

**Comcast Shareholder Meeting Question**  
**David Ridenour, President**  
**The National Center for Public Policy Research**  
**May 15, 2013**

I'm David Ridenour. I'm here as proxy for my wife, who has been a Comcast shareholder for many years, long before you controlled NBC Universal.

Mr. Roberts, last year MSNBC's Rachel Maddow falsely accused my wife of bribing Members of Congress, a felony. At last year's shareholder meeting, our counsel asked for a correction, and you promised to look into the situation. After months went by with no word, our counsel reminded you, and we eventually received a very nasty letter from MSNBC President Phil Griffin making additional false claims, and refusing corrections. Although it is tempting, I won't detail all the allegations here now in the interest of time, but Mr. Griffin's letter contained sufficient evidence of malice to significantly strengthen any libel claim.

As a long-time shareholder, my wife was appalled. Reasoning that it is unlikely that her case was handled any differently by MSNBC than anyone else's would be, she concluded that MSNBC, and thereby Comcast, must be turning a blind eye to libel risk. This is not in the best interest of shareholders nor to our customers, who deserve a news product that is as accurate as we can possibly make it. Rather than sue, she filed a shareholder proposal asking Comcast's board of directors to simply prepare a low-cost report, omitting proprietary information, describing the policies and procedures that this Company uses to avoid the risk and exposure of libel, slander and defamation lawsuits.

Mr. Roberts, we both know that such a report could have been written very easily and vaguely, with many high-sounding words that revealed little detail. My wife knew this, but hoped that in the process of writing it, Comcast's legal team and management would look into the true state of the fact-checking at MSNBC and NBC, and realize just how bad it is. She hoped management – your management, Mr. Roberts – would realize that there is a need for improvements, and then take appropriate internal action that would improve both our Company's product, but also its bottom line.

However, instead of allowing the proposal to be voted on, or simply agreeing to write the report to avoid the expense of printing the proposal and calculating the votes, your management team hired a very expensive law firm to fight my wife's proposal. In other words, you used shareholders' money to fight disclosure to shareholders, so far, successfully.

Mr. Roberts, shareholders have a right to know that your management team has good systems in place to minimize the risk of expensive libel suits, so I am asking you here now to publicly answer this question: What exactly are the systems in place to prevent libel exposure? What, precisely, are the procedures for keeping broadcasts and news reports accurate, and for handling serious allegations of libel with corrections or appropriate other measures so they do not become libel lawsuits that are expensive to defend, let alone lose?

*Contact: Judy Kent at (703) 759-7476 or [jkent@nationalcenter.org](mailto:jkent@nationalcenter.org) or David Almasi at (703) 568-4727 or [dalmasi@nationalcenter.org](mailto:dalmasi@nationalcenter.org)*