I demonstrate that, during the 2018-2023 period, companies with dissatisfied shareholders (e.g., those with low support rates at shareholder meetings) evade shareholder scrutiny in several ways: They are more inclined to conduct virtual meetings rather than in-person ones, less likely to choose to respond to questions submitted by shareholders at virtual meetings, and more likely to explicitly limit the scope of questions they are willing to address. When these practices are employed, shareholder meetings are briefer and allocate less time to addressing shareholders' questions. In instances where meetings are held virtually, both the post-meeting abnormal volume and the number of tweets are smaller, suggesting that less meaningful information is conveyed to the market in such meetings. My paper shows that virtual meetings have limited shareholders voice because companies chose to design shareholder meetings in a way that limits shareholders’ voice.