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Item 8.01 Other Events.

On September 5, 2023, Grayscale Investments, LLC, the sponsor (the “Sponsor”) of Grayscale Bitcoin Trust (BTC) (the “Trust”) delivered a comment letter to the Securities Exchange Commission (“SEC”) with important information to consider as it decides on next steps after the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals granted the Sponsor’s petition and vacated the SEC’s order, as further described below, on August 29, 2023.

In October 2021, NYSE Arca filed a proposal with the SEC pursuant to Rule 19b-4 under the Exchange Act for a rule change to list the shares of the Trust on NYSE Arca as an exchange traded product, and on June 29, 2022, the SEC issued a final order disapproving NYSE Arca’s proposed rule change. On June 29, 2022, the Sponsor filed a petition for review of the SEC’s final order in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. On August 29, 2023, the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals granted the Sponsor’s petition and vacated the SEC’s order.

A copy of the comment letter and blog post announcing delivery of the comment letter are attached to this Current Report as Exhibits 99.1 and 99.2, respectively.

Item 9.01 Financial Statements and Exhibits.

(d) Exhibits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>Grayscale Bitcoin Trust (BTC) Comment Letter to the SEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>Blog Post Announcing a New Comment Letter from Grayscale Investments to the SEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Cover Page Interactive Data File (the cover page XBRL tags are embedded within the inline XBRL document)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pursuant to the requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the registrant has duly caused this report to be signed on its behalf by the undersigned thereunto duly authorized.

Grayscale Investments, LLC as Sponsor of Grayscale Bitcoin Trust (BTC)

Date: September 5, 2023

By: /s/ Michael Sonnenshein
Michael Sonnenshein
Chief Executive Officer
September 5, 2023

Re: Grayscale Bitcoin Trust
    File No. SR-NYSEArca-2021-90

Haoxiang Zhu, Director, Division of Trading and Markets
Megan Barbero, General Counsel
Vanessa Countyman, Secretary
Securities and Exchange Commission
100 F Street, NE
Washington, DC 20549

Dear Mr. Zhu, Ms. Barbero and Ms. Countyman:

On behalf of our client Grayscale Investments, LLC, sponsor of Grayscale Bitcoin Trust (BTC) (OTCQX:GBTC) (the “Trust”), we would appreciate the opportunity to meet with the staff of the Securities and Exchange Commission as soon as practical to discuss the way forward in view of recent developments in the Trust’s ongoing effort to convert to an exchange-traded product (“ETP”).

On June 29, 2022, the Commission disapproved a proposed rule change filed by NYSE Arca, Inc. pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (as amended, the “Exchange Act”) and Rule 19b-4 thereunder seeking to list and trade shares of the Trust.1 Grayscale thereafter sought review of the Commission’s decision in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit pursuant to Section 25(a) of the Exchange Act, and on August 29, 2023 the Court of Appeals vacated the Commission’s disapproval order.2

After the Commission has had the opportunity to fully analyze the court’s opinion in light of the record, including the reasons for rejection set forth in the vacated order as well as the evidence and arguments put forward by Grayscale, NYSE Arca and public commenters, we believe the Commission should conclude that there are no grounds for treating the Trust differently from ETPs that invest in bitcoin futures contracts traded on the Chicago Mercantile Exchange (“CME”) whose Rule 19b-4 filings the Commission has previously approved, and therefore move expeditiously to approve the Trust’s Rule 19b-4 filing as well.3

If any other reason could be offered in attempting to differentiate spot bitcoin ETPs from bitcoin futures ETPs—whether based on the Exchange Act’s requirement that rules be “designed to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices”4 or otherwise—we are confident that it would have surfaced by now in one of the fifteen Commission orders that rejected spot bitcoin Rule 19b-4 filings even after bitcoin futures ETPs began trading.5 Grayscale first raised this issue almost two years ago (before all but one of these

---

disapproval orders), explaining why a rejection of its Rule 19b-4 filing would not be justifiable once the Commission determined it was able to approve bitcoin futures ETPs under the controlling standard in Section 6(b)(5) of the Exchange Act.6

But now that the Court of Appeals has spoken, there is no available rationale that would distinguish a bitcoin futures ETP from a spot bitcoin ETP under the legal analysis previously adopted by the Commission in rejecting spot bitcoin ETPs. This is because, as the Commission has consistently explained:

[A]n exchange that lists bitcoin-based ETPs can meet its obligations under Exchange Act Section 6(b)(5) by demonstrating that the exchange has a comprehensive surveillance-sharing agreement with a regulated market of significant size related to the underlying or reference bitcoin assets.7

This is the test, and the Court of Appeals unequivocally determined that it is met:

Grayscale has demonstrated its proposed bitcoin ETP is materially similar, across relevant regulatory factors, to the approved bitcoin futures ETPs. First, the underlying assets—bitcoin and bitcoin futures—are closely correlated. And second, the surveillance sharing agreements with the CME are identical and should have the same likelihood of detecting fraudulent or manipulative conduct in the market for bitcoin and bitcoin futures.8

---


8 Grayscale Inv., LLC v. SEC, supra note 2, slip op. at 11.
The Trust’s Rule 19b-4 filing has now been pending for nearly three times the length permitted for Commission action under Section 19(b) of the Exchange Act. NYSE Arca originally filed the Trust’s proposed rule change on October 19, 2021, and the Commission published it in the Federal Register on November 8, 2021, as required by Section 19(b)(1). Under Section 19(b)(2)(A)(i), publication started a 45-day clock for the Commission to approve or disapprove, or institute proceedings to determine whether to approve or disapprove. Section 19(b)(2)(A)(ii) gave the Commission power to extend this period by an additional 45 days, until February 6, 2022, and the Commission exercised that extension power on December 15, 2021. Thereafter, on February 4, 2022, the Commission instituted proceedings under Section 19(b)(2)(B), wherein the agency was obligated to approve or disapprove by May 7, 2022 (180 days after the original November 8, 2021 publication date), subject to an ability to extend the final deadline by up to 60 days. On May 4, 2022, the Commission fully extended its deadline, and on June 29, 2022, it disapproved the filing—a week shy of the maximum eight months allotted by Congress for final action.

And so the Commission’s review of the Trust’s Rule 19b-4 filing has now driven on significantly longer than the time allowed by Section 19(b). Per Section 19(b)(2)(D), a proposed rule change is deemed approved by the Commission if the agency does not issue an order one way or the other within the statutory timeframe. We question whether a disapproval order that is later vacated in full by the Court of Appeals can fulfill the Commission’s obligation to act within the timeframe needed to avoid deemed approval under Section 19(b)(2)(D). But assuming deemed approval does not apply—at least when the Commission promptly revisits the filing in light of the court’s reasoning—we believe the Commission should take three points into account as it considers next steps.

- **First**, each day that passes without listing the Trust’s shares on NYSE Arca is another day when the Trust’s existing investors bear unjustified harm in the form of shares that trade at a substantial discount to net asset value. This harm could be avoided if the Trust were treated the same as the bitcoin futures ETPs whose Rule 19b-4 filings the Commission has already approved. Indeed, on the day the Court of Appeals announced its decision, the discount tightened by more than 600 basis points in anticipation of eventual Rule 19b-4 approval, representing more than $2 billion in value returned to investors in a single trading session—which even then was more than $3 billion below the Trust’s net asset value, where it would trade if it had approval to operate as an ETP.9

- **Second**, U.S. investors seeking access to regulated bitcoin investment products should not be forced into less efficient and more complicated product structures simply because these are the only product types yet to gain Commission approval. Spot-based ETPs are strongly preferred by investors, as evidenced by their commercial success with other commodities like gold. Each day that passes, investors and spot bitcoin product issuers like Grayscale incur competitive harm by not benefiting from the treatment accorded to bitcoin futures ETPs—which, unlike Grayscale, can grow their assets under management using the time-tested ETP wrapper. As a concrete illustration of this harm, on the day of the Court of Appeals decision, a bitcoin futures ETP10 benefited from net inflows representing an increase of more than 800% above its average daily net fund flows during the preceding 30-day period. It is more than reasonable to assume that the Trust would have attracted a substantial portion of this investment capital had it too been operating as an ETP on that day.

- **Third**, in the past few weeks the Commission has received Rule 19b-4 filings relating to several proposed spot bitcoin ETPs, each of which seeks to compete with the Trust.11 As noted in

---

9 Source: Bloomberg L.P.
10 ProShares Bitcoin Strategy ETF; source: Bloomberg L.P.
Grayscale’s comment letters responding to these filings, the listing exchange in each proposes to enter into a surveillance-sharing agreement with a major U.S. spot bitcoin trading venue. Grayscale’s letters explain that the Commission’s prior bitcoin futures ETP approval orders make clear that a surveillance-sharing agreement with the CME alone is sufficient to satisfy Section 6(b)(5) for bitcoin futures ETPs. As a result, and following the reasoning of the Court of Appeals, we believe the Commission may not now impose an additional, new requirement on spot bitcoin ETPs for a surveillance-sharing agreement with a spot bitcoin market.

The Trust is ready to operate as an ETP upon Commission approval. And so we hope you will agree that the best use of resources now is for the Commission to issue an order approving NYSE Arca’s Rule 19b-4 filing and authorize the staff to work with Grayscale and NYSE Arca to finalize the prompt listing of the Trust’s shares. We believe the Trust’s nearly one million investors deserve this fair playing field as quickly as possible.

We look forward to discussing the foregoing with the Commission and its staff. Please contact me at (212) 450-4565 or Hillary Coleman at (212) 450-4733.

Very truly yours,

Joseph A. Hall

cc: Michael Sonnenshein, Chief Executive Officer, Grayscale Investments, LLC
    Craig Salm, Chief Legal Officer, Grayscale Investments, LLC
    Donald B. Verrilli, Jr., Munger, Tolles & Olson LLP
    Hillary Coleman, Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP


13 Grayscale Invs., LLC v. SEC, supra note 2, slip op. at 11 (“[T]he surveillance sharing agreements with the CME are identical and should have the same likelihood of detecting fraudulent or manipulative conduct in the market for bitcoin and bitcoin futures.”).
New Comment Letter from Grayscale’s Legal Team

As of 09/05/2023

On August 29, 2023, a panel of the Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit unanimously vacated the SEC’s June 2022 denial of Grayscale Bitcoin Trust’s (GBTC) conversion to a spot bitcoin ETF. This is a significant milestone in GBTC’s conversion – a win celebrated by GBTC shareholders, the Grayscale team, and the Bitcoin, Crypto, and investment communities more broadly.

Today, following its review of the Court’s Opinion, our legal team and counsel at Davis Polk & Wardwell and Munger Tolles & Olsen delivered a letter to the SEC with important information to consider as it decides on next steps.

There are a few key quotes worth highlighting from the letter:

- *If any other reason could be offered in attempting to differentiate spot bitcoin ETPs from bitcoin futures ETPs—whether based on the Exchange Act’s requirement that rules be “designed to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices” or otherwise—we are confident that it would have surfaced by now in one of the fifteen Commission orders that rejected spot bitcoin Rule 19b-4 filings even after bitcoin futures ETPs began trading.*

- *The Trust’s Rule 19b-4 filing has now been pending for nearly three times the length permitted for Commission action under Section 19(b) of the Exchange Act. […] And so the Commission’s review of the Trust’s Rule 19b-4 filing has now driven on significantly longer than the time allowed by Section 19(b).*

Grayscale’s legal team also provides three points that they believe the SEC should take into account as it considers next steps, and concludes the letter with the following statement: “And so we hope you will agree that the best use of resources now is for the Commission to issue an order approving NYSE Arca’s Rule 19b-4 filing and authorize the staff to work with Grayscale and NYSE Arca to finalize the prompt listing of the Trust’s shares. We believe the Trust’s nearly one million investors deserve this fair playing field as quickly as possible.”
GBTC is ready to operate as an ETF upon regulatory approval, and Grayscale and its investors look forward to more information from the SEC.

You can download the comment letter here.

1 We use the generic term “ETF” to refer to exchange-traded investment vehicles, including those that are required to register under the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended (the “‘40 Act”), as well as other exchange-traded products which are not subject to the registration requirements of the ‘40 Act.

ARTICLE DISCLOSURES

Investments in digital assets are speculative investments that involve high degrees of risk, including a partial or total loss of invested funds. Investments in digital assets are not suitable for any investor that cannot afford loss of the entire investment.

All content is original and produced by Grayscale Investments, LLC (“Grayscale”) unless otherwise stated herein. No part of this content may be reproduced in any form, or referred to in any other publication, without the express consent of Grayscale.

This information should not be relied upon as research, investment advice, or a recommendation regarding any products, strategies, or any investment in particular. This material is strictly for illustrative, educational, or informational purposes and is subject to change. This content does not constitute an offer to sell or the solicitation of an offer to sell or buy any security in any jurisdiction where such an offer or solicitation would be illegal. There is not enough information contained in this content to make an investment decision and any information contained herein should not be used as a basis for this purpose.

This content does not constitute a recommendation or take into account the particular investment objectives, financial situations, or needs of investors.
Investors are not to construe this content as legal, tax or investment advice, and should consult their own advisors concerning an investment in digital assets. The price and value of assets referred to in this content and the income from them may fluctuate. Past performance is not indicative of the future performance of any assets referred to herein. Fluctuations in exchange rates could have adverse effects on the value or price of, or income derived from, certain investments.