

Supreme Court Considers Mutual Fund Whistleblowers

December 01, 2013

The U.S. Supreme Court heard oral arguments November 12 in the cases of two Fidelity whistleblowers claiming retaliation after they alleged deficiencies in mutual fund prospectus and shareholder report disclosure. The issue is whether certain Sarbanes-Oxley Act anti-retaliation protections apply to employees of *private*, as well as *public*, companies. An assistant Solicitor General argued the SEC's position that the protections apply to employees of private companies, including fund investment advisers. The rationale is that, otherwise, funds would not benefit from the anti-retaliation protections, because, as Justice Breyer put it, a fund "has virtually no employees and does all its work really through investment advisers" that are often private companies. Justices Kagan, Ginsburg, Roberts, and Scalia also recognized the SEC's position. For example, when the assistant SG pointed out that "investment advising . . . is the heart of what [private investment adviser] contractors of mutual funds do for mutual funds," Justice Scalia said, "I understand that." On the other side, Fidelity argued for non-applicability of the anti-retaliation protections, noting that the Act gave rule-making authority to implement the Act to the Department of Labor -- not the SEC. Justice Breyer said that this fact raised the question whether "it's the SEC we should defer to." Fidelity also emphasized the availability of other potent protections for whistleblowers, pointing to the Act's unrestricted imposition of *criminal* liability on "whoever shall retaliate against anybody who provides information to a law enforcement officer, which includes the SEC," as well as the anti-retaliation protections in the later-adopted Dodd-Frank Act. In fact, under Dodd-Frank, the SEC in October 2013 announced awards to whistleblowers of \$150,000 and \$14 million, which probably signals a building momentum for that program.

Authored By



Gary O. Cohen

Related Practices

Securities Litigation and Enforcement

©2024 Carlton Fields, P.A. Carlton Fields practices law in California through Carlton Fields, LLP. Carlton Fields publications should not be construed as legal advice on any specific facts or circumstances. The contents are intended for general information and educational purposes only, and should not be relied on as if it were advice about a particular fact situation. The distribution of this publication is not intended to create, and receipt of it does not constitute, an attorney-client relationship with Carlton Fields. This publication may not be quoted or referred to in any other publication or proceeding without the prior written consent of the firm, to be given or withheld at our discretion. To request reprint permission for any of our publications, please use our Contact Us form via the link below. The views set forth herein are the personal views of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of the firm. This site may contain hypertext links to information created and maintained by other entities. Carlton Fields does not control or guarantee the accuracy or completeness of this outside information, nor is the inclusion of a link to be intended as an endorsement of those outside sites.