

FOXBY CORP.  
Form N-CSR  
March 09, 2012

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

FORM N-CSR

CERTIFIED SHAREHOLDER REPORT OF REGISTERED  
MANAGEMENT INVESTMENT COMPANIES

Investment Company Act file number: 811-09261

Foxyby Corp.  
(Exact name of registrant as specified in charter)

11 Hanover Square, New York, NY 10005  
(Address of principal executive offices) (Zipcode)

John F. Ramírez, Esq.  
11 Hanover Square  
New York, NY 10005  
(Name and address of agent for service)

Registrant's telephone number, including area code: 1-212-344-6310

Date of fiscal year end: 12/31

Date of reporting period: 1/1/11 - 12/31/11

Form N-CSR is to be used by management investment companies to file reports with the Commission not later than 10 days after the transmission to stockholders of any report that is required to be transmitted to stockholders under Rule 30e-1 under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (17 CFR 270.30e1). The Commission may use the information provided on Form N-CSR in its regulatory, disclosure review, inspection, and policy making roles.

A registrant is required to disclose the information specified by Form N-CSR and the Commission will make this information public. A registrant is not required to respond to the collection of information contained in Form N-CSR unless the Form displays a current valid Office of Management and Budget ("OMB") control number. Please direct comments concerning the accuracy of the information collection burden estimate and any suggestions for reducing the burden to Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 Fifth Street, NW, Washington, DC 20549-0609. The OMB has reviewed this collection of information under clearance requirements of 44 U.S.C. sec. 3507.

Item 1. Report to Shareholders.



FOXBY  
CORP.

ANNUAL REPORT  
December 31, 2011

Ticker

**FXBY**

11 Hanover Square  
New York, NY 10005

[www.FoxbyCorp.com](http://www.FoxbyCorp.com)

INVESTMENTS BY INDUSTRY\*

\* Investments by industry use approximate percentages of net assets and may not add up to 100% due to leverage or other assets, rounding, and other factors. Industry percentages of less than 0.01% are not shown.

---

FOXBY  
CORP.

Ticker: **FXBY**

11 Hanover Square,  
New York, NY 10005  
www.FoxbyCorp.com

February 3, 2012

Dear Shareholders:

It is a pleasure to submit this Foxby Corp. 2011 Annual Report to shareholders and to welcome our new Foxby Corp. shareholders who find the Fund's flexible total return investment approach attractive. As a closed end fund seeking total return, the Fund may invest in equity and fixed income securities of both new and seasoned U.S. and foreign issuers, including securities convertible into common stock and debt securities, closed end funds, and mutual funds. The Fund uses a flexible strategy in the selection of securities and is not limited by the issuer's location, industry, or market capitalization. The Fund may employ aggressive and speculative investment techniques, such as selling securities short, employing futures and options, derivatives, and borrowing money for investment purposes, a strategy known as "leverage." A potential benefit of its closed end structure, the Fund may invest without limit in illiquid investments such as private placements and private companies. The Fund may also invest defensively in high grade money market instruments.

#### Economic and Market Report and Investment Outlook

Stock market performance for the year ended December 31, 2011 was positive, although volatile. Including the reinvestment of dividends in the one year period, the S&P 500 Index returned 2.11%, according to Morningstar, the Fund's net asset value return was 4.07%, and the Fund's market return was 12.73%. The index is unmanaged and is not available for direct investment. Generally, the Fund's total return on a net asset value basis will be lower than total return on a market value basis in periods where there is a decrease in the discount or an increase in the premium of the market value to the net asset value from the beginning to the end of such periods.

In the calendar year 2011, real gross domestic product (GDP), or the output of goods and services produced by labor and property located in the United States, increased only 1.6%, as compared to an increase of 3.1% in 2010, according to a recent report of the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis. In an announcement well received by financial markets, to support the moderately expanding economy, the Federal Open Market Committee (FOMC) has indicated that it will keep the target range for the federal funds interest rate at 0% to 0.25%. Offsetting this potential reason for optimism, the FOMC also indicated that it anticipates subdued economic conditions, including low rates of resource utilization, to likely warrant exceptionally low levels for the federal funds interest rate at least through late 2014. While the FOMC has noted that there appears to be some improvement in overall labor market conditions, it seems to view the unemployment rate as elevated and, while household spending has continued to advance, it observes that growth in business fixed investment has slowed and the housing sector remains depressed. Interestingly, inflation over the 2011 year, as measured by the Consumer Price Index, increased 3.0% before seasonal adjustment.

Recently, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) reported that the U.S government will likely run its fourth straight year of annual deficits over \$1 trillion, and may continue to do so for the next several years assuming Bush-era tax cuts are extended. For 2012, the CBO also suggests modest GDP growth of 2% and unemployment over 8%. The U.S. economic outlook appears to be for a slow economy and a challenging job market, with low interest rates and inflation. Globally, we are concerned by a further slowing of the Chinese economy and with the Eurozone's sovereign debt and banking industry issues. Nevertheless, we are encouraged by the potential for strength in financial markets derived in part by improving corporate profits, an accommodative monetary policy, and a perception that an economic recovery may occur.

---

### Total Return Strategy

In view of these moderate economic and market conditions, the Fund's strategy in 2011 was to maintain its focus on large, quality companies with attractive valuations, in concentrated, individual positions. Currently, the Fund's holdings include some of the largest and best known U.S. companies in the technology, investment management, insurance, and retail industries.

Our current view of financial conditions continues to suggest that the Fund may benefit during 2012 from its flexible portfolio approach, investing opportunistically in a variety of markets, and employing aggressive and speculative investment techniques as deemed appropriate. At December 31, 2011, the Fund's top ten holdings comprised approximately 72% of its total assets. As the Fund pursues its total return objective through its flexible investment approach, these holdings and allocations are subject to substantial change at any time.

We share your enthusiasm for the Fund, as evidenced by the fact that affiliates of CEF Advisers, Inc., the Fund's Investment Manager, own approximately 24% of the Fund's shares.

Fund Website: [www.foxbycorp.com](http://www.foxbycorp.com)

The Fund's website, [www.foxbycorp.com](http://www.foxbycorp.com), provides investors with investment information, news, and other material regarding the Fund. You are invited to use this excellent resource to learn more about the Fund.

Thank you for investing in Foxby Corp. We look forward to serving your investment needs over the years ahead.

Sincerely,

Bassett S. Winmill  
Chairman and Portfolio Manager

TOP TEN HOLDINGS  
AT DECEMBER 31, 2011

- |                         |                                 |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. Apple Inc.           | 6. Franklin Resources, Inc.     |
| 2. Amazon.com, Inc.     | Berkshire Hathaway, Inc.,       |
| 3. Google Inc.          | 7. Class B                      |
| 4. McDonald's Corp.     | The Procter & Gamble            |
| 5. The Home Depot, Inc. | 8. Company                      |
|                         | 9. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.        |
|                         | 10. United Parcel Service, Inc. |

Top ten holdings comprise approximately 72% of total assets. Portfolio holdings are subject to change. This portfolio information should not be considered as a recommendation to purchase or sell a particular security.



## SCHEDULE OF PORTFOLIO INVESTMENTS - DECEMBER 31, 2011

Shares		Cost	Value
	COMMON STOCKS (95.17%)		
	Electronic Computers (18.25%)		
2,100	Apple Inc. (a)	\$430,978	\$ 850,500
	Fire, Marine & Casualty Insurance (5.73%)		
3,500	Berkshire Hathaway, Inc., Class B (a) (b)	296,368	267,050
	Gold & Silver Ores (0.15%)		
13,243	Rockwell Diamonds Inc	374,646	7,153
	Information Retrieval Services (6.93%)		
500	Google Inc. (a)	231,910	322,950
	Investment Advice (6.18%)		
3,000	Franklin Resources, Inc. (b)	303,381	288,180
	National Commercial Banks (3.55%)		
6,000	Wells Fargo & Company	163,265	165,360
	Operative Builders (2.19%)		
5,000	Toll Brothers, Inc. (a) (b)	116,698	102,100
	Petroleum Refining (6.60%)		
900	Chevron Corp	90,629	95,760
2,500	Exxon Mobil Corp.(b)	171,549	211,900
		262,178	307,660
	Retail - Catalog & Mail Order Houses (7.43%)		
2,000	Amazon.com, Inc. (a)	170,440	346,200
	Retail - Consulting & Investment (0%)		
72,728	Amerivon Holdings LLC (a) (c)	0	0
	Retail - Eating Places (6.46%)		
3,000	McDonald's Corp	167,748	300,990
	Retail - Lumber & Other Building Materials Dealers (6.31%)		
7,000	The Home Depot, Inc.(b)	191,873	294,280
	Retail - Variety Stores (4.87%)		
3,800	Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. (b)	196,260	227,088
	Security Brokers, Dealers & Flotation Companies (3.24%)		
1,000	The Goldman Sachs Group, Inc. (b)	184,940	90,430
4,000	Morgan Stanley	120,560	60,520
		305,500	150,950



## SCHEDULE OF PORTFOLIO INVESTMENTS - DECEMBER 31, 2011

Shares		Cost	Value
	COMMON STOCKS (continued)		
	Services - Prepackaged Software (3.34%)		
6,000	Microsoft Corp	\$ 141,020	\$ 155,760
	Smelting (0%)		
82,111	China Silicon Corporation (a) (c)	56,882	0
	Soap, Detergents, Cleaning Preparations, Perfumes, Cosmetics (5.72%)		
4,000	The Procter & Gamble Company	234,390	266,840
	Surgical & Medical Instruments & Apparatus (3.51%)		
2,000	3M Company	185,130	163,460
	Trucking & Courier Services (4.71%)		
3,000	United Parcel Service, Inc. (b)	221,388	219,570
	Total common stocks	4,050,055	4,436,091
	PREFERRED STOCKS (2.46%)		
	Retail - Consulting & Investment (2.46%)		
166,781	Amerivon Holdings LLC (c)	458,681	114,662
	Smelting (0%)		
945	China Silicon Corporation (a) (c)	177,282	0
	Total preferred stocks	635,963	114,662
	MONEY MARKET FUND (3.12%)		
145,533	SSgA Money Market Fund, 7 day annualized yield 0.01%	145,533	145,533
	SECURITIES HELD AS COLLATERAL ON LOANED SECURITIES (28.71%)		
1,338,037	State Street Navigator Securities Lending Prime Portfolio	1,338,037	1,338,037
	Total investments (129.46%)	\$ 6,169,588	6,034,323
	Liabilities in excess of other assets (-29.46%)		(1,373,064)
	Net assets (100.00%)		\$ 4,661,259

- (a) Non-income producing.  
(b) All or a portion of this security was on loan.  
(c) Illiquid and/or restricted security that has been fair valued.

See notes to financial statements.

5

---

## STATEMENT OF ASSETS AND LIABILITIES

December 31, 2011

## ASSETS

Investments at value (cost: \$6,169,589) (including \$1,338,037 for securities loaned)	\$6,034,323
Receivables	
Dividends	1,389
Income from securities loaned	198
Other assets	1,067
Total	
assets	6,036,977

## LIABILITIES

Collateral on securities loaned, at value	1,338,037
Payables	
Accrued expenses	34,530
Investment management fee	1,849
Administrative services	1,302
Total liabilities	1,375,718

NET ASSETS \$4,661,259

## NET ASSET VALUE PER SHARE

(applicable to 2,610,050  
shares outstanding: 500,000,000  
shares of \$.01 par value  
authorized) \$1.79

## NET ASSETS CONSIST OF

Paid in capital	\$8,010,712
Accumulated net investment income	15,598
Accumulated net realized loss on Investments	(3,229,785)
Net unrealized depreciation on investments	(135,266 )
	\$4,661,259

## STATEMENT OF OPERATIONS

Year Ended December 31, 2011

## INVESTMENT INCOME

Dividends \$106,410

Edgar Filing: FOXBY CORP. - Form N-CSR

Income from securities loaned	1,557
Total investment income	107,967
<b>EXPENSES</b>	
Investment management	22,750
Auditing	18,180
Bookkeeping and pricing	17,250
Legal	10,860
Shareholder communications	8,072
Administrative services	5,241
Transfer agent	3,552
Directors	3,285
Other	3,179
Total expenses	92,369
Net investment income	15,598
<b>REALIZED AND UNREALIZED GAIN (LOSS)</b>	
Net realized loss on investments	(220,369 )
Unrealized appreciation on investments	374,752
Net realized and unrealized gain	154,383
Net increase in net assets resulting from operations	\$ 169,981

See notes to financial statements.

## STATEMENTS OF CHANGES IN NET ASSETS

Years Ended December 31, 2011 and 2010

	2011	2010
<b>OPERATIONS</b>		
Net investment income (loss)	\$15,598	\$(17,065 )
Net realized loss	(220,369 )	(791,086 )
Unrealized appreciation	374,752	997,463
Net increase in net assets resulting from operations	169,981	189,312
Total increase in net assets	169,981	189,312
<b>NET ASSETS</b>		
Beginning of period	4,491,278	4,301,966
End of period	\$4,661,259	\$4,491,278
(b) End of period net assets include undistributed net investment income	\$15,598	\$—

See notes to financial statements.

NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS – DECEMBER 31, 2011

1. Organization and Significant Accounting Policies

Foxyby Corp., a Maryland corporation registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended (the “Act”), is a non-diversified, closed end management investment company whose shares are quoted over the counter under the ticker symbol FXBY. The Fund’s non-fundamental investment objective is total return which it may seek from growth of capital and from income in any security type and in any industry sector. The Fund retains CEF Advisers, Inc. as its Investment Manager.

The following is a summary of the Fund’s significant accounting policies:

**Valuation of Investments** – Portfolio securities are valued by various methods depending on the primary market or exchange on which they trade. Most equity securities for which the primary market is in the United States are valued at the official closing price, last sale price or, if no sale has occurred, at the closing bid price. Most equity securities for which the primary market is outside the United States are valued using the official closing price or the last sale price in the principal market in which they are traded. If the last sale price on the local exchange is unavailable, the last evaluated quote or closing bid price normally is used. Certain of the securities in which the Fund may invest are priced through pricing services that may utilize a matrix pricing system which takes into consideration factors such as yields, prices, maturities, call features, and ratings on comparable securities. Bonds may be valued according to prices quoted by a bond dealer that offers pricing services. Open end investment companies are valued at their net asset value. Foreign securities markets may be open on days when the U.S. markets are closed. For this reason, the value of any foreign securities owned by the Fund could change on a day when stockholders cannot buy or sell shares of the Fund. Securities for which market quotations are not readily available or reliable and other assets may be valued as determined in good faith by the Investment Manager under the direction of or pursuant to procedures established or approved by the Fund’s Board of Directors, called “fair value pricing.” Due to the inherent uncertainty of valuation, fair value pricing values may differ from the values that would have been used had a readily available market for the securities existed. These differences in valuation could be material. A security’s valuation may differ depending on the method used for determining value. The use of fair value pricing by the Fund may cause the net asset value of its shares to differ from the net asset value that would be calculated using market prices.

**Foreign Currency Translation** – Securities denominated in foreign currencies are translated into U.S. dollars at prevailing exchange rates. Realized gain or loss on sales of such investments in local currency terms is reported separately from gain or loss attributable to a change in foreign exchange rates for those investments.

**Short Sales** – The Fund may sell a security short it does not own in anticipation of a decline in the market value of the security. When the Fund sells a security short, it must borrow the security sold short and deliver it to the broker/dealer through which it made the short sale. The Fund is liable for any dividends or interest paid on securities sold short. A gain, limited to the price at which the Fund sold the security short, or a loss, unlimited in size, will be recognized upon the termination of the short sale. Securities sold short result in off balance sheet risk as the Fund’s ultimate obligation to satisfy the terms of a sale of securities sold short may exceed the amount recognized in the Statement of Assets and Liabilities.

**Derivatives** – The Fund may use derivatives for a variety of reasons, such as to attempt to protect against possible changes in the value of their portfolio holdings or to generate potential gain. Derivatives are financial instruments that derive their values from other securities or commodities, or that are based on indices. Derivative instruments are marked to market with the change in value reflected in unrealized appreciation or depreciation. Upon disposition, a realized gain or loss is recognized accordingly, except when taking delivery of a security underlying a contract. In



these instances, the recognition of gain or loss is postponed until the disposal of the security underlying the contract. Risk may arise as a result of the potential inability of the counterparties to meet the terms of their contracts. Derivative instruments include written option, purchased options, futures contracts, forward foreign currency exchange contracts, and swap agreements.

NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS – CONTINUED

**Investments in Other Investment Companies** – The Fund may invest in shares of other investment companies (the “Acquired Funds”) in accordance with the Act and related rules. Shareholders in the Fund bear the pro rata portion of the fees and expenses of the Acquired Funds in addition to the Fund’s expenses. Expenses incurred by the Fund that are disclosed in the Statement of Operations do not include fees and expenses incurred by the Acquired Funds. The fees and expenses of the Acquired Funds are reflected in the Fund’s total returns.

**Investment Transactions** – Investment transactions are accounted for on the trade date (the date the order to buy or sell is executed). Realized gains or losses are determined by specifically identifying the cost basis of the investment sold.

**Investment Income** – Dividend income is recorded on the ex-dividend date or in the case of certain foreign securities, as soon as the Fund is notified. Interest income is recorded on the accrual basis. Taxes withheld on foreign dividends have been provided for in accordance with the Fund’s understanding of the applicable country’s tax rules and rates.

**Expenses** – Expenses deemed by the Investment Manager to have been incurred solely by the Fund are charged to the Fund. Expenses deemed by the Investment Manager to have been incurred jointly by the Fund and one or more of the investment companies for which the Investment Manager or its affiliates serve as investment manager (the “Fund Complex”) or other entities are allocated on the basis of relative net assets, except where a more appropriate allocation can be made fairly in the judgment of the Investment Manager.

**Expense Reduction Arrangement** – Through arrangements with the Fund’s custodian and cash management bank, credits realized as a result of uninvested cash balances are used to reduce custodian expenses. No credits were realized by the Fund during the periods covered by this report.

**Distributions to Shareholders** – Distributions to shareholders, if any, are determined in accordance with income tax regulations and recorded on the ex-dividend date.

**Income Taxes** – No provision has been made for U.S. income taxes because the Fund’s current intention is to continue to qualify as a regulated investment company under the Internal Revenue Code (the “IRC”) and to distribute to its shareholders substantially all of its taxable income and net realized gains. Foreign securities held by the Fund may be subject to foreign taxation. Foreign taxes, if any, are recorded based on the tax regulations and rates that exist in the foreign markets in which the Fund invests. The Fund recognizes the tax benefits of uncertain tax positions only where the position is “more likely than not” to be sustained assuming examination by tax authorities. The Fund has reviewed its tax positions and has concluded that no liability for unrecognized tax benefits should be recorded related to uncertain tax positions taken on federal, state, and local income tax returns for open tax years (2008 – 2010) or expected to be taken in the Fund’s 2011 tax returns.

**Use of Estimates** – In preparing financial statements in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America (“GAAP”), management makes estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities at the date of the financial statements, as well as the reported amounts of revenues and expenses during the reporting period. Actual results could differ from those estimates.

**Recent Accounting Standards Update** – In May 2011, the Financial Accounting Standards Board issued Accounting Standards Update (“ASU”) 2011-04 “Amendments to Achieve Common Fair Value Measurement and Disclosure Requirements in U.S. GAAP and IFRSs (“International Financial Reporting Standards”)”. ASU 2011-04 includes common requirements for measurement of and disclosure about fair value between GAAP and IFRS. ASU 2011-04 will require disclosure of the following information for fair value measurements categorized within level 3 of the fair value hierarchy: quantitative information about the unobservable inputs used in the fair value measurement, the valuation processes used by the Fund, and a narrative description of the sensitivity of the fair value measurement to

changes in unobservable inputs and the interrelationships between those unobservable inputs. In addition,

9

---

## NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS – CONTINUED

ASU 2011-04 will require disclosures about amounts and reasons for all transfers in and out of level 1 and level 2 fair value measurements. ASU 2011-04 is effective for interim and annual reporting periods beginning after December 15, 2011. The Fund has concluded that upon adoption of ASU 2011-04 the Fund's financial statements and accompanying notes will fully comply with the required new and revised disclosures.

In December 2011, FASB issued ASU 2011-11 "Disclosures about Offsetting Assets and Liabilities." The amendments in ASU 2011-11 will require the Fund to disclose information about offsetting and related arrangements to enable users of its financial statements to understand the effect of those arrangements on its financial position. ASU 2011-11 is effective for annual reporting periods beginning on or after January 1, 2013, and interim periods within those annual periods. ASU 2011-11 requires retrospective application for all comparative periods presented. The Fund is evaluating ASU 2011-11 and the impact it may have to its financial statement disclosures.

## 2. Fees and Transactions with Related Parties

The Fund retains the Investment Manager pursuant to an Investment Management Agreement ("IMA"). Under the terms of the IMA, the Investment Manager receives a management fee, payable monthly, based on the average daily net assets of the Fund at the annual rate of 1/2 of 1%. Certain officers and directors of the Fund are officers and directors of the Investment Manager. Pursuant to the IMA, the Fund reimburses the Investment Manager for providing at cost certain administrative services comprised of compliance and accounting services. For the year ended December 31, 2011, the Fund incurred total administrative cost of \$5,241, comprised of \$3,912 and \$1,329 for compliance and accounting services, respectively.

## 3. Distributions to Shareholders and Distributable Earnings

As of December 31, 2011, the components of distributable earnings on a tax basis were as follows:

Undistributed net investment income	\$15,598
Capital loss carryover	(3,004,784)
Post-October capital losses	(225,001 )
Unrealized depreciation	(135,266 )
	\$(3,349,453)

Federal income tax regulations permit post-October net capital losses, if any, to be deferred and recognized on the tax return of the next succeeding taxable year.

GAAP requires certain components of net assets to be classified differently for financial reporting than for tax reporting purposes. While these differences have no effect on net assets or net asset value per share, these differences may result in distribution reclassifications. Primarily due to the expiration of capital loss carryovers, on December 31, 2011 the fund recorded the following financial reporting adjustment to increase (decrease) the identified accounts to reflect those differences.

Decrease in Accumulated Investment Loss	Decrease in Accumulated Net Realized Loss on Investments	Decrease in Paid in Capital
\$ —	\$832,702	\$(832,702)

Capital loss carryover is calculated and reported as of a specific date. Results of transactions and other activity after that date may affect the amount of capital loss carryover actually available for the Fund to utilize under the IRC and

related regulations based on the results of future transactions.

Under the IRC, capital losses incurred in taxable years beginning after December 22, 2010, are allowed to be carried forward indefinitely and retain the character of the original loss. The Fund has a net capital loss carryover as of December 31, 2011 of \$3,225,153, of which \$220,369 may be carried forward indefinitely, \$211,845, \$1,033,623, \$964,048 and \$795,268 expires in 2013, 2016, 2017, and 2018, respectively.

NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS – CONTINUED

4. Fair Value Measurements

GAAP establishes a hierarchy that prioritizes inputs to valuation methods. The three levels of inputs are:

- Level 1 – unadjusted quoted prices in active markets for identical assets or liabilities including securities actively traded on a securities exchange.
- Level 2 – observable inputs other than quoted prices included in level 1 that are observable for the asset or liability which may include quoted prices for similar instruments, interest rates, prepayment speeds, credit risk, yield curves, default rates, and similar data.
- Level 3 – unobservable inputs for the asset or liability including the Fund’s own assumptions about the assumptions a market participant would use in valuing the asset or liability.

The availability of observable inputs can vary from security to security and is affected by a wide variety of factors, including, for example the type of security, whether the security is new and not yet established in the marketplace, the liquidity of markets, and other characteristics particular to the security. To the extent that valuation is based on models or inputs that are less observable or unobservable in the market, the determination of fair value requires more judgment. Accordingly, the degree of judgment exercised in determining fair value is greatest for investments categorized in level 3.

The inputs used to measure fair value may fall into different levels of the fair value hierarchy. In such cases, the level in the fair value hierarchy within which the fair value measurement falls in its entirety, is determined based on the lowest level input that is significant to the fair value measurement in its entirety.

The inputs or methodology used for valuing investments are not an indication of the risk associated with investing in those securities.

The following is a description of the valuation techniques applied to the Fund’s major categories of assets and liabilities measured at fair value on a recurring basis:

Equity securities (common and preferred stock). Equity securities traded on a national securities exchange or market are stated normally at the official closing price, last sale price or, if no sale has occurred, at the closing bid price on the day of valuation. To the extent these securities are actively traded and valuation adjustments are not applied, they may be categorized in level 1 of the fair value hierarchy. Preferred stock and other equities on inactive markets or valued by reference to similar instruments may be categorized in level 2.

Restricted and/or illiquid securities. Restricted and/or illiquid securities for which quotations are not readily available or reliable may be valued as determined in good faith by the Investment Manager under the direction of or pursuant to procedures established by the Fund's Board of Directors. Restricted securities issued by publicly traded companies are generally valued at a discount to similar publicly traded securities. Restricted or illiquid securities issued by nonpublic entities may be valued by reference to comparable public entities or fundamental data relating to the issuer or both or similar inputs. Depending on the relative significance of valuation inputs, these instruments may be classified in either level 2 or level 3 of the fair value hierarchy.

The following is a summary of the inputs used as of December 31, 2011 in valuing the Fund’s assets carried at fair value. Refer to the Schedule of Portfolio Investments for detailed information on specific investments.

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Total
Assets				

Edgar Filing: FOXBY CORP. - Form N-CSR

Investments, at value				
Common stocks				
Electronic Computers	\$ 850,500	\$-	\$-	\$ 850,500
Fire, Marine & Casualty Insurance	267,050	-	-	267,050
Gold & Silver Ores	7,153	-	-	7,153
Information Retrieval Services	322,950	-	-	322,950
Investment Advice	288,180	-	-	288,180
National Commercial Banks	165,360	-	-	165,360
Operative Builders	102,100	-	-	102,100
Petroleum Refining	307,660	-	-	307,660
Retail - Catalog & Mail Order Houses	346,200	-	-	346,200
Retail - Consulting and Investment	-	-	0	0
Retail - Eating Places	300,990	-	-	300,990
Retail - Lumber & Other Building Materials Dealers	294,280	-	-	294,280
Retail - Variety Stores	227,088	-	-	227,088
Security Brokers, Dealers & Flotation Companies	150,950	-	-	150,950
Services - Prepackaged Software	155,760	-	-	155,760
Smelting	-	-	0	0
Soap, Detergents, Cleaning Preparations, Perfumes, Cosmetics				
Surgical & Medical Instruments & Apparatus	266,840	-	-	266,840
Trucking & Courier Services	163,460	-	-	163,460
219,570	-	-	-	219,570
Preferred stocks				
Retail - Consulting & Investment	-	-	114,662	114,662
Smelting	-	-	0	0
Money market fund	145,533	-	-	145,533
Securities held as collateral on loaned securities	1,338,037	-	-	1,338,037
Total investments, at value	\$5,919,661	\$-	\$114,662	\$6,034,323

## NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS – CONTINUED

There were no transfers between level 1 and level 2 during the year ended December 31, 2011.

The following is a reconciliation of level 3 investments for which significant unobservable inputs were used to determine fair value:

	Common Stocks	Preferred Stocks	Warrants	Total
Balance at December 31, 2010	\$0	\$111,546	\$0	\$111,546
Cost of purchases	–	12,498	–	12,498
Proceeds from sales	–	–	(1 )	(1 )
Realized gain (loss)	(225,000 )	–	1	(224,999 )
Change in unrealized depreciation	545,128	(9,382 )	–	535,746
Transfers in or out of level 3	(320,128 )	–	–	(320,128 )
Balance at December 31, 2011	\$0	\$114,662	\$–	\$114,662

## 5. Investment Transactions

Purchases and proceeds from sales of investment securities, excluding short term securities, aggregated \$509,645 and \$666,856, respectively, for the year ended December 31, 2011. At December 31, 2011, for federal income tax purposes the aggregate cost of securities was \$6,169,589 and net unrealized depreciation was \$135,266, comprised of gross unrealized appreciation of \$1,047,565 and gross unrealized depreciation of \$1,182,831.



## 6. Illiquid and Restricted Securities

The Fund owns securities which have a limited trading market and/or certain restrictions on trading and, therefore, may be considered illiquid and/or restricted. Such securities have been valued using fair value pricing. Due to the inherent uncertainty of valuation, fair value pricing values may differ from the values that would have been used had a readily available market for the securities existed. These differences in valuation could be material. Illiquid and/or restricted securities owned at December 31, 2011 were as follows:

Security	Acquisition Date	Cost	Value
Amerivon Holdings LLC preferred shares	9/20/07	\$458,681	\$114,662
Amerivon Holdings LLC common equity units	9/20/07	0	0
China Silicon Corp. preferred shares	7/18/07	177,282	0
China Silicon Corp. common shares	2008-2010	56,882	0
		\$692,845	\$114,662
Percent of net assets		15	% 2 %

## 7. Bank Credit Facility

Effective April 1, 2011, the Fund and the other Funds in the Fund Complex (the “Borrowers”) entered into a committed secured line of credit facility, which is subject to annual renewal, with State Street Bank and Trust Company (“SSB”), the Fund’s custodian. The aggregate amount of the credit facility is \$30,000,000. The borrowing of each Borrower is collateralized by the underlying investments of such Borrower. SSB will make revolving loans to a Borrower not to exceed in the aggregate outstanding at any time with respect to any one Borrower, the least of 30% of the total net assets (as defined in the line of credit facility) of a Borrower, the maximum amount permitted pursuant to each Borrower’s investment policies, or as permitted under the Act. The commitment fee on this facility is 0.15% per annum. All loans under this facility will be available at the Borrower’s option of (i) overnight Federal funds or (ii) LIBOR (30, 60, 90 days), each as in effect from time to time, plus 1.10% per annum. Prior to April 1, 2011, the aggregate amount of the credit facility was \$10,000,000 and all the loans under this facility was available at the Borrower’s option of (i) overnight Federal funds or (ii) LIBOR (30, 60, 90 days) plus 1.50% per annum. During the year ended December 31, 2011, the Fund did not borrow from the credit facility.

## 8. Securities Lending

The Fund may lend securities to qualified financial institutions. The Fund receives compensation in the form of fees, or retains a portion of the return on the investment of any cash received as collateral. The Fund receives as collateral cash, U.S. government securities, or bank letters of credit valued greater than the value of the securities on loan. Cash is invested in a money market fund. The value of the loaned securities is determined based upon the most recent closing prices and any additional required collateral is delivered to the Fund on the next business day. Any increase or decrease in the value of the securities loaned that might occur and any interest earned or dividends declared on those securities during the term of the loan is retained by the Fund. As with other extensions of credit, the Fund bears the risk of delay on recovery or loss of rights in the collateral should the borrower of the securities default. The Fund has the right under the lending agreement to recover the loaned securities from the borrower on demand. The value of loaned securities and related collateral outstanding at December 31, 2011 were \$1,302,478 and \$1,338,037, respectively.



NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS – CONCLUDED

9. Foreign Securities Risk

Investments in the securities of foreign issuers involve special risks which include changes in foreign exchange rates and the possibility of future adverse political and economic developments which could adversely affect the value of such securities. Moreover, securities in foreign issuers and markets may be less liquid and their prices more volatile than those of U.S. issuers and markets.

10. Capital Stock

At December 31, 2011, there were 2,610,050 shares of \$.01 par value common stock outstanding and 500,000,000 shares authorized. There were no transactions in capital stock during the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010, respectively. At December 31, 2011, an affiliate of the Investment Manager owned approximately 24% of the Fund's outstanding common stock.

11. Share Repurchase Program

In accordance with Section 23(c) of the Act, the Fund may from time to time repurchase its shares in the open market at the discretion of and upon such terms as the Board of Directors shall determine. During the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010, the Fund did not repurchase any of its shares.

12. Contingencies

The Fund indemnifies its officers and directors from certain liabilities that might arise from their performance of their duties for the Fund. Additionally, in the normal course of business, the Fund enters into contracts that contain a variety of representations and warranties and which may provide general indemnifications. The Fund's maximum exposure under these arrangements is unknown as it involves future claims that may be made against the Fund under circumstances that have not occurred.

13. Other Information

The Fund may at times raise cash for investment by issuing shares through one or more offerings, including rights offerings. Proceeds from any such offerings will be invested in accordance with the investment objective and policies of the Fund.

14. Subsequent Events

The Fund has evaluated subsequent events through the date the financial statements were issued and has determined that no subsequent events have occurred that require additional disclosure in the financial statements.

## FINANCIAL HIGHLIGHTS

	Year Ended December 31,				
	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
<b>Per Share Operating Performance</b>					
(for a share outstanding throughout each period)					
Net asset value, beginning of period	\$ 1.72	\$ 1.65	\$ 1.26	\$ 3.43	\$ 2.90
<b>Income from investment operations:</b>					
Net investment income (loss) (1)	01	(.01 )	– (2)	(.04 )	(.06 )
Net realized and unrealized gain (loss) on investments	06	.08	.39	(2.13 )	.61
Total from investment operations	07	.07	.39	(2.17 )	.55
<b>Less distributions:</b>					
Dividends from net investment income	–	–	–	–	(.02 )
Net asset value, end of period	\$ 1.79	\$ 1.72	\$ 1.65	\$ 1.26	\$ 3.43
Market value, end of period	\$ 1.24	\$ 1.10	\$ 1.02	\$ .55	\$ 2.96
<b>Total Return (3)</b>					
Based on net asset value	4.07 %	4.24 %	30.95 %	(63.27 )%	19.09 %
Based on market price	12.73 %	7.84 %	85.45 %	(81.42 )%	23.67 %
<b>Ratios/Supplemental Data</b>					
Net assets, end of period (000's omitted)	\$ 4,661	\$ 4,491	\$ 4,302	\$ 3,297	\$ 8,947
Ratio of total expenses to average net assets	2.03 %	2.28 %	2.61 %	3.76 %	2.77 %
Ratio of net expenses to average net assets	2.03 %	2.28 %	2.61 %	3.76 %	2.77 %
Ratio of net expenses excluding loan interest and fees to average net assets	2.03 %	2.25 %	2.56 %	3.35 %	2.18 %
Ratio of net investment income (loss) to average net assets	0.34 %	(0.41 )%	0.09 %	(1.71 )%	(1.78 )%
Portfolio turnover rate	11.41 %	4.49 %	85.91 %	78.13 %	69.86 %

(1) The per share amounts were calculated using the average number of common shares outstanding during the period.

(2) The amount of net investment income was less than \$.005 per share.

(3)

Total return on a market value basis is calculated assuming a purchase of common stock on the opening of the first day and a sale on the closing of the last day of each period reported. Dividends and distributions, if any, are assumed for purposes of this calculation to be reinvested at prices obtained under the Fund's Dividend Reinvestment Plan. Generally, total return on a net asset value basis will be higher than total return on a market value basis in periods where there is an increase in the discount or a decrease in the premium of the market value to the net asset value from the beginning to the end of such periods. Conversely, total return on a net asset value basis will be lower than total return on a market value basis in periods where there is a decrease in the discount or an increase in the premium of the market value to the net asset value from the beginning to the end of such periods. The calculation does not reflect brokerage commissions, if any.

See notes to financial statements.

REPORT OF INDEPENDENT REGISTERED PUBLIC ACCOUNTING FIRM

To the Board of Directors and Shareholders of Foxby Corp.:

We have audited the accompanying statement of assets and liabilities of Foxby Corp. (the "Fund"), including the schedule of portfolio investments as of December 31, 2011, the related statement of operations for the year then ended, the statements of changes in net assets for each of the two years in the period then ended, and the financial highlights for each of the five years in the period then ended. These financial statements and financial highlights are the responsibility of the Fund's management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements and financial highlights based on our audits.

We conducted our audits in accordance with auditing standards of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (United States). Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements and financial highlights are free of material misstatement. We were not engaged to perform an audit of the Fund's internal control over financial reporting. Our audits included consideration of internal control over financial reporting as a basis for designing audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the Fund's internal control over financial reporting. Accordingly, we express no such opinion. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. Our procedures included confirmation of securities owned as of December 31, 2011 by correspondence with the custodian. An audit also includes assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. We believe that our audits provide a reasonable basis for our opinion.

In our opinion, the financial statements and financial highlights referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of Foxby Corp. as of December 31, 2011, the results of its operations for the year then ended, the changes in its net assets for each of the two years in the period then ended, and the financial highlights for the five years presented, in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

TAIT, WELLER & BAKER LLP

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania  
February 24, 2012

## DIRECTORS AND OFFICERS

The following table sets forth certain information concerning the Directors currently serving on the Board of Directors of the Fund. Unless otherwise noted, the address of record for the directors and officers is 11 Hanover Square, New York, New York 10005.

Name, Position(s) Held with Fund, Term of Office(1), Principal Occupation for Past Five Years, and Age	Director Since	Number of Portfolios in Fund Complex Overseen by Director(2)	Other Directorships Held by Director(3)
Class I Director			
JAMES E. HUNT – He is a Limited Partner of Hunt Howe Partners LLC, executive recruiting consultants. He was born on December 14, 1930.	2004	6	0
Class II Director			
BRUCE B. HUBER, CLU, ChFC, MSFS – Retired. He is a former Financial Representative with New England Financial, specializing in financial, estate, and insurance matters. He is a member of the Board, emeritus, of the Millbrook School, and Chairman of the Endowment Board of the Community YMCA of Red Bank, NJ. He was born on February 7, 1930.	2004	6	0
Class III Director			
PETER K. WERNER – Since 1996, he has been teaching, coach-ing, and directing a number of programs at The Governor's Academy of Byfield, MA. Currently, he serves as chair of the History Department. Previously, he held the position of Vice President in the Fixed Income Departments of Lehman Brothers and First Boston. His responsibilities included trading sovereign debt instruments, currency arbitrage, syndication, medium term note trading, and money market trading. He was born on August 16, 1959.	2002	6	0
Class IV Director			
THOMAS B. WINMILL, ESQ.(4) – He is President, Chief Executive Officer, and Chief Legal Officer of the Fund, the other investment companies in the Fund Complex, the Investment Manager, Bexil Advisers LLC, and Midas Management Corporation (registered investment advisers, collectively, the “Advisers”), Bexil Securities LLC and Midas Securities Group, Inc. (registered broker-dealers, collectively, the “Broker-Dealers”), Bexil Corporation, and Winmill & Co. Incorporated (“Winco”). He is General Counsel of Tuxis Corporation. He is Chairman of the Investment Policy Committee of each of the Advisers (the “IPCs”), which currently manage the Fund, Dividend and Income Fund, Inc.,	2002	6	Eagle Bulk Shipping Inc.

and Midas Perpetual Portfolio, Inc., and he is the portfolio manager of Midas Fund, Inc. He is a member of the SEC Rules Committee of the Investment Company Institute. He is the son of Bassett S. Winmill. was born on June 25, 1959.

Additional Information (Unaudited)

18

---



Edgar Filing: FOXBY CORP. - Form N-CSR

Name, Position(s) Held with Fund, Term of Office(1), Principal Occupation for Past Five Years, and Age	Director Since	Number of Portfolios in Fund Complex	Other Directorships Held by Director(3)
Class V Director BASSETT S. WINMILL(4) – Chief Investment Strategist since 2011. He is also Chief Investment Strategist of the Advisers, Chairman of the Board of Bexil Corporation, Winco, Tuxis Corporation, and two of the investment companies in the Fund Complex, and portfolio manager of Foxby Corp. and Midas Magic, Inc. He is a member of the IPCs. He also is a member of the New York Society of Security Analysts, the Association for Investment Management and Research, and the International Society of Financial Analysts. He is the father of Thomas B. Winmill. He was born on February 10, 1930.	2007	2	0

Directors not elected annually shall be deemed to be continuing in office until after the time at which an annual (1) meeting is required to be held under Maryland law, the Fund’s Charter or Bylaws, the Act, or other applicable law.

The Fund Complex is comprised of the Fund, Dividend and Income Fund, Inc., Global Income Fund, Inc., Midas (2) Fund, Inc., Midas Magic, Inc., and Midas Perpetual Portfolio, Inc. which are managed by the Investment Manager and its affiliates.

(3)Refers to directorships held by a director in any company with a class of securities registered pursuant to Section 12 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 or any company registered as an investment company under the Act, excluding those within the Fund Complex.

(4) He is an “interested person” of the Fund as defined in the Act due to his affiliation with the Investment Manager.

Messrs. Huber, Hunt, and Werner serve on the Audit and Nominating Committees of the Board. Mr. Thomas Winmill serves on the Executive Committee of the Board. Each of the directors serves on the Continuing Directors Committee of the Board.

The executive officers, other than those who serve as Directors, and their relevant biographical information are set forth below.

Name and Age	Position(s) Held with Fund, Term of Office*, Principal Occupation for the Past 5 Years
Heidi Keating Born March 28, 1959	Vice President since 2002. She is also Vice President of the other investment com- panies in the Fund Complex, the Advisers, Bexil Corporation, Winco, and Tuxis Corporation. She is a member of the IPCs.
Thomas O’Malley Born on July 22, 1958	Chief Accounting Officer, Chief Financial Officer, Vice President, and Treasurer since 2005. He is also Chief Accounting Officer, Chief Financial Officer, Vice President, and Treasurer of the other investment companies in the Fund Complex, the Advisers, the Broker-Dealers, Bexil Corporation, Winco, and Tuxis Corporation. He is a certified public accountant.

John F. Ramirez, Esq. Chief Compliance Officer, AML Officer, Vice President, and Secretary since Born on April 29, 1977 2005 and Associate General Counsel since 2008 . He is also Chief Compliance Officer, Associate General Counsel, AML Officer, Vice President, and Secretary of the other investment companies in the Fund Complex, the Advisers, the Broker-Dealers, Bexil Corporation, Winco, and Tuxis Corporation. He is a member of the IPCs. He also is a member of the New York State Bar and the Chief Compliance Officer Committee and the Compliance Advisory Committee of the Investment Company Institute.

Officers hold their positions with the Fund until a successor has been duly elected and qualifies. Officers are generally elected annually. The officers were last elected on December 14, 2011.

Additional Information (Unaudited)

19

---

## PROXY VOTING

The Fund's Proxy Voting Guidelines, as well as its voting record for the most recent 12 months ended June 30, are available without charge by calling the Fund collect at 1-212-344-6310, on the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC") website at [www.sec.gov](http://www.sec.gov), and on the Fund's website at [www.FoxbyCorp.com](http://www.FoxbyCorp.com).

## QUARTERLY SCHEDULE OF PORTFOLIO HOLDINGS

The Fund files its complete schedule of portfolio holdings with the SEC for the first and third quarters of each fiscal year on Form N-Q. The Fund's Forms N-Q are available on the SEC's website at [www.sec.gov](http://www.sec.gov). The Fund's Forms N-Q may be reviewed and copied at the SEC's Public Reference Room in Washington, DC, and information on the operation of the Public Reference Room may be obtained by calling 1-800-SEC-0330. The Fund makes the Forms N-Q available to shareholders on its website at [www.FoxbyCorp.com](http://www.FoxbyCorp.com).

## FOXBYCORP.COM

Visit us on the web at [www.FoxbyCorp.com](http://www.FoxbyCorp.com). The site provides information about the Fund including market performance, net asset value, dividends, press releases, and shareholder reports. For further information, please email us at [info@FoxbyCorp.com](mailto:info@FoxbyCorp.com).

## FUND INFORMATION

Investment Manager CEF Advisers, Inc.	Stock Transfer Agent and Registrar IST Shareholder Services 209 West Jackson Blvd., Suite 903 Chicago, IL 60606 <a href="http://www.ilstk.com">www.ilstk.com</a> 1-800-757-5755
11 Hanover Square New York, NY 10005 <a href="http://www.cefadvisers.com">www.cefadvisers.com</a> 1-212-344-6310	

Additional Information (Unaudited)

Cautionary Note Regarding Forward Looking Statements - This report contains “forward looking statements” as defined under the U.S. federal securities laws. Generally, the words “believe,” “expect,” “intend,” “estimate,” “anticipate,” “project,” “will” and similar expressions identify forward looking statements, which generally are not historical in nature. Forward looking statements are subject to certain risks and uncertainties that could cause actual results to materially differ from the Fund’s historical experience and its current expectations or projections indicated in any forward looking statements. These risks include, but are not limited to, changes in economic and political conditions; regulatory and legal changes; closed end fund industry risk; leverage risk; valuation risk; interest rate risk; tax risk; and other risks discussed in the Fund’s filings with the SEC. You should not place undue reliance on forward looking statements, which speak only as of the date they are made. The Fund undertakes no obligation to update or revise any forward looking statements made herein. There is no assurance that the Fund’s investment objectives will be attained.

This report, including the financial statements herein, is transmitted to the shareholders of the Fund for their information. The financial information included herein is taken from the records of the Fund. This is not a prospectus, circular, or representation intended for use in the purchase of shares of the Fund or any securities mentioned in this report. Pursuant to Section 23 of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, notice is hereby given that the Fund may in the future, purchase shares of its common stock in the open market. These purchases may be made from time to time, at such times, and in such amounts, as may be deemed advantageous to the Fund, although nothing herein shall be considered a commitment to purchase such shares.

Additional Information (Unaudited)

FOXBY  
CORP.



Printed on recycled paper

FXBY - AR 12/11



Item 2. Code of Ethics.

- (a) The registrant has adopted a code of ethics (the “Code”) that applies to its principal executive officer, principal financial officer, principal accounting officer or controller, or persons performing similar functions, regardless of whether these individuals are employed by the registrant or a third party.
- (b) No information need be disclosed pursuant to this paragraph.
- (c) Not applicable.
- (d) Not applicable.
- (e) Not applicable.
- (f) The text of the Code can be viewed on the registrant’s website, [www.foxbycorp.com](http://www.foxbycorp.com), or a copy of the Code may be obtained free of charge by calling collect 1-212-344-6310.

Item 3. Audit Committee Financial Expert.

The registrant’s Board of Directors has determined that it has three “audit committee financial experts” serving on its audit committee, each of whom are “independent” Directors: Bruce B. Huber, James E. Hunt, and Peter K. Werner. Under applicable securities laws, a person who is determined to be an audit committee financial expert will not be deemed an “expert” for any purpose, including without limitation for the purposes of Section 11 of the Securities Act of 1933, as a result of being designated or identified as an audit committee financial expert. The designation or identification of a person as an audit committee financial expert does not impose on such person any duties, obligations, or liabilities that are greater than the duties, obligations, and liabilities imposed on such person as a member of the audit committee and Board of Directors in the absence of such designation or identification. The designation or identification of a person as an audit committee financial expert pursuant to this Item does not affect the duties, obligations, or liability of any other member of the audit committee or board of directors.

Item 4. Principal Accountant Fees and Services.

- (a) The aggregate fees billed for each of the last two fiscal years for professional services rendered by the principal accountant for the audit of the registrant’s annual financial statements or services that are normally provided by the accountant in connection with statutory and regulatory filings or engagements for those fiscal years are as follows:

AUDIT FEES

2011 - \$13,500  
2010 - \$13,500

- (b)

## Edgar Filing: FOXBY CORP. - Form N-CSR

The aggregate fees billed in each of the last two fiscal years for assurance and related services by the principal accountant that are reasonably related to the performance of the audit of the registrant's financial statements and are not reported under paragraph (a) of this Item are as follows:

### AUDIT-RELATED FEES

2011 - \$1,500

2010 - \$1,500

Audit-related fees include amounts reasonably related to the performance of the audit of the registrant's financial statements, including the issuance of a report on internal controls and review of periodic reporting.

- (c) The aggregate fees billed in each of the last two fiscal years for professional services rendered by the principal accountant for tax compliance, tax advice, and tax planning. Registrants shall describe the nature of the services comprising the fees disclosed under this category are as follows:

### TAX FEES

2011 - \$1,750

2010 - \$1,500

Tax fees include amounts related to tax compliance, tax planning, and tax advice.

- (d) The aggregate fees billed in each of the last two fiscal years for products and services provided by the principal accountant, other than the services reported in paragraphs (a) through (c) of this Item. Registrants shall describe the nature of the services comprising the fees disclosed under this category are as follows:

### ALL OTHER FEES

2011 - N/A

2010 - N/A

- (e) (1) Pursuant to the registrant's Audit Committee Charter, the Audit Committee shall consider for pre-approval any audit and non-audit services proposed to be provided by the auditors to the registrant and any non-audit services proposed to be provided by such auditors to the registrant's Investment Manager, if the engagement relates directly to the registrant's operations or financial reporting. In those situations when it is not convenient to obtain full Audit Committee approval, the Chairman of the Audit Committee is delegated the authority to grant pre-approvals of audit, audit-related, tax, and all other services so long as all such pre-approved decisions are reviewed with the full Audit Committee at its next scheduled meeting. Such pre-approval of non-audit services proposed to be provided by the auditors to the Fund is not necessary, however, under the following circumstances: (1) all such services do not aggregate to more than 5% of total revenues paid by the Fund to the auditor in the fiscal year in which services are provided, (2) such services were not recognized as non-audit services at the time of the engagement, and (3) such services are brought to the attention of the Audit Committee, and approved by the Audit Committee, prior to the completion of the audit.

(2) No services included in (b) - (d) above were approved pursuant to paragraph (c)(7)(i)(C) of Rule 2-01 of Regulation S-X.

(f) Not applicable.

(g) The aggregate non-audit fees billed by the registrant's accountant for services rendered to the registrant, and rendered to the registrant's investment adviser (not including any sub-adviser whose role is primarily portfolio management and is subcontracted with or overseen by another investment adviser), and any entity controlling, controlled by, or under common control with the adviser that provides ongoing services to the registrant for each of the last two fiscal years of the registrant were \$24,250 and \$23,500, respectively.

(h) The registrant's audit committee has determined that the provision of non-audit services that were rendered by accountant to the registrant's investment adviser (not including any sub-adviser whose role is primarily portfolio management and is subcontracted with or overseen by another investment adviser), and any entity controlling, controlled by, or under common control with the investment adviser that provides ongoing services to the registrant that were not pre-approved pursuant to paragraph (c)(7)(ii) of Rule 2-01 of Regulation S-X is compatible with maintaining the principal accountant's independence.

#### Item 5. Audit Committee of Listed Registrants.

The registrant has a standing audit committee. The members of the audit committee are Bruce B. Huber, James E. Hunt and Peter K. Werner.

#### Item 6. Schedule of Investments.

Included as part of the report to shareholders filed under Item 1 of this Form.

#### Item 7. Disclosure of Proxy Voting Policies and Procedures for Closed-End Management Investment Companies.

##### AMENDED PROXY VOTING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES 2012

Foxby Corp.

Foxby Corp. (the "Fund") delegates the responsibility for voting proxies of portfolio companies held in the Fund's portfolio to Institutional Shareholder Services ("ISS"). A concise summary of the Proxy Voting Guidelines of ISS (see attached) is incorporated by reference herein as the Fund's proxy voting policies and procedures, as supplemented by the terms hereof. The Fund retains the right to override the delegation to ISS on a case-by-case basis, in which case the ADDENDUM – NON-DELEGATED PROXY VOTING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES supersede the Proxy Voting Guidelines of ISS in their entirety. In all cases, the Fund will seek to vote its proxies in the best interests of the Fund.

With respect to a vote upon which the Fund overrides the delegation to ISS, to the extent that such vote presents a material conflict of interest between the Fund and its Investment Manager or any affiliated person of the Investment



Manager, the Fund normally will disclose such conflict to, and obtain consent from, its Independent Directors, or a committee thereof, prior to voting the proxy.

ADDENDUM  
NON-DELEGATED PROXY VOTING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

These proxy voting policies and procedures are intended to provide general guidelines regarding the issues they address. As such, they cannot be “violated.” In each case the vote generally will be based on maximizing shareholder value over the long term, as consistent with overall investment objectives and policies.

Board and Governance Issues

Board of Director Composition

Typically, we will not object to slates with at least a majority of independent directors.

We generally will not object to shareholder proposals that request that the board audit, compensation and/or nominating committees include independent directors exclusively.

Approval of IRPAF

We will evaluate on a case-by-case basis instances in which the audit firm has a significant audit relationship with the company to determine whether we believe independence has been compromised.

We will review and evaluate the resolutions seeking ratification of the auditor when fees for financial systems design and implementation substantially exceed audit and all other fees, as this can compromise the independence of the auditor.

We will carefully review and evaluate the election of the audit committee chair if the audit committee recommends an auditor whose fees for financial systems design and implementation substantially exceed audit and all other fees, as this can compromise the independence of the auditor.

Increase Authorized Common Stock

We will generally support the authorization of additional common stock necessary to facilitate a stock split.

We will generally support the authorization of additional common stock.

Blank Check Preferred Stock

---

Blank check preferred is stock with a fixed dividend and a preferential claim on company assets relative to common shares. The terms of the stock (voting, dividend and conversion rights) are determined at the discretion of the Board when the stock is issued. Although such an issue can in theory be used for financing purposes, often it has been used in connection with a takeover defense. Accordingly, we will generally evaluate the creation of blank check preferred stock.

#### Classified or “Staggered” Board

On a classified (or staggered) board, directors are divided into separate classes (usually three) with directors in each class elected to overlapping three-year terms. Companies argue that such Boards offer continuity in direction which promotes long-term planning. However, in some instances they may serve to deter unwanted takeovers since a potential buyer would have to wait at least two years to gain a majority of Board seats.

We will vote on a case-by-case basis on issues involving classified boards.

#### Supermajority Vote Requirements

Supermajority vote requirements in a company charter or bylaws require a level of voting approval in excess of simple majority. Generally, supermajority provisions require at least 2/3 affirmative vote for passage of issues.

We will vote on a case-by-case basis regarding issues involving supermajority voting.

#### Restrictions on Shareholders to Act by Written Consent

Written consent allows shareholders to initiate and carry out a shareholder action without waiting until the annual meeting or by calling a special meeting. It permits action to be taken by the written consent of the same percentage or outstanding shares that would be required to effect the proposed action at a shareholder meeting.

We will generally not object to proposals seeking to preserve the right of shareholders to act by written consent.

#### Restrictions on Shareholders to Call Meetings

We will generally not object to proposals seeking to preserve the right of the shareholders to call meetings.

#### Limitations, Director Liability and Indemnification

Because of increased litigation brought against directors of corporations and the increase costs of director liability insurance, many states have passed laws limiting director liability for those acting in good faith. Shareholders, however, often must opt into such statutes. In addition, many companies are seeking to add indemnification of directors to corporate bylaws.

We will generally support director liability and indemnification resolutions because it is important for companies to be able to attract the most qualified individuals to their Boards.

#### Reincorporation

Corporations are in general bound by the laws of the state in which they are incorporated. Companies reincorporate for a variety of reasons including shifting incorporation to a state where the company has its most active operations or corporate headquarters, or shifting incorporation to take advantage of state corporate takeovers laws.

We typically will not object to reincorporation proposals.

#### Cumulative Voting

Cumulative voting allows shareholders to cumulate their votes behind one or a few directors running for the board that is, cast more than one vote for a director thereby helping a minority of shareholders to win board representation. Cumulative voting generally gives minority shareholders an opportunity to effect change in corporate affairs.

---

We typically will not object to proposals to adopt cumulative voting in the election of directors.

#### Dual Classes of Stock

In order to maintain corporate control in the hands of a certain group of shareholders, companies may seek to create multiple classes of stock with differing rights pertaining to voting and dividends.

We will vote on a case-by-case basis dual classes of stock. However, we will typically not object to dual classes of stock.

#### Limit Directors Tenure

In general, corporate directors may stand for re-election indefinitely. Opponents of this practice suggest that limited tenure would inject new perspectives into the boardroom as well as possibly creating room for directors from diverse backgrounds; however, continuity is important to corporate leadership and in some instances alternative means may be explored for injecting new ideas or members from diverse backgrounds into corporate boardrooms.

Accordingly, we will vote on a case-by-case basis regarding attempts to limit director tenure.

#### Minimum Director Stock Ownership

The director share ownership proposal requires that all corporate directors own a minimum number of shares in the corporation. The purpose of this resolution is to encourage directors to have the same interest as other shareholders.

We normally will not object to resolutions that require corporate directors to own shares in the company.

#### Executive Compensation

##### Disclosure of CEO, Executive, Board and Management Compensation

On a case-by-case basis, we will support shareholder resolutions requesting companies to disclose the salaries of top management and the Board of Directors.

##### Compensation for CEO, Executive, Board and Management

We typically will not object to proposals regarding executive compensation if we believe the compensation clearly does not reflect the current and future circumstances of the company.

##### Formation and Independence of Compensation Review Committee

We normally will not object to shareholder resolutions requesting the formation of a committee of independent directors to review and examine executive compensation.

##### Stock Options for Board and Executives

We will generally review the overall impact of stock option plans that in total offer greater than 25% of shares outstanding because of voting and earnings dilution.

We will vote on a case-by-case basis option programs that allow the repricing of underwater options.

In most cases, we will oppose stock option plans that have option exercise prices below the marketplace on the day of the grant.

Generally, we will support options programs for outside directors subject to the same constraints previously described.

#### Employee Stock Ownership Plan (ESOPs)

We will generally not object to ESOPs created to promote active employee ownership. However, we will generally oppose any ESOP whose purpose is to prevent a corporate takeover.

---

### Changes to Charter or By-Laws

We will conduct a case-by-case review of the proposed changes with the voting decision resting on whether the proposed changes are in shareholder best interests.

### Confidential Voting

Typically, proxy voting differs from voting in political elections in that the company is made aware of shareholder votes as they are cast. This enables management to contact dissenting shareholders in an attempt to get them to change their votes.

We generally will not object to confidential voting.

### Equal Access to Proxy

Equal access proposals ask companies to give shareholders access to proxy materials to state their views on contested issues, including director nominations. In some cases they would actually allow shareholders to nominate directors. Companies suggest that such proposals would make an increasingly complex process even more burdensome.

In general, we will not oppose resolutions for equal access proposals.

### Golden Parachutes

Golden parachutes are severance payments to top executives who are terminated or demoted pursuant to a takeover. Companies argue that such provisions are necessary to keep executives from “jumping ship” during potential takeover attempts.

We will not object to the right of shareholders to vote on golden parachutes because they go above and beyond ordinary compensation practices. In evaluating a particular golden parachute, we will examine if considered material total management compensation, the employees covered by the plan, and the quality of management and all other factors deemed pertinent.

### Mergers and Acquisitions

#### Mergers, Restructuring and Spin-offs

A merger, restructuring, or spin-off in some way affects a change in control of the company assets. In evaluating the merit of each issue, we will consider the terms of each proposal. This will include an analysis of the potential long-term value of the investment.

On a case by case basis, we will review management proposals for merger or restructuring to determine the extent to which the transaction appears to offer fair value and other proxy voting policies stated are not violated.

### Poison Pills

Poison pills (or shareholder rights plans) are triggered by an unwanted takeover attempt and cause a variety of events to occur which may make the company financially less attractive to the suitor. Typically, directors have enacted these plans without shareholder approval. Most poison pill resolutions deal with putting poison pills up for a vote or

repealing them altogether.

We typically will not object to most proposals to put rights plans up for a shareholder vote. In general, poison pills will be reviewed for the additional value provided to shareholders, if any.

#### Anti-Greenmail Proposals

Greenmail is the payment a corporate raider receives in exchange for his/her shares. This payment is usually at a premium to the market price, so while greenmail can ensure the continued independence of the company, it discriminates against other shareholders.

We generally will support anti-greenmail provisions.

---

Opt-Out of State Anti-takeover Law

A strategy for dealing with anti-takeover issues has been a shareholder resolution asking a company to opt-out of a particular state anti-takeover laws.

We generally will not object to bylaws changes requiring a company to opt out of state anti-takeover laws. Resolutions requiring companies to opt into state anti-takeover statutes generally will be subject to further review for appropriateness.

Other Situations

In the event an issue is not addressed in the above guidelines, we will determine on a case-by-case basis any proposals that may arise from management or shareholders. To the extent that a proposal from management does not infringe on shareholder rights, we will generally support management position. We may also elect to abstain or not vote on any given matter.

January 1, 2012

---



2012 U.S. Proxy Voting Concise Guidelines  
December 20, 2011

Institutional Shareholder Services Inc.

---

## 2012 U.S. Proxy Voting Concise Guidelines

The policies contained herein are a sampling of select, key proxy voting guidelines and are not exhaustive. A full listing of ISS' 2012 proxy voting guidelines can be found at <http://www.issgovernance.com/files/2012USSummaryGuidelines.pdf>

### Routine/Miscellaneous

#### Auditor Ratification

Vote FOR proposals to ratify auditors, unless any of the following apply:

- An auditor has a financial interest in or association with the company, and is therefore not independent;
- There is reason to believe that the independent auditor has rendered an opinion which is neither accurate nor indicative of the company's financial position;
- Poor accounting practices are identified that rise to a serious level of concern, such as: fraud; misapplication of GAAP; and material weaknesses identified in Section 404 disclosures; or
- Fees for non-audit services ("Other" fees) are excessive.

Non-audit fees are excessive if:

- Non-audit ("other") fees > audit fees + audit-related fees + tax compliance/preparation fees

»»»»»»

#### Board of Directors

##### Voting on Director Nominees in Uncontested Elections

Votes on director nominees should be determined CASE-BY-CASE.

Four fundamental principles apply when determining votes on director nominees:

1. Board Accountability
2. Board Responsiveness
3. Director Independence
4. Director Competence

##### 1. Board Accountability

Vote AGAINST<sup>1</sup> or WITHHOLD from the entire board of directors (except new nominees<sup>2</sup>, who should be considered CASE-BY-CASE) for the following:

---

<sup>1</sup> In general, companies with a plurality vote standard use "Withhold" as the contrary vote option in director elections; companies with a majority vote standard use "Against". However, it will vary by company and the proxy must be checked to determine the valid contrary vote option for the particular company.

---

Problematic Takeover Defenses:

Classified Board Structure:

- 1.1. The board is classified, and a continuing director responsible for a problematic governance issue at the board/committee level that would warrant a withhold/against vote recommendation is not up for election -- any or all appropriate nominees (except new) may be held accountable;

Director Performance Evaluation:

- 1.2. The board lacks accountability and oversight, coupled with sustained poor performance relative to peers. Sustained poor performance is measured by one- and three-year total shareholder returns in the bottom half of a company's four-digit GICS industry group (Russell 3000 companies only). Take into consideration the company's five-year total shareholder return and five-year operational metrics. Problematic provisions include but are not limited to:

- A classified board structure
- A supermajority vote requirement;
- Either a plurality vote standard in uncontested director elections or a majority vote standard with no plurality carve-out for contested elections;
- The inability of shareholders to call special meetings;
- The inability of shareholders to act by written consent;
- A dual-class capital structure; and/or
- A non-shareholder-approved poison pill.

Poison Pills:

- 1.3. The company's poison pill has a "dead-hand" or "modified dead-hand" feature. Vote WITHHOLD or AGAINST every year until this feature is removed;
- 1.4. The board adopts a poison pill with a term of more than 12 months ("long-term pill"), or renews any existing pill, including any "short-term" pill (12 months or less), without shareholder approval. A commitment or policy that puts a newly adopted pill to a binding shareholder vote may potentially offset an adverse vote recommendation. Review such companies with classified boards every year, and such companies with annually elected boards at least once every three years, and vote AGAINST or WITHHOLD votes from all nominees if the company still maintains a non-shareholder-approved poison pill. This policy applies to all companies adopting or renewing pills after the announcement of this policy (Nov. 19, 2009); or
- 1.5. The board makes a material adverse change to an existing poison pill without shareholder approval.

Vote CASE-BY-CASE on all nominees if:

- 1.6. The board adopts a poison pill with a term of 12 months or less ("short-term pill") without shareholder approval, taking into account the following factors:
  - The date of the pill's adoption relative to the date of the next meeting of shareholders— i.e. whether the company had time to put the pill on ballot for shareholder ratification given the circumstances;
  - The issuer's rationale;

- The issuer's governance structure and practices; and
- The issuer's track record of accountability to shareholders.

---

2 A “new nominee” is any current nominee who has not already been elected by shareholders and who joined the board after the problematic action in question transpired. If ISS cannot determine whether the nominee joined the board before or after the problematic action transpired, the nominee will be considered a “new nominee” if he or she joined the board within the 12 months prior to the upcoming shareholder meeting.

---

**Problematic Audit-Related Practices**

Generally vote AGAINST or WITHHOLD from the members of the Audit Committee if:

- 1.7. The non-audit fees paid to the auditor are excessive (see discussion under “Auditor Ratification”);
- 1.8. The company receives an adverse opinion on the company’s financial statements from its auditor; or
- 1.9. There is persuasive evidence that the Audit Committee entered into an inappropriate indemnification agreement with its auditor that limits the ability of the company, or its shareholders, to pursue legitimate legal recourse against the audit firm.

Vote CASE-BY-CASE on members of the Audit Committee and potentially the full board if:

- 1.10. Poor accounting practices are identified that rise to a level of serious concern, such as: fraud; misapplication of GAAP; and material weaknesses identified in Section 404 disclosures. Examine the severity, breadth, chronological sequence and duration, as well as the company’s efforts at remediation or corrective actions, in determining whether WITHHOLD/AGAINST votes are warranted.

**Problematic Compensation Practices/Pay for Performance Misalignment**

In the absence of an Advisory Vote on Executive Compensation ballot item, or, in egregious situations, vote AGAINST or WITHHOLD from the members of the Compensation Committee and potentially the full board if:

- 1.11. There is a significant misalignment between CEO pay and company performance (pay for performance);
- 1.12. The company maintains significant problematic pay practices;
- 1.13. The board exhibits a significant level of poor communication and responsiveness to shareholders;
- 1.14. The company fails to submit one-time transfers of stock options to a shareholder vote; or
- 1.15. The company fails to fulfill the terms of a burn rate commitment made to shareholders.

Vote CASE-BY-CASE on Compensation Committee members (or, in exceptional cases, the full board) and the Management Say-on-Pay proposal if:

- 1.16. The company's previous say-on-pay proposal received the support of less than 70 percent of votes cast, taking into account:
  - The company's response, including:
  - Disclosure of engagement efforts with major institutional investors regarding the issues that contributed to the low level of support;
  - Specific actions taken to address the issues that contributed to the low level of support;
  - Other recent compensation actions taken by the company;
  - Whether the issues raised are recurring or isolated;
  - The company's ownership structure; and

- Whether the support level was less than 50 percent, which would warrant the highest degree of responsiveness.

Governance Failures

Under extraordinary circumstances, vote AGAINST or WITHHOLD from directors individually, committee members, or the entire board, due to:

- 1.17. Material failures of governance, stewardship, risk oversight, or fiduciary responsibilities at the company;
  - 1.18. Failure to replace management as appropriate; or
-

1.19. Egregious actions related to a director's service on other boards that raise substantial doubt about his or her ability to effectively oversee management and serve the best interests of shareholders at any company.

## 2. Board Responsiveness

Vote AGAINST or WITHHOLD from the entire board of directors (except new nominees, who should be considered CASE-BY-CASE) if:

- 2.1. The board failed to act on a shareholder proposal that received the support of a majority of the shares outstanding the previous year;
- 2.2. The board failed to act on a shareholder proposal that received the support of a majority of shares cast in the last year and one of the two previous years;
- 2.3. The board failed to act on takeover offers where the majority of shares are tendered;
- 2.4. At the previous board election, any director received more than 50 percent withhold/against votes of the shares cast and the company has failed to address the issue(s) that caused the high withhold/against vote; or
- 2.5. The board implements an advisory vote on executive compensation on a less frequent basis than the frequency that received the majority of votes cast at the most recent shareholder meeting at which shareholders voted on the say-on-pay frequency.

Vote CASE-BY-CASE on the entire board if:

- 2.6. The board implements an advisory vote on executive compensation on a less frequent basis than the frequency that received a plurality, but not a majority, of the votes cast at the most recent shareholder meeting at which shareholders voted on the say-on-pay frequency, taking into account:
  - The board's rationale for selecting a frequency that is different from the frequency that received a plurality;
  - The company's ownership structure and vote results;
  - ISS' analysis of whether there are compensation concerns or a history of problematic compensation practices; and
  - The previous year's support level on the company's say-on-pay proposal.

## 3. Director Independence

Vote AGAINST or WITHHOLD from Inside Directors and Affiliated Outside Directors (per the Categorization of Directors) when:

- 3.1. The inside or affiliated outside director serves on any of the three key committees: audit, compensation, or nominating;
- 3.2. The company lacks an audit, compensation, or nominating committee so that the full board functions as that committee;
- 3.3. The company lacks a formal nominating committee, even if the board attests that the independent directors fulfill the functions of such a committee; or

3.4. Independent directors make up less than a majority of the directors.

#### 4. Director Competence

Attendance at Board and Committee Meetings:

Vote AGAINST or WITHHOLD from the entire board of directors (except new nominees, who should be considered CASE-BY-CASE) if:

4.1. The company's proxy indicates that not all directors attended 75 percent of the aggregate board and committee meetings, but fails to provide the required disclosure of the names of the director(s) involved.

Generally vote AGAINST or WITHHOLD from individual directors who:

---



4.2. Attend less than 75 percent of the board and committee meetings (with the exception of new nominees). Acceptable reasons for director absences are generally limited to the following:

- Medical issues/illness;
- Family emergencies; and
- Missing only one meeting.

These reasons for directors' absences will only be considered by ISS if disclosed in the proxy or another SEC filing. If the disclosure is insufficient to determine whether a director attended at least 75 percent of board and committee meetings in aggregate, vote AGAINST or WITHHOLD from the director.

Overboarded Directors:

Vote AGAINST or WITHHOLD from individual directors who:

4.3. Sit on more than six public company boards; or

4.4. Are CEOs of public companies who sit on the boards of more than two public companies besides their own— withhold only at their outside boards.

»»»»»»

Voting for Director Nominees in Contested Elections

Vote CASE-BY-CASE on the election of directors in contested elections, considering the following factors:

- Long-term financial performance of the target company relative to its industry;
- Management's track record;
- Background to the proxy contest;
- Qualifications of director nominees (both slates);
- Strategic plan of dissident slate and quality of critique against management;
- Likelihood that the proposed goals and objectives can be achieved (both slates);
- Stock ownership positions.

»»»»»»

Proxy Access

ISS supports proxy access as an important shareholder right, one that is complementary to other best-practice corporate governance features. However, in the absence of a uniform standard, proposals to enact proxy access may vary widely; as such, ISS is not setting forth specific parameters at this time and will take a case-by-case approach in evaluating these proposals.

Vote CASE-BY-CASE on proposals to enact proxy access, taking into account, among other factors:

- Company-specific factors; and
- Proposal-specific factors, including:
  - The ownership thresholds proposed in the resolution (i.e., percentage and duration);
  - The maximum proportion of directors that shareholders may nominate each year; and
  - The method of determining which nominations should appear on the ballot if multiple shareholders submit nominations.

»»»»»»



## Shareholder Rights & Defenses

### Exclusive Venue

Vote CASE-BY-CASE on exclusive venue proposals, taking into account:

- Whether the company has been materially harmed by shareholder litigation outside its jurisdiction of incorporation, based on disclosure in the company's proxy statement; and
- Whether the company has the following good governance features:
  - An annually elected board;
  - A majority vote standard in uncontested director elections; and
  - The absence of a poison pill, unless the pill was approved by shareholders.

»»»»»»»»

### Poison Pills- Management Proposals to Ratify Poison Pill

Vote CASE-BY-CASE on management proposals on poison pill ratification, focusing on the features of the shareholder rights plan. Rights plans should contain the following attributes:

- No lower than a 20% trigger, flip-in or flip-over;
- A term of no more than three years;
- No dead-hand, slow-hand, no-hand or similar feature that limits the ability of a future board to redeem the pill;
- Shareholder redemption feature (qualifying offer clause); if the board refuses to redeem the pill 90 days after a qualifying offer is announced, 10 percent of the shares may call a special meeting or seek a written consent to vote on rescinding the pill.

In addition, the rationale for adopting the pill should be thoroughly explained by the company. In examining the request for the pill, take into consideration the company's existing governance structure, including: board independence, existing takeover defenses, and any problematic governance concerns.

»»»»»»»»

### Poison Pills- Management Proposals to Ratify a Pill to Preserve Net Operating Losses (NOLs)

Vote AGAINST proposals to adopt a poison pill for the stated purpose of protecting a company's net operating losses ("NOLs") if the term of the pill would exceed the shorter of three years and the exhaustion of the NOL.

Vote CASE-BY-CASE on management proposals for poison pill ratification, considering the following factors, if the term of the pill would be the shorter of three years (or less) and the exhaustion of the NOL:

- The ownership threshold to transfer (NOL pills generally have a trigger slightly below 5 percent);
- The value of the NOLs;
- Shareholder protection mechanisms (sunset provision, or commitment to cause expiration of the pill upon exhaustion or expiration of NOLs);
- The company's existing governance structure including: board independence, existing takeover defenses, track record of responsiveness to shareholders, and any other problematic governance concerns; and
- Any other factors that may be applicable.

»»»»»»»»

### Shareholder Ability to Act by Written Consent

Generally vote AGAINST management and shareholder proposals to restrict or prohibit shareholders' ability to act by written consent.

---

Generally vote FOR management and shareholder proposals that provide shareholders with the ability to act by written consent, taking into account the following factors:

- Shareholders' current right to act by written consent;
- The consent threshold;
- The inclusion of exclusionary or prohibitive language;
- Investor ownership structure; and
- Shareholder support of, and management's response to, previous shareholder proposals.

Vote CASE-BY-CASE on shareholder proposals if, in addition to the considerations above, the company has the following governance and antitakeover provisions:

- An unfettered<sup>3</sup> right for shareholders to call special meetings at a 10 percent threshold;
- A majority vote standard in uncontested director elections;
- No non-shareholder-approved pill; and
- An annually elected board.

»»»»»»

## CAPITAL/RESTRUCTURING

### Common Stock Authorization

Vote FOR proposals to increase the number of authorized common shares where the primary purpose of the increase is to issue shares in connection with a transaction on the same ballot that warrants support.

Vote AGAINST proposals at companies with more than one class of common stock to increase the number of authorized shares of the class of common stock that has superior voting rights.

Vote AGAINST proposals to increase the number of authorized common shares if a vote for a reverse stock split on the same ballot is warranted despite the fact that the authorized shares would not be reduced proportionally.

Vote CASE-BY-CASE on all other proposals to increase the number of shares of common stock authorized for issuance. Take into account company-specific factors that include, at a minimum, the following:

- Past Board Performance:
- The company's use of authorized shares during the last three years
- The Current Request:
- Disclosure in the proxy statement of the specific purposes of the proposed increase;
- Disclosure in the proxy statement of specific and severe risks to shareholders of not approving the request; and
- The dilutive impact of the request as determined by an allowable increase calculated by ISS (typically 100 percent of existing authorized shares) that reflects the company's need for shares and total shareholder returns.

»»»»»»

---

<sup>3</sup> "Unfettered" means no restrictions on agenda items, no restrictions on the number of shareholders who can group together to reach the 10 percent threshold, and only reasonable limits on when a meeting can be called: no greater than

30 days after the last annual meeting and no greater than 90 prior to the next annual meeting.

---

## Preferred Stock Authorization

Vote FOR proposals to increase the number of authorized preferred shares where the primary purpose of the increase is to issue shares in connection with a transaction on the same ballot that warrants support.

Vote AGAINST proposals at companies with more than one class or series of preferred stock to increase the number of authorized shares of the class or series of preferred stock that has superior voting rights.

Vote CASE-BY-CASE on all other proposals to increase the number of shares of preferred stock authorized for issuance. Take into account company-specific factors that include, at a minimum, the following:

- Past Board Performance:
- The company's use of authorized preferred shares during the last three years;
- The Current Request:
- Disclosure in the proxy statement of the specific purposes for the proposed increase;
- Disclosure in the proxy statement of specific and severe risks to shareholders of not approving the request;
- In cases where the company has existing authorized preferred stock, the dilutive impact of the request as determined by an allowable increase calculated by ISS (typically 100 percent of existing authorized shares) that reflects the company's need for shares and total shareholder returns; and
- Whether the shares requested are blank check preferred shares that can be used for antitakeover purposes.

»»»»»»»»

## Dual Class Structure

Generally vote AGAINST proposals to create a new class of common stock unless:

- The company discloses a compelling rationale for the dual-class capital structure, such as:
- The company's auditor has concluded that there is substantial doubt about the company's ability to continue as a going concern; or
- The new class of shares will be transitory;
- The new class is intended for financing purposes with minimal or no dilution to current shareholders in both the short term and long term; and
- The new class is not designed to preserve or increase the voting power of an insider or significant shareholder.

»»»»»»»»

## Mergers and Acquisitions

Vote CASE –BY- CASE on mergers and acquisitions. Review and evaluate the merits and drawbacks of the proposed transaction, balancing various and sometimes countervailing factors including:

- Valuation - Is the value to be received by the target shareholders (or paid by the acquirer) reasonable? While the fairness opinion may provide an initial starting point for assessing valuation reasonableness, emphasis is placed on the offer premium, market reaction and strategic rationale.
- Market reaction - How has the market responded to the proposed deal? A negative market reaction should cause closer scrutiny of a deal.
- Strategic rationale - Does the deal make sense strategically? From where is the value derived? Cost and revenue synergies should not be overly aggressive or optimistic, but reasonably achievable. Management should also have a favorable track record of successful integration of historical acquisitions.
- Negotiations and process - Were the terms of the transaction negotiated at arm's-length? Was the process fair and equitable? A fair process helps to ensure the best price for shareholders. Significant negotiation "wins"

can also signify the deal makers' competency. The comprehensiveness of the sales process (e.g., full auction, partial auction, no auction) can also affect shareholder value.

---



- Conflicts of interest - Are insiders benefiting from the transaction disproportionately and inappropriately as compared to non-insider shareholders? As the result of potential conflicts, the directors and officers of the company may be more likely to vote to approve a merger than if they did not hold these interests. Consider whether these interests may have influenced these directors and officers to support or recommend the merger. The CIC figure presented in the "ISS Transaction Summary" section of this report is an aggregate figure that can in certain cases be a misleading indicator of the true value transfer from shareholders to insiders. Where such figure appears to be excessive, analyze the underlying assumptions to determine whether a potential conflict exists.
- Governance - Will the combined company have a better or worse governance profile than the current governance profiles of the respective parties to the transaction? If the governance profile is to change for the worse, the burden is on the company to prove that other issues (such as valuation) outweigh any deterioration in governance.

»»»»»»

## COMPENSATION

### Executive Pay Evaluation

Underlying all evaluations are five global principles that most investors expect corporations to adhere to in designing and administering executive and director compensation programs:

1. Maintain appropriate pay-for-performance alignment, with emphasis on long-term shareholder value: This principle encompasses overall executive pay practices, which must be designed to attract, retain, and appropriately motivate the key employees who drive shareholder value creation over the long term. It will take into consideration, among other factors, the link between pay and performance; the mix between fixed and variable pay; performance goals; and equity-based plan costs;
2. Avoid arrangements that risk "pay for failure": This principle addresses the appropriateness of long or indefinite contracts, excessive severance packages, and guaranteed compensation;
3. Maintain an independent and effective compensation committee: This principle promotes oversight of executive pay programs by directors with appropriate skills, knowledge, experience, and a sound process for compensation decision-making (e.g., including access to independent expertise and advice when needed);
4. Provide shareholders with clear, comprehensive compensation disclosures: This principle underscores the importance of informative and timely disclosures that enable shareholders to evaluate executive pay practices fully and fairly;
5. Avoid inappropriate pay to non-executive directors: This principle recognizes the interests of shareholders in ensuring that compensation to outside directors does not compromise their independence and ability to make appropriate judgments in overseeing managers' pay and performance. At the market level, it may incorporate a variety of generally accepted best practices.

### Advisory Votes on Executive Compensation- Management Proposals (Management Say-on-Pay)

Vote CASE-BY-CASE on ballot items related to executive pay and practices, as well as certain aspects of outside director compensation.

Vote AGAINST Advisory Votes on Executive Compensation (Management Say-on-Pay – MSOP) if:

- There is a significant misalignment between CEO pay and company performance (pay for performance);

Edgar Filing: FOXBY CORP. - Form N-CSR

- The company maintains significant problematic pay practices;
  - The board exhibits a significant level of poor communication and responsiveness to shareholders.
-

Vote AGAINST or WITHHOLD from the members of the Compensation Committee and potentially the full board if:

- There is no MSOP on the ballot, and an AGAINST vote on an MSOP is warranted due to pay for performance misalignment, problematic pay practices, or the lack of adequate responsiveness on compensation issues raised previously, or a combination thereof;
- The board fails to respond adequately to a previous MSOP proposal that received less than 70 percent support of votes cast;
- The company has recently practiced or approved problematic pay practices, including option repricing or option backdating; or
- The situation is egregious.

Vote AGAINST an equity plan on the ballot if:

- A pay for performance misalignment is found, and a significant portion of the CEO's misaligned pay is attributed to non-performance-based equity awards, taking into consideration:
- Magnitude of pay misalignment;
- Contribution of non-performance-based equity grants to overall pay; and
- The proportion of equity awards granted in the last three fiscal years concentrated at the named executive officer (NEO) level.

Primary Evaluation Factors for Executive Pay

Pay-for-Performance Evaluation

ISS annually conducts a pay-for-performance analysis to identify strong or satisfactory alignment between pay and performance over a sustained period. With respect to companies in the Russell 3000 index, this analysis considers the following:

1. Peer Group<sup>4</sup> Alignment:

- The degree of alignment between the company's TSR rank and the CEO's total pay rank within a peer group, as measured over one-year and three-year periods (weighted 40/60);
- The multiple of the CEO's total pay relative to the peer group median.

2. Absolute Alignment: The absolute alignment between the trend in CEO pay and company TSR over the prior five fiscal years – i.e., the difference between the trend in annual pay changes and the trend in annualized TSR during the period.

If the above analysis demonstrates significant unsatisfactory long-term pay-for-performance alignment or, in the case of non-Russell 3000 index companies, misaligned pay and performance are otherwise suggested, analyze the following

---

<sup>4</sup> The peer group is generally comprised of 14-24 companies that are selected using market cap, revenue (or assets for financial firms), and GICS industry group, via a process designed to select peers that are closest to the subject company, and where the subject company is close to median in revenue/asset size. The relative alignment evaluation will consider the company's rank for both pay and TSR within the peer group (for one- and three-year periods) and the CEO's pay relative to the median pay level in the peer group.



qualitative factors to determine how various pay elements may work to encourage or to undermine long-term value creation and alignment with shareholder interests:

- The ratio of performance- to time-based equity awards;
- The ratio of performance-based compensation to overall compensation;
- The completeness of disclosure and rigor of performance goals;
- The company's peer group benchmarking practices;
- Actual results of financial/operational metrics, such as growth in revenue, profit, cash flow, etc., both absolute and relative to peers;
- Special circumstances related to, for example, a new CEO in the prior fiscal year or anomalous equity grant practices (e.g., biennial awards); and
- Any other factors deemed relevant.

#### Problematic Pay Practices

The focus is on executive compensation practices that contravene the global pay principles, including:

- Problematic practices related to non-performance-based compensation elements;
- Incentives that may motivate excessive risk-taking; and
- Options Backdating.

#### Problematic Pay Practices related to Non-Performance-Based Compensation Elements

Pay elements that are not directly based on performance are generally evaluated CASE-BY-CASE considering the context of a company's overall pay program and demonstrated pay-for-performance philosophy. Please refer to ISS' Compensation FAQ document for detail on specific pay practices that have been identified as potentially problematic and may lead to negative recommendations if they are deemed to be inappropriate or unjustified relative to executive pay best practices. The list below highlights the problematic practices that carry significant weight in this overall consideration and may result in adverse vote recommendations:

- Repricing or replacing of underwater stock options/SARS without prior shareholder approval (including cash buyouts and voluntary surrender of underwater options);
- Excessive perquisites or tax gross-ups, including any gross-up related to a secular trust or restricted stock vesting;
- New or extended agreements that provide for:
- CIC payments exceeding 3 times base salary and average/target/most recent bonus;
- CIC severance payments without involuntary job loss or substantial diminution of duties ("single" or "modified single" triggers);
- CIC payments with excise tax gross-ups (including "modified" gross-ups).

#### Incentives that may Motivate Excessive Risk-Taking

- Multi-year guaranteed bonuses;
- A single or common performance metric used for short- and long-term plans;
- Lucrative severance packages;
- High pay opportunities relative to industry peers;
- Disproportionate supplemental pensions; or
- Mega annual equity grants that provide unlimited upside with no downside risk.



Factors that potentially mitigate the impact of risky incentives include rigorous claw-back provisions and robust stock ownership/holding guidelines.

#### Options Backdating

The following factors should be examined CASE-BY-CASE to allow for distinctions to be made between “sloppy” plan administration versus deliberate action or fraud:

- Reason and motive for the options backdating issue, such as inadvertent vs. deliberate grant date changes;
- Duration of options backdating;
- Size of restatement due to options backdating;
- Corrective actions taken by the board or compensation committee, such as canceling or re-pricing backdated options, the recouping of option gains on backdated grants; and
- Adoption of a grant policy that prohibits backdating, and creates a fixed grant schedule or window period for equity grants in the future.

#### Board Communications and Responsiveness

Consider the following factors CASE-BY-CASE when evaluating ballot items related to executive pay on the board’s responsiveness to investor input and engagement on compensation issues:

- Failure to respond to majority-supported shareholder proposals on executive pay topics; or
- Failure to adequately respond to the company's previous say-on-pay proposal that received the support of less than 70 percent of votes cast, taking into account:
- The company's response, including:
- Disclosure of engagement efforts with major institutional investors regarding the issues that contributed to the low level of support;
- Specific actions taken to address the issues that contributed to the low level of support;
- Other recent compensation actions taken by the company;
- Whether the issues raised are recurring or isolated;
- The company's ownership structure; and
- Whether the support level was less than 50 percent, which would warrant the highest degree of responsiveness.

»»»»»»»»

#### Frequency of Advisory Vote on Executive Compensation (Management "Say on Pay")

Vote FOR annual advisory votes on compensation, which provide the most consistent and clear communication channel for shareholder concerns about companies' executive pay programs.

»»»»»»»»

#### Voting on Golden Parachutes in an Acquisition, Merger, Consolidation, or Proposed Sale

Vote CASE-BY-CASE on proposals to approve the company's golden parachute compensation, consistent with ISS' policies on problematic pay practices related to severance packages. Features that may lead to a vote AGAINST include:

- Recently adopted or materially amended agreements that include excise tax gross-up provisions (since prior annual meeting);
- Recently adopted or materially amended agreements that include modified single triggers (since prior annual meeting);
- Single trigger payments that will happen immediately upon a change in control, including cash payment and such items as the acceleration of performance-based equity despite the failure to achieve performance measures;
- Single-trigger vesting of equity based on a definition of change in control that requires only shareholder approval of the transaction (rather than consummation);
- Potentially excessive severance payments;
- Recent amendments or other changes that may make packages so attractive as to influence merger agreements that may not be in the best interests of shareholders;
- In the case of a substantial gross-up from pre-existing/grandfathered contract: the element that triggered the gross-up (i.e., option mega-grants at low point in stock price, unusual or outsized payments in cash or equity made or negotiated prior to the merger); or
- The company's assertion that a proposed transaction is conditioned on shareholder approval of the golden parachute advisory vote. ISS would view this as problematic from a corporate governance perspective.

In cases where the golden parachute vote is incorporated into a company's separate advisory vote on compensation ("management "say on pay"), ISS will evaluate the "say on pay" proposal in accordance with these guidelines, which may give higher weight to that component of the overall evaluation.

»»»»»»»»

#### Equity-Based and Other Incentive Plans

Vote CASE-BY-CASE on equity-based compensation plans. Vote AGAINST the equity plan if any of the following factors apply:

- The total cost of the company's equity plans is unreasonable;
- The plan expressly permits repricing;
- A pay-for-performance misalignment is found;
- The company's three year burn rate exceeds the burn rate cap of its industry group;
- The plan has a liberal change-of-control definition; or
- The plan is a vehicle for problematic pay practices.

»»»»»»»»

#### Social/Environmental Issues

##### Overall Approach

When evaluating social and environmental shareholder proposals, ISS considers the following factors:

- Whether adoption of the proposal is likely to enhance or protect shareholder value;
- Whether the information requested concerns business issues that relate to a meaningful percentage of the company's business as measured by sales, assets, and earnings;
- The degree to which the company's stated position on the issues raised in the proposal could affect its reputation or sales, or leave it vulnerable to a boycott or selective purchasing;
- Whether the issues presented are more appropriately/effectively dealt with through governmental or company-specific action;





- Whether the company has already responded in some appropriate manner to the request embodied in the proposal;
- Whether the company's analysis and voting recommendation to shareholders are persuasive;
- What other companies have done in response to the issue addressed in the proposal;
- Whether the proposal itself is well framed and the cost of preparing the report is reasonable;
- Whether implementation of the proposal's request would achieve the proposal's objectives;
- Whether the subject of the proposal is best left to the discretion of the board;
- Whether the requested information is available to shareholders either from the company or from a publicly available source; and
- Whether providing this information would reveal proprietary or confidential information that would place the company at a competitive disadvantage.

»»»»»»»»

#### Political Spending & Lobbying Activities

Generally vote AGAINST proposals asking the company to affirm political nonpartisanship in the workplace so long as:

- There are no recent, significant controversies, fines or litigation regarding the company's political contributions or trade association spending; and
- The company has procedures in place to ensure that employee contributions to company-sponsored political action committees (PACs) are strictly voluntary and prohibit coercion.

Vote AGAINST proposals to publish in newspapers and other media the company's political contributions. Such publications could present significant cost to the company without providing commensurate value to shareholders. Generally vote FOR proposals requesting greater disclosure of a company's political contributions and trade association spending policies and activities. However, the following will be considered:

- The company's current disclosure of policies and oversight mechanisms related to its direct political contributions and payments to trade associations or other groups that may be used for political purposes, including information on the types of organizations supported and the business rationale for supporting these organizations; and
- Recent significant controversies, fines, or litigation related to the company's political contributions or political activities.

Vote AGAINST proposals barring the company from making political contributions. Businesses are affected by legislation at the federal, state, and local level; barring political contributions can put the company at a competitive disadvantage.

Vote AGAINST proposals asking for a list of company executives, directors, consultants, legal counsels, lobbyists, or investment bankers that have prior government service and whether such service had a bearing on the business of the company. Such a list would be burdensome to prepare without providing any meaningful information to shareholders.

Vote CASE-BY-CASE on proposals requesting information on a company's lobbying activities, including direct lobbying as well as grassroots lobbying activities, considering:

- The company's current disclosure of relevant policies and oversight mechanisms;
- Recent significant controversies, fines, or litigation related to the company's public policy activities; and
- The impact that the policy issues may have on the company's business operations.

»»»»»



#### Hydraulic Fracturing

Generally vote FOR proposals requesting greater disclosure of a company's (natural gas) hydraulic fracturing operations, including measures the company has taken to manage and mitigate the potential community and environmental impacts of those operations, considering:

- The company's current level of disclosure of relevant policies and oversight mechanisms;
- The company's current level of such disclosure relative to its industry peers;
- Potential relevant local, state, or national regulatory developments; and
- Controversies, fines, or litigation related to the company's hydraulic fracturing operations.

»»»»»»

#### Disclosure/Disclaimer

This document and all of the information contained in it, including without limitation all text, data, graphs, and charts (collectively, the "Information") is the property of Institutional Shareholder Services Inc. (ISS), its subsidiaries, or, in some cases third party suppliers.

The Information has not been submitted to, nor received approval from, the United States Securities and Exchange Commission or any other regulatory body. None of the Information constitutes an offer to sell (or a solicitation of an offer to buy), or a promotion or recommendation of, any security, financial product or other investment vehicle or any trading strategy, and ISS does not endorse, approve, or otherwise express any opinion regarding any issuer, securities, financial products or instruments or trading strategies.

The user of the Information assumes the entire risk of any use it may make or permit to be made of the Information.

ISS MAKES NO EXPRESS OR IMPLIED WARRANTIES OR REPRESENTATIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE INFORMATION AND EXPRESSLY DISCLAIMS ALL IMPLIED WARRANTIES (INCLUDING, WITHOUT LIMITATION, ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF ORIGINALITY, ACCURACY, TIMELINESS, NON-INFRINGEMENT, COMPLETENESS, MERCHANTABILITY, AND FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE) WITH RESPECT TO ANY OF THE INFORMATION.

Without limiting any of the foregoing and to the maximum extent permitted by law, in no event shall ISS have any liability regarding any of the Information for any direct, indirect, special, punitive, consequential (including lost profits), or any other damages even if notified of the possibility of such damages. The foregoing shall not exclude or limit any liability that may not by applicable law be excluded or limited.

»»»»»»

---

Item 8. Portfolio Managers of Closed End Management Investment Companies.

As of March 9, 2012, Bassett S. Winmill is the portfolio manager of the registrant. He has served as the portfolio manager of the registrant since 2009. Mr. Winmill is also the Chief Investment Strategist of the investment manager of the registrant and the portfolio manager of Midas Magic, Inc. He is the Chairman of the Board of Winmill & Co. Incorporated (“WCI”) and is a member of the New York Society of Security Analysts, the Association for Investment Management and Research, and the International Society of Financial Analysts.

As of December 31, 2011, the portfolio manager compensation plan generally consists of base salary, employee benefits plan participation, qualified retirement plan participation, annual and asset level bonuses, certain prerequisites, and participation in equity based compensation plans. A portion of the portfolio manager’s compensation may be deferred based on criteria established by the investment manager, or at the election of the portfolio manager.

The portfolio manager’s base salary is determined annually by level of responsibility and tenure at the investment manager or its affiliates. The primary components of the portfolio manager’s annual bonus are based on (i) number of weeks’ salary paid as annual bonuses to employees generally of the investment manager and its affiliates, and (ii) the financial performance of the investment manager and its affiliates. A subjective component of the portfolio manager’s annual bonus is based on the portfolio manager’s overall contribution to management of the investment manager and its affiliates. Portfolio managers may receive an asset level bonus upon assets under management of the registrant, the other investment companies advised by the investment manager and its affiliates reaching certain levels. The portfolio manager also is compensated under equity-based compensation plans linked to increases or decreases in the market value of the stock of the parent of the investment manager and its affiliates.

The portfolio manager compensation plan may give rise to potential conflicts of interest. A portfolio manager’s base pay tends to increase with additional and more complex responsibilities often reflecting increased assets under management and marketing efforts, which together indirectly link compensation to sales of Fund shares. The asset level bonus, although intended to encourage above average investment performance and account servicing, as well as lower expense ratios may give rise to potential conflicts of interest by linking compensation to sales. The management of multiple Funds and accounts (including proprietary accounts) may give rise to potential conflicts of interest if the Funds and accounts have different objectives, benchmarks, time horizons, and fees as the portfolio manager must allocate his time and investment ideas across multiple Funds and accounts. The portfolio manager may execute transactions for one Fund or account that may adversely impact the value of securities held by another Fund. Securities selected for one Fund or accounts rather than another Fund may outperform the securities selected for the Fund. The management of personal accounts may give rise to potential conflicts of interest; there is no assurance that the Funds’ codes of ethics will adequately address such conflicts.

The following table provides information relating to other (non-registrant) accounts where the portfolio manager is jointly or primarily responsible for day-to-day management as of December 31, 2011. The portfolio manager does not manage accounts or assets with performance-based advisory fees, or other pooled investment vehicles.

Number of Registered Investment Companies	Assets (millions)
---	-------------------

4	\$158
---	-------

Assets (millions)

Number of Other  
Accounts

0                      \$0

As of March 9, 2012, Bassett S. Winmill did not beneficially own any shares of the registrant. Bassett S. Winmill may be deemed to have indirect beneficial ownership of 638,588 registrant shares as a result of his status as a controlling person of WCI and Midas Securities Group, Inc., the direct beneficial owner. Mr. Winmill disclaims beneficial ownership of the registrant shares held by Midas Securities Group, Inc.

Item 9. Purchases of Equity Securities by Closed-End Management Investment Company and Affiliated Purchasers.

Not applicable.

Item 10. Submission of Matters to a Vote of Security Holders.

There were no material changes to the procedures by which shareholders may recommend nominees to the registrant's board of directors made or implemented after the registrant last provided disclosure in response to the requirements of Item 407(c)(2)(iv) of Regulation S-K (17 CFR 229.407), or this Item.

Item 11. Controls and Procedures.

- (a) The registrant's principal executive officer and principal financial officer have concluded that the registrant's disclosure controls and procedures (as defined in Rule 30a-3(c) under the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended (the "1940 Act")) are effective as of a date within 90 days of the filing date of this report that includes the disclosure required by this paragraph, based on their evaluation of the disclosure controls and procedures required by Rule 30a-3(b) under the 1940 Act and 15d-15(b) under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.
- (b) There were no changes in the registrant's internal control over financial reporting (as defined in Rule 30a-3(d) under the 1940 Act) that occurred during the registrant's second fiscal quarter of the period covered by the report that have materially affected, or are likely to materially affect the registrant's internal control over financial reporting.

Item 12. Exhibits.

- (a) Certifications pursuant to Rule 30a-2(a) under the Investment Company Act of 1940(17 CFR 270.360a-2) attached hereto as Exhibits EX-31 and certifications pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 1350, as adopted pursuant to Section 906 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 attached hereto as Exhibit EX-32.

#### SIGNATURES

Pursuant to the requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and the Investment Company Act of 1940, the registrant has duly caused this report to be signed on its behalf by the undersigned, thereunto duly authorized.

Edgar Filing: FOXBY CORP. - Form N-CSR

Foxby Corp.

March 9, 2012

By: /s/ Thomas B. Winmill  
Thomas B. Winmill  
President

Foxby Corp.

March 9, 2012

By: /s/ Thomas O'Malley  
Thomas O'Malley  
Chief Financial Officer

Pursuant to the requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and the Investment Company Act of 1940, the registrant has duly caused this report to be signed below by the following persons on behalf of the registrant and in the capacities and on the dates indicated.

Foxby Corp.

March 9, 2012

By: /s/ Thomas B. Winmill  
Thomas B. Winmill  
President

Foxby Corp.

March 9, 2012

By: /s/ Thomas O'Malley  
Thomas O'Malley  
Chief Financial Officer