a repeated election loss for a "holdover" director.

RESPONSE TO RULE 14a-8(i)(2) ARGUMENT

The Company and its Delaware counsel argue that the Proposal may be excluded under Rule 14a-8(i)(2) because implementing it would cause the Company to violate Delaware law. The Company argues that the "compelling reason or reasons" language and the required acceptance of a "holdover" director's resignation following a second consecutive election loss would cause the

Board to violate its fiduciary duty to act in the best interest of the Company and its stockholders in contravention of Delaware law for the following reasons:

1. Implementation of the Proposal Would Cause the Company to Violate Delaware Law Because It Would Limit the Board's Decision-Making Authority in Contravention of Its Fiduciary Duties, and

2. Implementation of the Proposal Would Cause the Company to Violate Delaware Law Because It Would Permit Stockholders to Effect the Removal of a Director Without the Statutorily Required Vote.

The Fund believes that the Company fails to present persuasive arguments for omission based on Rule 14a--8(i)(2).

The Proposal Would Not Limit the Board's Decision-Making Authority

Rule 14a-8(i)(2) permits a company to exclude a proposal if its implementation would cause the company to violate state, federal or foreign law applicable to the company. The Company is incorporated under the laws of the state of Delaware. Section 141(a) of the DGCL provides: "The business and affairs of every corporation organized under this chapter shall be managed by or under the direction of a board of directors, except as may be otherwise provided in this chapter or in its certificate of incorporation." The Company argues that the Board's authority to manage the business and affairs of the Company under the DGCL requires that the Board have complete authority to accept or reject a "holdover" director's resignation. It cites several cases for the proposition that a board of directors has authority to manage the business and affairs of a Delaware corporation. The Fund does not dispute this proposition. However, the Company's resignation bylaw sets the process for the adjudication of shareholder vote outcomes in director elections, not the management of the "business and affairs" of the Company. Thus, the Proposal's resignation bylaw provisions do not interfere with the Board's management of the Company nor does requesting acceptance of an incumbent nominees previously tendered resignation constitute compelling directors to breach their fiduciary duties.

The official State of Delaware website contains a discussion of Delaware Corporate Law entitled "The Delaware Way: Deference to the Business Judgment of Directors Who Act Loyally and Carefully." *www.corplaw.delaware.gov.* It begins by stating:

> The Delaware General Corporation Law's central mandate appears in Section 141(a); it provides that the business and affairs of every Delaware corporation are managed by or under the direction of the corporation's board of directors. In discharging their duty to manage or oversee the management of the corporation, directors owe fiduciary duties of loyalty and care to the corporation and its stockholders.
>
> Business judgment rule**:** Although some major transactions require the consent of stockholders as well as the approval of the board, the board generally has the power and duty to make business decisions for the corporation. These decisions include

> establishing and overseeing the corporation's long-term business plans and strategies, and the hiring and firing of executive officers. Delaware law affords directors making such decisions a set of presumptions—known as the "business judgment rule"—that, so long as a majority of the directors have no conflicting interest (see "duty of loyalty" below) in the decision, their decision will not later be second-guessed by a court if it is undertaken with due care and in good faith.

Managing the business and affairs of a Delaware corporation clearly includes authority to establish and oversee a company's long-term strategic plans, hire, monitor, compensate and, if necessary, fire executive officers. Just as clearly, overseeing the election of directors is not within the exclusive purview of the board of directors as the Company's request for no-action relief request suggests.

The Company fails to establish that Delaware law assigns to the board of directors unlimited power over the election of directors. Delaware law does no such thing. In MM Companies v. Liquid Audio, Inc., 813 A.2d 1118, 1128 (Del. 2003), the Delaware Supreme Court stated:

> The most fundamental principles of corporate governance are a function of the allocation of power within a corporation between its stockholders and its board of directors. [] The stockholders' power is the right to vote on specific matters, in particular, in an election of directors. The power of managing the corporate enterprise is vested in the shareholders' duly elected board representatives. [] Accordingly, while these "fundamental tenets of Delaware corporate law provide for a separation of control and ownership,"[] the stockholder franchise has been characterized as the "ideological underpinning" upon which the legitimacy of the directors' managerial power rests. [*Blasius Indus., Inc. v. Atlas Corp.*, 564 A.2d 651, 659 (Del.Ch. 1988).] (footnotes omitted)
>
> Maintaining a proper balance in the allocation of power between the stockholders' right to elect directors and the board of directors' right to manage the corporation is dependent upon the stockholders' unimpeded right to vote effectively in an election of directors. This Court has repeatedly stated that, if the stockholders are not satisfied with the management or actions of their elected representatives on the board of directors, the power of corporate democracy is available to the stockholders to replace the incumbent directors when they stand for re-election. []
>
> In *Blasius*, Chancellor Allen set forth a cogent explanation of why judicial review under the deferential traditional business judgment rule standard is inappropriate when a board of directors acts for the primary purpose of impeding or interfering with the effectiveness of a shareholder vote, especially in the specific context presented in *Blasius* of a contested election for directors:
>
> [T]he ordinary considerations to which the business judgment rule originally responded are simply not present in the shareholder voting context. That is, a decision by the board to act for the primary purpose of preventing the effectiveness of a shareholder vote inevitably involves the question who, as between the principal and the agent, has authority with respect to a matter of internal corporate governance. That, of course, is true in a very specific way in this case which deals with the question who should constitute the board of directors of the corporation, but it will be true in every instance in which an incumbent board seeks to thwart a

> shareholder majority. A board's decision to act to prevent the shareholders from creating a majority of new board positions and filling them does not involve the exercise of the corporation's power over its property, or with respect to its rights or obligations; rather, it involves allocation, between shareholders as a class and the board, of effective power with respect to governance of the corporation . . .. Action designed principally to interfere with the effectiveness of a vote inevitably involves a conflict between the board and shareholder majority.

The Company's entire argument depends upon its contention that the Proposal improperly interferes with directors' fiduciary discretion, but as this discussion demonstrates the Proposal embraces the Delaware Supreme Court discussion of the appropriate role of shareholders vis-à-vis the board of directors. Consider the logic behind the Company's argument. The Board chose to adopt a majority vote standard for the election of directors. The Board's adoption of a majority vote standard gave Company shareholders the right to vote "For" or "Against" nominees to the Board, or to abstain from voting. The votes have legal consequence, as the Board surely intended. As facilitated by the 2006 amendment to DCGL Section 141(b), the Company adopted a director resignation bylaw providing that Board nominees submit an irrevocable resignation conditioned on their failure to be reelected under the majority vote standard. The resignation requirement conditioned on failure to gain majority shareholder support was necessitated by the Board's concern that absent such a resignation requirement, a director who is not reelected would simply continue to serve on the Board by operation of the law despite shareholders' legal vote. The Company's resignation bylaw, beyond simply requiring the conditional resignation, empowers the Board to decide whether to accept or reject the tendered resignation.

It is important to note that the DCGL Section 141(b) amendments permitting a director resignation conditioned on his or her failure to receive majority shareholder support did not speak to a post-election process by a board to determine the effectiveness of the resignation. In this context consider that the Proposal does not seek to preclude directors from strong control of the results of director elections, despite the clear statements from the Delaware Supreme Court emphasizing shareholders' rights. Rather, the Proposal requests that when shareholders cast a majority vote against an incumbent director to the Board that the other directors accept that nominees' tendered resignation unless the Board determines it has a compelling reason or reasons not to do so. It is a very measured proposition. Yet the Company argues that if the Board must articulate a compelling reason to keep that director on the board that this can only be done by the Board ignoring its fiduciary duties. The opinion of Delaware counsel discusses the Board process for considering a director's resignation. It states:

> The decision whether to accept a resignation is a business decision for the Board in which it is required to exercise its fiduciary duties. *Louisiana Mun. Police Emps. Ref. Sys. v. Morgan Stanley & Co. Inc.,* 2011 WL 773316, at *6 (Del. Ch. Mar. 4, 2011). There are a number of factors which need to be considered in deciding whether to accept a resignation which a Board must consider and balance, including, without limitation, the underlying reasons for the director failing to receive a majority vote for such director's election, the tenure and qualifications of the director, the director's past and expected future contributions to the Board and the overall composition of the Board including whether accepting the resignation would cause the Company to fail to meet the requirements of any law, rule or regulation applicable to the Company. The Proposal requests

> amendments to the Bylaws that would mandate current and future directors of the Company to make determinations based on a "compelling reasons" standard that has meaning only if it would require the directors to accept a resignation in circumstances where proper application of its fiduciary duties would cause it to decide otherwise.

First, as we have demonstrated above, accepting a resignation is not a business decision. Second, the argument that considering whether there is a compelling reason not to accept the resignation "has meaning only if it would require the directors to accept a resignation in circumstances where proper application of its fiduciary duties would cause it to decide otherwise" is an unsupported and illogical assertion. The factors the Board must consider include why the nominee did not receive a majority vote, past and future contributions to the board, and the implications of accepting the resignation. The Board could simply add to this list "consideration of the director failing to be elected by virtue of not receiving the necessary level of shareholder support."

The Proposal is Not a Removal Provision or Bylaw that Contravenes Delaware Law

The Company also argues that the Proposal represents a director "removal" contravening DGCL Section 141(k) by requesting that a "holdover" director's resignation be automatically effective following a second consecutive annual election defeat. The Company's argument, if correct, would eviscerate the director election voting rights of shareholders in Delaware corporations. The Company has established a majority of the votes cast standard for the annual election of directors and Section 141(k) has a more demanding "majority of the shares then entitled to vote" standard. The Company conflates a removal action against one or more directors with the director election process that may result in an incumbent director or directors failing to be reelected and leaving the board through resignation. The logical conclusion of the Company's removal argument is that a company with the common "majority of votes cast" director election standard, rather than Section 141(k)'s more demanding "majority of the shares then entitled to vote" standard, could not require an unelected incumbent director to resign or otherwise leave the board. A clear reading of the DGCL sections 141(k) and Section 216 addressing the vote requirement for director elections at an annual meeting of shareholders indicate the Section 141(k) vote standard does not pertain to director election votes that may result in directors leaving a corporate board. As quoted above, in MM Companies the Delaware Supreme Court stated:

> Maintaining a proper balance in the allocation of power between the stockholders' right to elect directors and the board of directors' right to manage the corporation is dependent upon the stockholders' unimpeded right to vote effectively in an election of directors.

Contrast the Company's argument with the Delaware Supreme Court's ruling. The Company's removal argument holds that it would be a violation of Delaware law for an incumbent director nominee who twice failed to receive the requisite level of shareholder support for election to be required to tender his or her resignation for board acceptance. On the other hand, the Delaware Supreme Court holds that shareholders must have the "unimpeded right to vote effectively." The Company's removal argument fails.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, the Fund requests that the Staff not concur with the Company's position that the Fund's Proposal may be excluded under Rule 14a-8(i)(2), as to do so would severely undermine the director election voting rights of shareholders under DGCL. We would gladly provide any additional information regarding this matter.

Sincerely,

Edward J. Durkin

cc. Sean Mersten, Quest Diagnostics Incorporated Sean.D.Mersten@questdiagnostics.com