
Notice of Exempt Solicitation Pursuant to Rule 14a-103

Name of Registrant: HCA Healthcare, Inc. (HCA)

Title: Shareholder Right to Act by Written Consent

Meeting Date: April 23, 2026

Name of person relying on exemption: John Chevedden, HCA Shareholder since 2014

Address of persons relying on exemption: POB 2673, Redondo Beach, CA 90278

These written materials are submitted pursuant to Rule 14a-6(g)(1) promulgated under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. John Chevedden does not beneficially own more than \$5 million of the class of subject securities, and this notice of exempt solicitation is therefore being provided on a voluntary basis.

This is not a solicitation of authority to vote your proxy.

Please DO NOT send me your proxy card; the shareholder is not able to vote your proxies, nor does this communication contemplate such an event.

The shareholder asks all shareholders to vote by following the procedural instructions provided in the proxy materials.



Proposal 5 for an HCA Healthcare, Inc. (HCA) shareholder right to act by written consent deserves shareholder support

HCA has a flawed argument next to Proposal 5. Proposal 5 does not ask shareholders to choose between a shareholder right to act by written consent and a shareholder right to call a special shareholder meeting although GPN seems to present it as such.

Shareholders are best served when they have both rights. And HCA's current shareholder right to call for a special shareholder meeting is so weak that this creates an added incentive for HCA shareholders to have a right to act by written consent.

For instance a substantial block of HCA shares are completely disqualified from formal participation in calling for a special shareholder meeting – where is the principle of democracy in this disqualification?

Shame on HCA for suggesting that shareholders limit themselves to one shareholder right when HCA shareholders are entitled to 2 shareholder rights under state law.

And HCA does not understand the right to act by written consent.

Written consent is a shareholder right that requires the formal backing of an HCA majority based on all shares outstanding. This majority support requirement in reality is much more than majority support because it is not economically possible to contact a significant percent of HCA shares to get their formal backing.

Thus for an issue to still get majority support, based on all shares outstanding, under written consent it could need 70% support from the HCA shares are economically possible to reach. And the HCA shares that are economically possible to reach are the HCA shares that are most informed and have the greatest incentive to cast an informed ballot.

HCA then claims that HCA shareholders should be distracted from even considering the merits of this proposal because HCA shareholders should alternatively just be happy that HCA has a number of governance practices that most other companies have.

HCA then makes a shoe that does not fit claim. It claims that there could be abuse with written consent. This is an argument that might apply to a \$10 million company but not to a company worth over \$100 Billion like HCA. From the companies that have opposed written consent there has never been one cited example of abuse at a company of any significant size.