

NUVEEN PREMIUM INCOME MUNICIPAL FUND INC  
Form N-CSR  
January 06, 2014

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 811-05570

Nuveen Premium Income Municipal Fund, Inc.  
(Exact name of registrant as specified in charter)

Nuveen Investments  
333 West Wacker Drive  
Chicago, IL 60606  
(Address of principal executive offices) (Zip code)

Kevin J. McCarthy  
Nuveen Investments  
333 West Wacker Drive  
Chicago, IL 60606  
(Name and address of agent for service)

Registrant's telephone number, including area code: (312) 917-7700

Date of fiscal year end: October 31

Date of reporting period: October 31, 2013

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 270.30e-1). The Commission may use the information provided on Form N-CSR in its regulatory, disclosure review, inspection, and policymaking 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 currently 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 the clearance requirements of 44 U.S.C. ss. 3507.

ITEM 1. REPORTS TO STOCKHOLDERS.

---

Life is Complex

Nuveen makes things e-simple.

It only takes a minute to sign up for e-Reports. Once enrolled, you'll receive an e-mail as soon as your Nuveen Investments Fund information is ready—no more waiting for delivery by regular mail. Just click on the link within the e-mail to see the report and save it on your computer if you wish.

Free e-Reports right to your e-mail!

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

If you receive your Nuveen Fund dividends and statements from your financial advisor or brokerage account.

or

[www.nuveen.com/accountaccess](http://www.nuveen.com/accountaccess)

If you receive your Nuveen Fund dividends and statements directly from Nuveen.

---

Table of Contents

Chairman’s Letter to Shareholders	4
Portfolio Managers’ Comments	5
Fund Leverage	10
Common Share Information	12
Risk Considerations	14
Performance Overview Holding Summaries	15
Shareholder Meeting Report	18
Report of Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm	19
Portfolios of Investments	20
Statement of Assets and Liabilities	70
Statement of Operations	71
Statement of Changes in Net Assets	72
Statement of Cash Flows	73
Financial Highlights	74
Notes to Financial Statements	79
Board Members & Officers	88
Annual Investment Management Agreement Approval Process	93
Reinvest Automatically, Easily and Conveniently	101
Glossary of Terms Used in this Report	102
Additional Fund Information	107

Nuveen Investments

3

Chairman's Letter to Shareholders

Dear Shareholders,

I am pleased to have this opportunity to introduce myself to you as the new independent chairman of the Nuveen Fund Board, effective July 1, 2013. I am honored to have been selected as chairman, with its primary responsibility to serve the interests of the Nuveen Fund shareholders. My predecessor, Robert Bremner, was the first independent director to serve as chairman of the Board and I, and my fellow Board members, plan to continue his legacy of strong independent oversight of your funds.

The global economy has hit major turning points over the last several months to a year. The developed world is gradually recovering from their financial crisis while the emerging markets appear to be struggling with the downshift of China's growth potential. Japan is entering a new era of growth after decades of economic stagnation and many of the Eurozone nations appear to be exiting their recession. Despite the positive events, there are still potential risks. Middle East tensions, rising oil prices, defaults in Europe and fallout from the financial stress in emerging markets could all reverse the recent progress in the global economy.

On the domestic front, recent events such as the Federal Reserve decision to slow down its bond buying program beginning in January of 2014 and the federal budget compromise that would guide government spending into 2015 are both positives for the economy moving forward. Corporate fundamentals are strong as earnings per share and corporate cash are at the highest level in two decades. Unemployment is trending down and the housing market has experienced a rebound, each assisting the positive economic scenario. However, there are some issues to be watched. Interest rates are expected to increase but significant uncertainty about the timing remains. Partisan politics in Washington D.C. with their troublesome outcome add to the uncertainties that could cause problems for the economy going forward.

In the near term, governments are focused on economic recovery and the growth of their economies, which could lead to an environment of attractive investment opportunities. Over the long term, the uncertainties mentioned earlier could hinder the potential growth. Because of this, Nuveen's investment management teams work hard to balance return and risk with a range of investment strategies. I encourage you to read the following commentary on the management of your fund.

On behalf of the other members of the Nuveen Fund Board, we look forward to continuing to earn your trust in the months and years ahead.

Sincerely,

William J. Schneider  
Chairman of the Nuveen Fund Board  
December 23, 2013

## Portfolio Managers' Comments

Nuveen Premium Income Municipal Fund, Inc. (NPI)  
Nuveen Premium Income Municipal Fund 2, Inc. (NPM)  
Nuveen Premium Income Municipal Fund 4, Inc. (NPT)

These Funds feature management by Nuveen Asset Management, LLC, an affiliate of Nuveen Investments. Portfolio managers Paul L. Brennan, CFA, and Christopher L. Drahn, CFA, discuss U.S. economic and municipal market conditions, key investment strategies and the twelve-month performance of these three national Funds. Paul has managed NPI and NPM since 2006 and Chris assumed portfolio management responsibility for NPT in 2011.

What factors affected the U.S. economy and the national municipal market during the twelve-month reporting period ended October 31, 2013?

During this reporting period, the U.S. economy's progress toward recovery from recession continued at a moderate pace. The Federal Reserve (Fed) maintained its efforts to improve the overall economic environment by holding the benchmark fed funds rate at the record low level of zero to 0.25% that it established in December 2008. The Fed also continued its monthly purchases of \$40 billion of mortgage-backed securities and \$45 billion of longer-term Treasury securities in an open-ended effort to bolster growth and promote progress toward the Fed's mandates of maximum employment and price stability. At its June 2013 meeting, the Fed indicated that it believed downside risks to the economy had diminished since the autumn of 2012. Subsequent comments by Fed Chairman Ben Bernanke suggested that the Fed might begin to reduce, or taper, its asset purchase program later in 2013. However, in September 2013, the Fed surprised the market by announcing that it had decided to wait for more evidence that the progress it discerned in June was sustainable before it made any adjustments to the pace of the purchase program. At its October 2013 meeting, the central bank reiterated this decision and said that it expected to continue its "highly accommodative stance of monetary policy" for "a considerable time" after the purchase program ends and the economic recovery strengthens. Finally, in December of 2013, the Fed announced a decision to slow down its bond buying program beginning in January of 2014.

In the third quarter of 2013, the U.S. economy, as measured by the U.S. gross domestic product (GDP), grew at an annualized rate of 2.8%, up from 2.5% for the second quarter of 2013, continuing the pattern of positive economic growth for the tenth consecutive quarter. The Consumer Price Index (CPI) rose 1.0% year-over-year as of October 2013, while the core CPI (which excludes food and energy) increased 1.7% during the same period, staying within the Fed's unofficial objective of 2.0% or lower for this inflation measure. Improvements in the labor markets continued to be slow, and unemployment remained above the Fed's target of 6.5%. As of October 2013, the national unemployment rate was 7.3%, up from 7.2% in September 2013 but below the 7.9% reported in October 2012. The slight uptick in October's

Certain statements in this report are forward-looking statements. Discussions of specific investments are for illustration only and are not intended as recommendations of individual investments. The forward-looking statements and other views expressed herein are those of the portfolio managers as of the date of this report. Actual future results or occurrences may differ significantly from those anticipated in any forward-looking statements, and the views expressed herein are subject to change at any time, due to numerous market and other factors. The Funds disclaim any obligation to update publicly or revise any forward-looking statements or views expressed herein.

Ratings shown are the highest rating given by one of the following national rating agencies: Standard & Poor's (S&P), Moody's Investors Service (Moody's), Inc. or Fitch, Inc. (Fitch). Credit ratings are subject to change. AAA, AA, A, and

BBB are investment grade ratings; BB, B, CCC, CC, C and D are below investment grade ratings. Certain bonds backed by U.S. government or agency securities are regarded as having an implied rating equal to the rating of such securities. Holdings designated N/R are not rated by these national rating agencies.

Nuveen Investments

5

---

Portfolio Managers' Comments (continued)

number reflected the increase in federal employees furloughed due to the government shutdown that month. The housing market continued to deliver good news, as the average home price in the S&P/Case-Shiller index of 20 major metropolitan areas rose 13.3% for the twelve months ended September 2013 (most recent data available at the time this report was prepared), the largest twelve-month percentage gain for the index since February 2006.

Early in this reporting period, the outlook for the U.S. economy was clouded by uncertainty about global financial markets and the outcome of the "fiscal cliff." The tax consequences of the fiscal cliff situation were averted through a last-minute deal that raised payroll taxes, but left in place a number of tax breaks, including tax exemptions on municipal bond interest. However, lawmakers failed to reach a resolution on \$1.2 trillion in spending cuts intended to address the federal budget deficit. This triggered a program of automatic spending cuts (or sequestration) that impacted federal programs beginning March 1, 2013. Although Congress later passed legislation that established federal funding levels for the remainder of fiscal 2013, the federal budget for fiscal 2014 continued to be debated. On October 1, 2013, the start date for fiscal 2014, the federal government shut down for 16 days until an interim appropriations bill was signed into law, funding the government at sequestration levels through January 15, 2014, and suspending the debt limit until February 7, 2014. Subsequent to the close of this reporting period, Congress preliminarily passed a federal budget deal that would guide government spending into 2015 and defuse the chances of another shutdown if it wins final passage. In addition to the ongoing political debate over federal spending, Chairman Bernanke's June 2013 remarks about tapering the Fed's asset purchase program touched off widespread uncertainty about the next step for the Fed's quantitative easing program and about the potential impact on the economy and financial markets, leading to increased market volatility. This was compounded by headline credit stories involving Detroit's bankruptcy filing in July 2013, the largest municipal bankruptcy in history, and the disappointing news that continued to come out of Puerto Rico, where a struggling economy and years of deficit spending and borrowing resulted in downgrades on the commonwealth's bonds.

While municipal bond prices generally rallied during the first part of this reporting period, as strong demand and tight supply created favorable municipal market conditions, we saw the environment shift during the second half of the reporting period. The Treasury market traded off, the municipal market followed suit, and spreads widened as investor concern grew. This unsettled environment prompted increased selling by bondholders across the fixed income markets. Following the Fed's September decision to delay tapering, we saw some stabilization of municipal bond fund flows and an October rally in municipal bond prices. However, for the reporting period as a whole, municipal bond prices generally declined, especially at the longer end of the maturity spectrum, while interest rates rose. At the same time, fundamentals on municipal bonds remained strong, as state governments made good progress in dealing with budget issues. Due to strong growth in personal tax collections, state tax revenues have increased for 15 consecutive quarters, while on the expense side, the states made headway in cutting and controlling costs, with more than 40 states implementing some type of pension reform. The current level of municipal issuance reflects the present political distaste for additional borrowing by state and local governments facing fiscal constraints and the prevalent atmosphere of municipal budget austerity. Over the twelve months ended October 31, 2013, municipal bond issuance nationwide totaled \$335.2 billion, a decrease of 11.7% from the issuance for the twelve-month period ended October 31, 2012.



What key strategies were used to manage these Funds during the twelve-month reporting period ended October 31, 2013?

As the municipal market environment shifted during this reporting period, from one characterized by heavy bond calls, tight supply and lower yields to one marked by increased market volatility and rising rates, we continued to take a bottom-up approach to discovering sectors that appeared undervalued as well as individual credits that had the potential to perform well over the long term.

During this reporting period, NPI and NPM found value in various areas of the market, including health care, transportation, and water and sewer. A number of new health care issues that we considered attractively priced enabled us to add to the Funds' exposure. We also purchased bonds issued for tollroads in Virginia, Illinois, Florida, Ohio and the Grand Parkway in Houston, Texas, which, when completed, will be the longest beltway in the U.S., at 184 miles. Also in the transportation sector, we bought airport credits issued for Dallas/Fort Worth, Miami and Denver. In addition, we added a new issue of Lehigh County Authority (Pennsylvania) water bonds. In anticipation of bond calls affecting our holdings of Louisiana and Washington tobacco credits, we also purchased tobacco bonds from other issuers in order to keep our tobacco exposure relatively stable. During the summer, as the market sold off, we were able to find these bonds at attractive prices in the secondary market.

In NPT, we also were active in areas where we saw value. During this reporting period, we slightly increased NPT's exposure to hospitals and the transportation sector. Purchases included many of the same names utilized by NPI and NPM. Other notable additions included bonds issued by the New York Metropolitan Transportation Authority, Miami-Dade County Water & Sewer revenue bonds and a Louisiana Public Facilities coal export terminal financing. NPT also employed strategies intended to enhance the Fund's positioning and potentially increase its income distribution. Many of the bonds we added to our portfolio in 2012 and early 2013 were purchased at premiums. Because tax laws require that these premiums be amortized, this reduces the amount of income available for distribution from the coupon. By swapping or repositioning into different bonds in a rising interest rate environment, the expense of amortization basically is converted into a capital loss, so that more of the income from the coupon can be distributed to shareholders. An additional benefit of this strategy was the generation of tax loss carryforwards that can be used to offset future capital gains.

Our focus during the reporting period was on maintaining the Funds' positioning, as we believed they were well situated for the existing environment. During the market sell-off, we took advantage of attractive opportunities to slightly increase the Funds' credit and duration profiles in light of our view that credit fundamentals generally continued to improve. As interest rates rose, NPI and NPM focused their purchases on bonds with maturities of 20 years and longer, while NPT emphasized maturities between 15 and 30 years. In both cases, this enabled us to take advantage of more attractive yields at the longer end of the municipal yield curve. During the reporting period, all three Funds increased their exposure to the single-A-rated sector, which we believed offered the best credit opportunities.

Although certain Funds engaged in a number of repositioning trades as rates rose, activity during this reporting period was still driven primarily by the reinvestment of proceeds from called and matured bonds, which was aimed at keeping the Funds fully invested and supporting their income streams. During the early part of this reporting period, we continued to experience a number of current bond calls resulting from a growth in refinancings, which provided a meaningful source of liquidity. As interest rates rose, refinancing activity declined. To generate cash for purchases, we sold selected holdings when we found better opportunities in the marketplace.

As of October 31, 2013, all three of these Funds continued to use inverse floating rate securities. We employ inverse floaters for a variety of reasons, including duration management, income enhancement and total return enhancement.



Portfolio Managers' Comments (continued)

How did the Funds perform during the twelve-month reporting period ended October 31, 2013?

The tables in each Fund's Performance Overview and Holding Summaries section of this report provide the Funds' total returns for the one-year, five-year and ten-year periods ended October 31, 2013. Each Fund's returns are compared with the performance of a corresponding market index and Lipper classification average.

For the twelve months ended October 31, 2013, the total returns on common share net asset value (NAV) for NPI, NPM and NPT underperformed the return for the national S&P Municipal Bond Index. For the same period, all three Funds exceeded the average return for the Lipper General & Insured Leveraged Municipal Debt Funds Classification Average.

Key management factors that influenced the Funds' returns during this reporting period included duration and yield curve positioning, credit exposure and sector allocation. In addition, the use of regulatory leverage was an important factor affecting the performance of these Funds. Leverage is discussed in more detail later in this report.

As interest rates rose and the yield curve steepened, municipal bonds with shorter maturities generally outperformed those with longer maturities. Overall, credits with maturities of five years or less posted the best returns during this reporting period, while bonds at the longest end of the municipal yield curve produced the weakest results. In general, differences in duration and yield curve positioning were the major drivers of differences in performance. Among these Funds, NPI was more advantageously positioned in terms of duration and yield curve, which helped its performance, while NPM and NPT had less exposure to the outperforming short end of the yield curve and greater exposure to the longer parts of the curve that underperformed.

Credit exposure also factored into the Funds' performance, especially during the latter half of the reporting period, as events in the municipal market led investors to avoid risk. High yield bonds came under selling pressure and credit spreads, or the difference in yield spreads between U.S. Treasury securities and comparable investments such as municipal bonds, began to widen. For the reporting period, AAA-rated and AA-rated bonds generally outperformed A- and BBB-rated bonds. While these Funds tended to have heavy weightings in A-rated bonds, this was offset to some degree by their weightings of AAA- and AA-rated bonds. Overall, the impact of the Funds' credit exposure ranged from neutral to slightly positive for the reporting period.

After underperforming for many months, pre-refunded bonds, which are often backed by U.S. Treasury securities, were among the best performing market segments. The outperformance of these bonds can be attributed primarily to their shorter effective maturities and higher credit quality. As of October 31, 2013, these three Funds were similarly weighted in pre-refunded bonds, with NPI having the largest allocation. Housing, health care and general obligation (GO) bonds also tended to outperform the general municipal market. All of these Funds had strong exposure to the health care sector, especially NPT.

In contrast, revenue bonds as a whole underperformed the municipal market. Among the revenue sectors that lagged municipal market performance by the widest margins were transportation, water and sewer and electric utilities. NPI, NPM and NPT all had double-digit weightings in the transportation sector. Tobacco credits backed by the 1998 master tobacco settlement agreement also performed poorly, due in part to their longer effective durations and lower credit ratings. As of October 31, 2013, all of these Funds had similar exposures to tobacco bonds.

During this reporting period, two credit situations weighed on the municipal market. It is important to note that, while these situations received much attention from the media, they represented isolated events. On July 18, 2013, the City of Detroit filed for Chapter 9 bankruptcy. Detroit, burdened by decades of population loss, declines in the auto

manufacturing industry and significant tax base deterioration, has been under severe financial stress for an extended period. Detroit's bankruptcy filing will likely be a lengthy one, given the complexity of its debt portfolio, number of creditors, numerous union contracts and significant legal questions that must be addressed. Each of these three Funds had small

8 Nuveen Investments

---

holdings of Detroit water and sewer credits (NPT's exposure being the largest of the three Funds), which are supported by revenue streams generated by service fees. NPM and NPT also held Detroit limited tax obligation bonds for state aid backed by the state of Michigan. During this reporting period, the impact of these holdings on investment performance for each Fund due to the Detroit bankruptcy ranged from negligible to very small.

Another factor affecting the Funds' holdings was the downgrade of debt issued by Puerto Rico. In 2012, Moody's downgraded Puerto Rico GO bonds to Baa3 from Baa1, Puerto Rico Sales Tax Financing Corporation (COFINA) senior sales tax revenue bonds to Aa3 from Aa2 and COFINA subordinate sales tax revenue bonds to A3 from A1. In October 2013, Moody's further downgraded the COFINA senior sales tax bonds to A2, while affirming the subordinate bonds at A3. On November 14, 2013 (subsequent to the close of this reporting period), Fitch announced that it was placing the majority of Puerto Rico issuance—with the exception of the COFINA bonds—on negative credit watch, which implies that another downgrade may be likely. While Fitch currently rates Puerto Rico issuance at BBB-, it affirmed the ratings on COFINA bonds at AA- for the senior bonds and A+ for the subordinate bonds, with stable outlooks. On December 11, 2013 (subsequent to the close of this reporting period), Moody's announced that it also had placed its Baa3 rating on Puerto Rico GOs (and other Puerto Rico issues linked to the GO rating) on review for downgrade. These downgrades were based on Puerto Rico's ongoing economic problems and, in the case of the COFINA bonds, the impact of these problems on the projected growth of sales tax revenues. However, the COFINA bonds were able to maintain a higher credit rating than the GOs because, unlike the revenue streams supporting some Puerto Rican issues, the sales taxes supporting the COFINA bonds cannot be diverted and used to support Puerto Rico's GO bonds.

For the reporting period ended October 31, 2013, Puerto Rico paper underperformed the municipal market as a whole. NPI, NPM and NPT have limited exposure to Puerto Rico bonds, the majority of which are the sales tax bonds issued by COFINA, which we consider among the strongest of Puerto Rico credits. In addition, much of NPI's COFINA exposure was insured, which we believe adds a measure of value. NPT also previously held a position in insured Puerto Rico GO credits, which matured in July 2013 and is therefore no longer in the portfolio. Overall, the small nature of our exposure helped to limit the impact of the Puerto Rico bonds' underperformance on the Funds.

## Fund Leverage

## IMPACT OF THE FUNDS' LEVERAGE STRATEGIES ON PERFORMANCE

One important factor impacting the returns of the Funds relative to their comparative benchmarks was the Funds' use of leverage through their issuance of preferred shares and/or investments in inverse floating rate securities, which represent leveraged investments in underlying bonds. The Funds use leverage because our research has shown that, over time, leveraging provides opportunities for additional income, particularly in the recent market environment where short-term market rates are at or near historical lows, meaning that the short-term rates the Fund has been paying on its leveraging instruments have been much lower than the interest the Fund has been earning on its portfolio of long-term bonds that it has bought with the proceeds of that leverage. However, use of leverage also can expose the Fund to additional price volatility. When a Fund uses leverage, the Fund will experience a greater increase in its net asset value if the municipal bonds acquired through the use of leverage increase in value, but it will also experience a correspondingly larger decline in its net asset value if the bonds acquired through leverage decline in value, which will make the Fund's net asset value more volatile, and its total return performance more variable over time. In addition, income in levered funds will typically decrease in comparison to unlevered funds when short-term interest rates increase and increase when short-term interest rates decrease. Leverage made a negative contribution to the performance of these Funds over this reporting period.

As of October 31, 2013, the Funds' percentages of effective and regulatory leverage are shown in the accompanying table.

	NPI	NPM	NPT
Effective Leverage*	39.03%	39.78%	38.22%
Regulatory Leverage*	31.31%	32.57%	31.81%

\* Effective Leverage is a Fund's effective economic leverage, and includes both regulatory leverage and the leverage effects of certain derivative and other investments in a Fund's portfolio that increase the Fund's investment exposure. Currently, the leverage effects of Tender Option Bond (TOB) inverse floater holdings are included in effective leverage values, in addition to any regulatory leverage. Regulatory leverage consists of preferred shares issued or borrowings of a Fund. Both of these are part of a Fund's capital structure. Regulatory leverage is subject to asset coverage limits set forth in the Investment Company Act of 1940.

## THE FUNDS' REGULATORY LEVERAGE

As of October 31, 2013, the Funds have issued and outstanding Variable Rate MuniFund Term Preferred (VMTP) Shares and Variable Rate Demand Preferred (VRDP) Shares as shown in the accompanying table.

	VMTP Shares		VRDP Shares		Total
	Series	Shares Issued at Liquidation Value	Series	Shares Issued at Liquidation Value	
NPI	2015	\$ 407,000,000		\$ —	\$ 407,000,000
NPM	—	\$ —	1	\$ 489,500,000	\$ 489,500,000
NPT	—	\$ —	1	\$ 262,200,000	\$ 262,200,000



During the current reporting period, NPI successfully exchanged all of its outstanding 4,024 Shares of Series 2014 VMTP for 4,024 Shares of Series 2015 VMTP. Concurrent with this exchange, the Fund also issued an additional 46 shares, \$4,600,000 at liquidation value, of Series 2015 VMTP Shares. Both of these transactions were completed in privately negotiated offerings. The Fund completed the exchange offer in which it refinanced its existing VMTP Shares with new VMTP Shares with a term redemption date of December 1, 2015. The proceeds from the additional VMTP Shares were used to take advantage of opportunities in the current municipal market.

Refer to Notes to Financial Statements, Note 1 – General Information and Significant Accounting Policies for further details on VMTP and VRDP Shares.

Nuveen Investments

11

---



## Common Share Information

## COMMON SHARE DIVIDEND INFORMATION

During the current reporting period ended October 31, 2013, the Funds' monthly dividends to common shareholders were as shown in the accompanying table.

	Per Common Share Amounts		
	NPI	NPM	NPT
November	\$ 0.0765	\$ 0.0745	\$ 0.0710
December	0.0720	0.0720	0.0680
January	0.0720	0.0720	0.0680
February	0.0720	0.0720	0.0680
March	0.0720	0.0720	0.0680
April	0.0720	0.0720	0.0680
May	0.0720	0.0720	0.0680
June	0.0720	0.0720	0.0680
July	0.0720	0.0720	0.0680
August	0.0720		