

iclg

Business Crime 2025

15th Edition



Contributing Editor:

Joel M. Cohen

White & Case LLP

glg Global Legal Group

Expert Analysis Chapters

- 1** DOJ Enforcement Priorities and Outlook for 2024/2025
Joel M. Cohen & Marietou Diouf, White & Case LLP
- 7** The Business Crime Landscape
Aziz Rahman, Nicola Sharp & Syedur Rahman, Rahman Ravelli
- 18** APAC Overview
Dennis Miralis, Phillip Gibson & Jasmina Ceic, Nyman Gibson Miralis

Q&A Chapters

- 26** **Australia**
Tobin Meagher, Andrew Moore, William Stefanidis & Joy Chen, Clayton Utz
- 38** **Austria**
Michael Ibesich, IBESICH
- 49** **Brazil**
Joyce Roysen & Veridiana Vianna, Joyce Roysen Advogados
- 63** **China**
Jianmin (Ken) Dai, Zhisong (Jet) Deng & Hongwei (Rock) Ma, Beijing Dacheng Law Offices, LLP
- 73** **England & Wales**
Neil Swift, James Tyler & Joseph Duggin, Peters & Peters Solicitors LLP
- 84** **France**
Alexandre Bisch & Antoine Kirry, Debevoise & Plimpton LLP
- 95** **Germany**
Maximilian Ohrloff, Mathias Priewer, Friedrich Florian Steinert & Julia Vorländer, Hengeler Mueller
- 107** **Greece**
Ilias G. Anagnostopoulos & Jerina (Gerasimoula) Zapanti, Anagnostopoulos
- 118** **India**
Sumeet Kachwaha & Tara Shahani, Kachwaha & Partners
- 129** **Italy**
Roberto Pisano, Studio Legale Pisano
- 141** **Japan**
Kumpei Ohashi, Tsuyoshi Unemoto & Junichiro Akahori, Oh-Ebashi LPC & Partners
- 151** **Malaysia**
Lim Koon Huan & Manshan Singh, Skrine
- 162** **Romania**
Simona Enache-Pirtea & Mădălin Enache, ENACHE PIRTEA & Associates
- 173** **Serbia**
Vladimir Hrle, Hrle Attorneys
- 182** **Singapore**
Thong Chee Kun, Josephine Chee & Stephania Wong, Rajah & Tann Singapore LLP
- 191** **Slovenia**
Stojan Zdolšek, Zdolšek – Attorneys at Law
- 201** **Switzerland**
Dr. Florian Baumann, Dr. Roman Huber & Cristina Ess, Kellerhals Carrard Zürich KIG
- 217** **Thailand**
Krida Phoonwathu, Ittichai Prasongprasit, Supawat Srirungruang & Melisa Uremovic, Rajah & Tann (Thailand) Limited

Australia

Clayton Utz



Tobin Meagher



Andrew Moore



William Stefanidis



Joy Chen

1 General Criminal Law Enforcement

1.1 What authorities can prosecute business crimes, and are there different enforcement authorities at the national and regional levels?

Australia has a federal system of government. The Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions (CDPP) is the primary prosecution authority responsible for prosecuting both indictable and summary criminal offences of a business crime nature (which are usually offences under Commonwealth laws). Several federal law enforcement authorities including, but not limited to, the Australian Federal Police (AFP), the Australian Securities and Investments Commission (ASIC), the Australian Taxation Office (ATO), the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission (ACCC), the Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission (ACIC) and the National Anti-Corruption Commission (NACC) investigate and refer appropriate matters to the CDPP for potential criminal prosecution. Each State and Territory has its own prosecution authority and investigative agencies. They sometimes have overlapping roles with federal authorities as they also have the capacity to investigate and prosecute fraud, corruption, false accounting, and similar offences under the relevant State/Territory law.

1.2 If there is more than one set of enforcement agencies, how are decisions made regarding the body that will investigate and prosecute a matter?

Generally, the CDPP is responsible for prosecuting offences under Commonwealth laws, and State/Territory prosecution authorities are responsible for prosecuting offences under State/Territory laws.

As far as investigations are concerned, the law enforcement authority responsible for administering the legislation that creates the business crime will generally be responsible for investigating it. For example, ASIC, as the corporate regulator, is responsible for investigating criminal breaches of directors' duties or insider trading under the *Corporations Act 2001* (Cth).

At the Commonwealth level, where an authority administers legislation that creates an offence but does not have investigative powers, the matter is generally referred to the AFP for investigation. Furthermore, the AFP generally takes a role in investigations where it is necessary to utilise police powers such as the power of arrest and execution of search warrants.

1.3 Can multiple authorities investigate and enforce simultaneously?

Multiple authorities can simultaneously investigate suspected criminal activity, including working with each other (e.g. joint operations and information sharing) where matters give rise to different potential offences being investigated by different authorities. If an accused is charged with offences under both Commonwealth and State/Territory legislation, prosecuting authorities will usually arrange for a joint trial on an indictment containing both Commonwealth and State/Territory charges to avoid multiple parallel criminal proceedings.

1.4 Is there any civil or administrative enforcement against business crimes? If so, what agencies enforce the laws civilly and which crimes do they combat?

There are several statutes that provide for both civil and criminal enforcement of business crime. This is particularly relevant to matters investigated by ASIC, the ACCC and the ATO. For example:

- ASIC can investigate an alleged failure by a listed company to disclose price-sensitive information to the market as a possible crime, contravention of a civil penalty provision or as a matter in respect of which ASIC may issue an infringement notice; and
- the ACCC can investigate suspected cartel conduct as a possible crime or as a contravention of a civil penalty provision.

A civil penalty provision is one that imposes a standard of behaviour typically imposed by criminal law, but allows enforcement by civil process (and with a civil standard of proof). They are commonly found in statutes that create business crime offences. Contraventions of such provisions are pursued by the relevant law enforcement authority itself (and not the CDPP). Civil remedies include monetary penalties, injunctive relief, and compensation orders to provide reparations to victims.

Proceeds of crime legislation also enables both conviction-based and non-conviction-based forfeiture of the proceeds, or instruments, of the crime. There are also a range of administrative orders that can be made, such as orders disqualifying a person from managing a corporation, obtaining an enforceable undertaking or issuing an infringement notice.

The *Regulatory Powers (Standard Provisions) Act 2014* (Cth) provides for a suite of standard regulatory powers that certain federal agencies may invoke in respect of legislation they administer. This regulatory regime is intended to bolster the

relevant agency's monitoring and investigating powers, as well as enforcement powers through the use of civil penalties, infringement notices, enforceable undertakings and injunctions.

1.5 What are the major business crime cases in your jurisdiction in the past year?

In 2022 and 2023, two waste management businesses, Aussie Skips and Bingo Industries, and their respective former CEOs, pleaded guilty to criminal cartel offences. The cases concerned price-fixing for the supply of skip bins and processing services for building and demolition waste in Sydney, and were prosecuted by the CDPP following investigations by the ACCC. In February 2024, the Federal Court of Australia fined Aussie Skips \$3.5 million (with its former CEO fined \$75,000 and sentenced to 18 months' imprisonment to be served by way of an intensive correction order (ICO)) and fined Bingo Industries \$30 million (with its former CEO fined \$100,000 and sentenced to two 18-month imprisonment terms to be served by way of an ICO): *CDPP v Aussie Skips Bin Services Pty Ltd* [2024] FCA 122; *CDPP v Bingo Industries Pty Ltd* [2024] FCA 121.

In March 2023, in what is widely known as the "Plutus Payroll tax fraud", five individuals were convicted, following an 11-month trial, of conspiring to dishonestly cause a loss to the Commonwealth and of conspiring to deal with more than \$1 million in proceeds of crime. The case concerned the provision of payroll services by Plutus Payroll Australia between 2014 and 2017, during which tax payments due to the ATO were improperly diverted to third-party companies ultimately for the benefit of the conspirators. All five individuals have been sentenced, including the lawyer who helped orchestrate the scheme, who was sentenced to 14 years' imprisonment with a non-parole period of nine years. The four other individuals also received imprisonment terms, with non-parole periods of between five and 10 years; for example, see *R v Cranston* [2023] NSWSC 1004. Over \$105 million in taxes payable to the ATO was siphoned off by the conspirators, making it one of the largest tax fraud schemes in Australian history. The AFP-led investigation, code-named "Operation Elbrus", resulted in the convictions of 15 individuals. In February 2024, the final person under Operation Elbrus was sentenced (to four years and six months' imprisonment), after pleading guilty to two counts of dealing with the proceeds of crime.

In August 2023, the High Court of Australia, in the matter of *The King v Jacobs Group (Australia) Pty Ltd*, provided important guidance on the proper construction of the expression "value of the benefit ... obtained" "in the maximum penalty provision in s 70.2(5)(b) of the *Criminal Code Act 1995* (Cth). The Court held that that expression should be construed broadly to mean the value of *any advantage* obtained. In that case, the company had pleaded guilty to three counts of conspiracy to cause an offer of the provision of a bribe to a foreign public official. It was common ground that the benefit obtained from the relevant conduct was securing contracts for the carrying out of three construction projects, and that money had been received by the company for performing those contracts. The Court held that, on its proper construction, s 70.2(5)(b) required the value of the benefit obtained to be determined as the sum of the amounts in fact received under the contracts secured by the bribery offence (i.e. the revenue received), rather than on a "net benefit" basis that took into account the costs incurred in performing the contracts. This decision is likely to substantially increase the applicable maximum penalty in most cases (as compared to the approach taken by the courts below).

In this particular case, it increased the maximum penalty for sequence three from \$11 million to approximately \$30.4 million. In August 2024, after the matter was remitted by the High Court, the company was ultimately fined in respect of sequence three in the amount of \$3.375 million. That sentence took into account all of the relevant circumstances of the case, including the company's self-report, guilty plea and extensive assistance given to the authorities.

In July 2024, following an ASIC investigation, four individuals were charged in relation to their involvement in a coordinated scheme, run through the Telegram messaging app in 2021, to pump up the price of shares in certain ASX-listed companies, mainly small-cap miners, before dumping them at inflated prices. They were charged with conspiracy to commit market rigging and false trading to artificially increase the price of the shares before dumping them. They face a maximum penalty of 15 years' imprisonment and a fine of over \$1 million.

2 Organisation of the Courts

2.1 How are the criminal courts in your jurisdiction structured? Are there specialised criminal courts for particular crimes?

Most federal criminal offences are prosecuted in the courts of the State or Territory where the alleged crime occurred, and the criminal procedures applicable in that State/Territory apply. Generally speaking, and with some minor exceptions, the States/Territories have three levels of courts, namely, Local/Magistrates' Courts, District/County Courts, and Supreme Courts.

The Federal Court of Australia has, for some time, specifically been vested with jurisdiction to deal with a relatively narrow category of crimes, including offences under the *Competition and Consumer Act 2010* (Cth). In 2024, however, the Court's criminal jurisdiction was expanded with the passing of the *Attorney-General's Portfolio Miscellaneous Measures Act 2024* (Cth). This Act conferred on the Court jurisdiction to hear a range of indictable and summary corporate and financial crime offences within the regulatory remit of ASIC, including offences under the *Corporations Act 2001* (Cth), the *Australian Securities and Investments Commission Act 2001* (Cth) and the *Criminal Code Act 1995* (Cth).

The High Court is the highest court in Australia and has jurisdiction to hear appeals in criminal matters. There are no specialised criminal courts for particular crimes.

2.2 Is there a right to a jury in business crime trials?

Often, there will be a right to a jury, but not in every case. All federal offences that are tried on indictment must be tried by jury under the Constitution. However, there are statutory mechanisms, at both the federal and State/Territory level, which enable some indictable offences to be heard summarily before a Magistrate alone where the maximum penalty is significantly moderated. Additionally, in certain circumstances, in some State/Territory jurisdictions, an accused charged on indictment for a State/Territory offence may apply or may elect for a trial to proceed by a judge alone.

2.3 Where juries exist, are they composed of citizens members alone or also professional jurists?

Juries are only composed of citizen members, randomly

selected from the electoral roll. Citizens who have been summoned to report to court on a particular day for jury service are then randomly selected and may be empanelled to serve on a jury in a particular trial. Certain classes of citizen are not eligible to be selected for a jury, including convicted criminals and legal professionals.

3 Particular Statutes and Crimes

3.1 Please describe the statutes that are commonly used in your jurisdiction to prosecute business crimes, including the elements of the crimes and the requisite mental state of the accused.

• Securities fraud

The *Corporations Act 2001* (Cth) criminalises market misconduct, including, but not limited to, intentionally making false or misleading statements in relation to financial products (including securities). The statement-maker must know or ought reasonably to have known that the statement is false or materially misleading, or not care whether the statement is true or false.

• Accounting fraud

The *Corporations Act 2001* (Cth) places a positive obligation on companies to keep financial records that correctly record its transactions and would enable true and fair financial statements to be prepared and audited. This is a strict liability offence, and it is unnecessary to establish any particular mental state. The *Corporations Act 2001* (Cth) and other State/Territory laws also criminalise conduct where a person dishonestly destroys or conceals accounting records or dishonestly makes or publishes any statement that is false or misleading. In March 2016, Australia introduced two new false accounting offences in the *Criminal Code Act 1995* (Cth). These offences criminalise conduct where a corporation or an individual engages in either intentional or reckless false dealings with accounting documents that, in effect, are dealings that cover up the receipt or payment of illegitimate benefits.

• Insider trading

The *Corporations Act 2001* (Cth) criminalises conduct where a person knows, or ought reasonably to know, that they have confidential, price-sensitive information about a financial product and intentionally deals with the financial product, procures another person to deal with the financial product or discloses the information to another person likely to trade in the financial product.

• Embezzlement

New South Wales (NSW) is the only Australian jurisdiction that retains a specific offence of embezzlement under its *Crimes Act 1900* (NSW). It criminalises conduct in which an employee intentionally misappropriates property entrusted to him by his employer. In other Australian jurisdictions, embezzlement conduct is dealt with under provisions relating to fraud, theft, or other property offences.

• Bribery of government officials

The *Criminal Code Act 1995* (Cth) creates an offence of bribing a foreign public official. It prohibits a person from offering or providing a benefit to another person with the intention of improperly influencing a foreign public official in order to obtain or retain business or a business or personal advantage. The Act also creates a similar offence for bribing Australian Commonwealth public officials, as well as a 'failure to prevent

foreign bribery' offence. Various State and Territory laws also prohibit bribery, including of State/Territory government officials.

• Criminal anti-competition

See below under the sub-heading "Cartels and other competition offences".

• Cartels and other competition offences

It is an offence under the *Competition and Consumer Act 2010* (Cth) for a corporation to intentionally enter into, or give effect to, a contract, arrangement or understanding that the corporation knows or believes contains a "cartel provision" relating to price-fixing, market-sharing, bid-rigging or restricting supply chain outputs.

• Tax crimes

Tax crimes and frauds against revenue are primarily prosecuted under the *Criminal Code Act 1995* (Cth) and the *Taxation Administration Act 1953* (Cth). The most serious tax crimes are generally pursued through various offence provisions under the *Criminal Code Act 1995* (Cth), which criminalises dishonest intentional conduct that is fraudulent and results in the loss (or the risk of loss) of Australia's taxation revenue.

• Government-contracting fraud

Government-contracting fraud is generally prosecuted under general fraud and corruption offences under the *Criminal Code Act 1995* (Cth) or the relevant State/Territory criminal statute. For example, under the *Criminal Code Act 1995* (Cth), it is an offence for a person to do anything with the intention of dishonestly obtaining a gain from a Commonwealth entity.

• Environmental crimes

Australia has an extensive array of environmental laws. The principal federal statute is the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (Cth). It contains, in addition to civil penalty provisions, criminal offence provisions for non-compliance. However, most environmental laws are State/Territory-based, and vary from one State/Territory to another. Many State/Territory environmental laws impose strict liability criminal offence provisions for non-compliance.

• Campaign-finance/election law

The *Commonwealth Electoral Act 1918* (Cth) creates several federal offences relating to elections, including offences that prohibit bribery, the undue influencing of votes, and interference with political liberty. The Act also makes it an offence to fail to disclose details of donations to political parties over a certain amount. The States/Territories have similar statutes, some of which make it an offence for certain persons (e.g. property developers in NSW) to make political donations.

• Market manipulation in connection with the sale of derivatives

The *Corporations Act 2001* (Cth) prohibits a person from intentionally taking part in a transaction that has, or is likely to have, the effect of creating or maintaining an artificial price for trading in financial products on a financial market.

• Money laundering or wire fraud

The *Criminal Code Act 1995* (Cth) provides for several money laundering offences that are used to combat business crime. Money laundering offences will apply to persons who are dealing with money or property that constitutes the proceeds, or may become an instrument, of crime and have the requisite state of awareness. There are similar offences under the equivalent State/Territory laws. In addition, the *Anti-Money*

Laundering and Counter-Terrorism Financing Act 2006 (Cth) aims to prevent money laundering and the financing of terrorism by imposing a number of reporting and other obligations on the financial sector, gambling sector, remittance services providers and other entities that provide particular designated services. However, most of the penalties under that Act are civil, rather than criminal, in nature.

• Cybersecurity and data protection law

Australia has implemented the Council of Europe Convention on Cybercrime via amendments to several statutes: the *Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters Act 1987* (Cth); the *Criminal Code Act 1995* (Cth); the *Telecommunications (Interception and Access) Act 1979* (Cth); and the *Telecommunications Act 1997* (Cth). Computer offences cover illegal access, modification or impairment of either data or electronic communication. These offences are generally prosecuted under the *Criminal Code Act 1995* (Cth) or the relevant State/Territory statute.

Personal information or data in Australia is protected principally through the *Privacy Act 1988* (Cth). It applies to the handling of such data by, *inter alia*, Australian federal government agencies and certain private sector organisations. In February 2018, the Notifiable Data Breaches scheme introduced an obligation on all agencies and organisations regulated under the *Privacy Act 1988* (Cth) to notify individuals whose personal information has been involved in a data breach that is likely to result in serious harm.

• Trade sanctions and export control violations

Trade sanctions are implemented in Australia by the following legislation and accompanying regulations:

- *Charter of the United Nations Act 1945* (Cth): international sanctions imposed by the United Nations Security Council; and
- *Autonomous Sanctions Act 2011* (Cth): sanctions imposed autonomously by Australia.

Australian export controls (and violations for breach) are regulated through a variety of statutes and administered by numerous government departments and agencies. Relevant legislation includes the *Customs Act 1901* (Cth) and the *Defence Trade Controls Act 2012* (Cth). The Defence and Strategic Goods List specifies goods, software or technology that is subject to those controls.

• Any other crime of particular interest in your jurisdiction

There are no other business crimes of particular interest in Australian jurisdiction.

3.2 Is there liability for inchoate crimes in your jurisdiction? Can a person be liable for attempting to commit a crime, whether or not the attempted crime is completed? Can a person be liable for "misprision" by helping another avoid being located or discovered?

Under the *Criminal Code Act 1995* (Cth), attempts are punishable as if the offence attempted had been committed. In order to be held criminally liable for an attempt, the person's conduct must be more than merely preparatory to the commission of the offence. It is not necessary that the attempted crime is completed. Furthermore, a person may be found guilty even if the commission of the offence was impossible or the actual offence was committed. The State/Territory laws also provide for criminal liability for attempts.

For other inchoate crimes, see the response to question 10.1 below.

It is a criminal offence in all Australian jurisdictions to be an "accessory after the fact", by knowingly assisting an offender to avoid apprehension or prosecution. There are also offences for perverting the course of justice. Further, in NSW, it is an offence to conceal a serious indictable offence.

4 Corporate Criminal Liability

4.1 Is there entity liability for criminal offences? If so, under what circumstances will an employee's conduct be imputed to the entity? Are there ways in which an entity can avoid criminal liability for the acts of its employees or agents?

It is commonly accepted that a corporation, as a separate legal entity, can be convicted of a criminal offence and have a criminal penalty imposed upon it. There are also numerous offences created under the statute that specifically apply to corporations, particularly in the area of occupational health and safety.

Under Part 2.5 of the *Criminal Code Act 1995* (Cth), the Criminal Code applies to body corporates in the same way as it applies to individuals subject to any statutory modification. If intention, knowledge, or recklessness is an element of a particular offence, it will be attributed to a body corporate that expressly, tacitly, or impliedly authorised or permitted the commission of the offence by an employee. The means by which such an authorisation or permission may be established include, amongst other things, proving, subject to a due diligence defence, that a high managerial agent of the body corporate intentionally, knowingly or recklessly engaged in the relevant conduct, or expressly, tacitly or impliedly authorised or permitted the commission of the offence. It may also be established by proving that a "corporate culture" existed within the body corporate that directed, encouraged, tolerated or led to non-compliance with the relevant provision. Accordingly, under Part 2.5, a body corporate that can prove that it exercised due diligence to prevent the conduct, or the authorisation or permission, of the high managerial agent, or that had a positive compliance culture, will be able to avoid criminal liability on those respective bases.

However, a number of federal statutes contain alternative legislative attribution methods. By way of example, the recently introduced 'failure to prevent foreign bribery' offence is a strict liability offence, with the only defence being if the body corporate can prove that it had in place 'adequate procedures' designed to prevent the commission of a foreign bribery offence by an employee, agent or other associate: see s 70.5A of the *Criminal Code Act 1995* (Cth). In other Australian jurisdictions, generally, a corporation may be found guilty of a criminal offence either on the grounds of vicarious responsibility or on the basis that the person who committed the acts and had the requisite mental state was the directing mind and embodiment of the company.

In its April 2020 report on Corporate Criminal Responsibility, the Australian Law Reform Commission recommended various legislative reforms to improve Australia's corporate criminal liability regime at the federal level. No such reforms have yet been implemented.

4.2 Is there personal liability for managers, officers, and directors if the entity becomes liable for a crime? Under what circumstances?

In order for personal criminal liability to ensue against a

person, the prosecuting authority needs to charge the individual as well as the company. Accessorial criminal liability of company officers is often provided for in a specific statutory provision. For example, a statute may provide that an officer will be liable if they were knowingly involved in the corporate offence, or alternatively if the corporate offence was committed with the consent, or connivance of, or was attributable to the neglect of, the officer. An officer may also be liable for a crime committed by the company if the officer aided, abetted, counselled, or procured the commission of the offence. Alternatively, depending on the circumstances, directors or senior managers may be civilly liable under the *Corporations Act 2001* (Cth) for failing to exercise due care and diligence, for example, by failing to ensure that appropriate risk management systems and processes were in place.

4.3 Where there is entity liability and personal liability, do the authorities have a policy or preference as to when to pursue an entity, when to pursue an individual, or both? Has the preference changed in recent years? How so?

Prosecution and law enforcement authorities generally do not have a policy or stated preference; however, they are more accustomed to charging individuals and are aware that this will often have a greater general deterrent effect. That said, in recent years, authorities have arguably increased their focus, in appropriate cases, on whether the company should also be charged. A determination of who is charged will ultimately be governed by whether there is a *prima facie* case, reasonable prospects of conviction, and whether it is in the public interest (see the response to question 8.2 below).

4.4 In a merger or acquisition context, can successor liability apply to the successor entity? When does successor liability apply? When does it not apply?

Australian law does not specifically recognise successor liability. Consequently, domestic mergers and acquisitions can be structured so that the successor entity avoids exposure to liability in Australia. However, where the court has approved a scheme for the reconstruction of a body or the amalgamation of two or more bodies, the court can make an order under s 413 of the *Corporations Act 2001* (Cth) transferring the liabilities of the transferor body to the transferee company.

5 Statutes of Limitations

5.1 How are enforcement-limitations periods calculated, and when does a limitations period begin running?

At general law, there is no limitations period for the commencement of a prosecution for criminal offences unless a statute provides otherwise. However, criminal proceedings may be stayed to prevent injustice to the defendant caused by unreasonable delay. In some States/Territories, there are limitations periods for the prosecution of summary offences. Under the *Crimes Act 1914* (Cth), there is no limitations period for the prosecution of offences by individuals against a law of the Commonwealth where the maximum penalty exceeds six months' imprisonment or for the prosecution of offences by companies where the maximum penalty exceeds \$46,950. If the maximum penalty is less than those thresholds, a

prosecution must be commenced within 12 months of the commission of the offence unless a statute provides for a longer period.

5.2 Can crimes occurring outside the limitations period be prosecuted if they are part of a pattern or practice, or ongoing conspiracy?

A charge of conspiracy to commit a serious offence is not subject to a limitations period. In matters involving a pattern or practice where there is no conspiracy, it is possible that any applicable limitations period may have expired for the older offences.

5.3 Can the limitations period be tolled? If so, how?

No, under Australian law the limitations period cannot be tolled.

6 Initiation of Investigations

6.1 Do enforcement agencies have jurisdiction to enforce their authority outside your jurisdiction's territory for certain business crimes? If so, which laws can be enforced extraterritorially and what are the jurisdictional grounds that allow such enforcement? How frequently do enforcement agencies rely on extraterritorial jurisdiction to prosecute business crimes?

Most federal business crimes have some level of extraterritorial reach, and it is not uncommon for enforcement agencies to rely on extraterritorial jurisdiction. In making such laws, Parliament is able to rely on the external affairs power in the Constitution, which has been interpreted broadly by the High Court. However, in many cases, if the conduct constituting the alleged offence occurs wholly in a foreign country and the alleged offender is neither an Australian citizen nor an Australian body corporate, criminal proceedings must not be commenced without the Attorney-General's consent, under the *Criminal Code Act 1995* (Cth).

6.2 How are investigations initiated? Are there any rules or guidelines governing the government's initiation of any investigation? Can third parties learn how the investigation began or obtain the initial file documents? If so, please describe them.

An investigation is generally commenced when a complaint is made, or information comes to the attention of the relevant authority that gives rise to a suspicion that an offence may have been committed. Some authorities, however, have their own guidelines as to when an investigation will be initiated (see, for example, the AFP's Case Categorisation and Prioritisation Model).

Generally, the initiation of investigations by law enforcement authorities, and associated documents forming part of the investigation file, are confidential and protected from disclosure to third parties (including media agencies), including under the doctrine of public interest immunity. However, authorities typically retain a discretion to disclose certain information concerning investigations where there is no risk that doing so will prejudice an ongoing investigation or extant proceedings.

6.3 Do the criminal authorities in your jurisdiction have formal and/or informal mechanisms for cooperating with foreign enforcement authorities? Do they cooperate with foreign enforcement authorities?

Australian authorities both assist, and seek assistance from, foreign prosecution and investigation authorities under mutual assistance and extradition legislation. The federal Attorney-General's Department is the central processing centre that facilitates formal cooperation between Australian and foreign authorities. The AFP also engages informally in "Police to Police Assistance". Additionally, regulatory authorities such as the ACCC and ASIC often work closely with their international counterparts throughout the course of their investigations, in some cases pursuant to international cooperation agreements.

7 Procedures for Gathering Information from a Company

7.1 What powers does the government have generally to gather information when investigating business crimes?

Law enforcement authorities have a range of investigative tools that enable them to gather information and evidence when investigating business crimes. For example, authorities such as ASIC, the ACCC, ATO, and ACIC may issue notices compelling a person to produce documents, provide information and/or attend a compulsory hearing or examination to answer questions. Law enforcement authorities also have the power to access premises to conduct searches and seize materials, although usually it will be necessary to first obtain a search warrant. For some serious offences, law enforcement authorities will also have access to more intrusive covert powers.

Document Gathering:

7.2 Under what circumstances can the government demand that a company under investigation produce documents to the government, and under what circumstances can the government raid a company under investigation and seize documents?

Certain authorities, such as those mentioned in the response to question 7.1 above, may issue notices that compel a company or individual to produce documents or provide information to the authority. Failure to comply with such a notice is an offence. Search warrant powers are also available to the AFP, and most authorities, upon application to a Magistrate. It is generally sufficient for the applicant to establish under oath or affirmation that he has "reasonable grounds for suspecting" that there is, or shortly will be, relevant evidential material at the premises.

7.3 Are there any protections against production or seizure that the company can assert for any types of documents? For example, does your jurisdiction recognise any privileges protecting documents prepared by in-house attorneys or external counsel, or corporate communications with in-house attorneys or external counsel?

Statutes that require the production of documents by a person or company in response to a law enforcement authority's notice

are subject to any valid claims for legal professional privilege (LPP), unless the right to LPP is expressly abrogated by the statute in question. LPP is a substantive rule of law that protects confidential communications between a client and a lawyer, or with third parties, made for the dominant purpose of giving or obtaining legal advice or for use in actual or reasonably anticipated litigation. LPP may also be claimed over material caught by the terms of a search warrant. Investigative powers to obtain documents are not impacted by labour laws.

7.4 Are there any labour or privacy laws in your jurisdiction (such as the General Data Protection Regulation in the European Union) that may impact the collection, processing, or transfer of employees' personal data, even if located in company files? Does your jurisdiction have blocking statutes or other domestic laws that may impede cross-border disclosure?

Data privacy laws in Australia do not provide an excuse for failing to produce employees' personal data in the circumstances set out in response to question 7.2 above. There are also no blocking statutes in Australia that may impede cross-border disclosure by law enforcement authorities to their overseas counterparts. Such disclosure is governed by Australian Privacy Principle 8 contained in Schedule 1 to the *Privacy Act 1988* (Cth).

7.5 Under what circumstances can the government demand that a company employee produce documents to the government, or raid the home or office of an employee and seize documents?

The government can demand that a company employee produce documents, or conduct a raid to seize documents, under the same circumstances set out in the response to question 7.2 above.

7.6 Under what circumstances can the government demand that a third person or entity produce documents to the government, or raid the home or office of a third person or entity and seize documents?

The government can make such a demand or conduct such a raid under the same circumstances set out in response to question 7.2 above. In addition, the *Telecommunications (Interception and Access) Act 1979* (Cth) empowers prescribed Australian enforcement agencies to apply for a warrant to covertly access communications stored by carriers and carriage service providers to assist in the investigation of domestic offences. Only the federal Attorney-General may authorise the AFP or State/Territory Police to apply for a stored communications warrant on behalf of a foreign law enforcement agency. The disclosure to a foreign country of any information obtained will be subject to certain conditions.

Questioning of Individuals:

7.7 Under what circumstances can the government demand that an employee, officer, or director of a company under investigation submit to questioning? In what forum can the questioning take place?

There are now several authorities that have compulsory examination powers, such as those authorities referred to in the

response to question 7.1 above. Those statutory powers enable the authority to compel an individual to attend a private examination or hearing to be questioned, under oath or affirmation, about matters relevant to an investigation. The relevant statute generally provides that the privilege against self-incrimination does not apply; however, certain protections are usually offered to the examinee if their answers may incriminate them, in particular that any incriminating responses will not be admissible against them in subsequent criminal proceedings. Nevertheless, there are criminal consequences for refusing to answer questions. The individual has the right to legal representation.

7.8 Under what circumstances can the government demand that a third person submit to questioning? In what forum can the questioning take place?

The response to question 7.7 above equally applies to a third person. Furthermore, once criminal proceedings are instituted, courts may issue subpoenas or summonses at the request of the prosecution authority, compelling the attendance at court of a person to give evidence prior to or at the trial.

7.9 What protections can a person assert upon being questioned by the government? Is there a right to be represented by an attorney during questioning? Is there a right or privilege against self-incrimination that may be asserted? If a right to assert the privilege against self-incrimination exists, can the assertion of the right result in an inference of guilt at trial?

See the response to question 7.7 above in relation to authorities with compulsory examination powers. Additionally, law enforcement authorities who suspect a person has committed an offence will generally invite the suspect to voluntarily participate in a recorded cautioned interview towards the end of the investigation phase. When this occurs, the investigator must caution the suspect about their right to remain silent and have several other rights explained to them, including the right to contact a lawyer and to have them attend any questioning.

8 Initiation of Prosecutions / Deferred Prosecution / Civil Dispositions

8.1 How are criminal cases initiated?

A criminal case is initiated in accordance with the procedural rules applicable in the State/Territory where the crime is prosecuted. Each jurisdiction has its peculiar procedural nuances. Generally speaking, criminal cases are initiated through the issuing and service of a document that sets out the written charge that alleges the commission of an offence(s). The defendant will either be compelled to attend court to answer the charge through a summons, or will be arrested and brought before the court as soon as practicable to face the charge.

8.2 What rules or guidelines govern the government's decision to charge an entity or individual with a crime?

Australian prosecution authorities have publicly available prosecution policies that guide their decision-making. In general, a prosecutor must assess whether there is a *prima*

facie case and reasonable prospects of conviction, and then determine whether it is in the public interest to prosecute. Matters relevant to a prosecutor's assessment of each matter are set out within the policy.

8.3 Can a defendant and the government agree to resolve a criminal investigation through pretrial diversion or an agreement to defer prosecution? If so, please describe any rules or guidelines governing whether pretrial diversion or deferred prosecution agreements are available to dispose of criminal investigations.

There are currently no legal mechanisms for a pre-trial diversion process or a deferred prosecution in Australia. However, a defendant can make a "No bill" submission to the Director of the CDPP (and similar processes apply in the States/Territories). This is, in effect, an application to the Director to discontinue the prosecution. The Director, in extraordinary cases, will accede to a "No bill" submission where it would not be in the public interest to pursue the prosecution, or it has become apparent that there is insufficient admissible evidence to prove the case. Such process does not allow the prosecution to be re-enlivened at a later date if the defendant fails to meet certain conditions.

8.4 If deferred prosecution or non-prosecution agreements are available to dispose of criminal investigations in your jurisdiction, must any aspects of these agreements be judicially approved? If so, please describe the factors that courts consider when reviewing deferred prosecution or non-prosecution agreements.

This is not applicable; deferred prosecution and non-prosecution agreements are not currently available in Australia.

In June 2023, the federal government introduced the *Crimes Legislation Amendment (Combating Foreign Bribery) Bill 2023* (Cth) into Parliament to amend the foreign bribery provisions in the *Criminal Code Act 1995* (Cth). The opposition unsuccessfully sought to amend the Bill to include a deferred prosecution agreement scheme for certain serious corporate criminal offences, including the foreign bribery offence. The Bill was passed in February 2024 and the amendments took effect on 8 September 2024. A review of the operation of the amendments is to be conducted as soon as practicable after March 2026.

8.5 In addition to, or instead of, any criminal disposition to an investigation, can a defendant be subject to any civil penalties or remedies? If so, please describe the circumstances under which civil penalties or remedies may apply.

Further to the matters set out in response to question 1.3 above, a law enforcement authority will consider all relevant facts and circumstances in determining the appropriate regulatory response and circumstances in determining the appropriate regulatory response, including the nature and seriousness of the alleged contravention and the strength of the available evidence. Further, if successful criminal action is taken, under various statutory regimes, a victim may be able to make a claim for a victim's compensation order from the sentencing judge for losses caused by the relevant criminal offence. Irrespective of whether criminal action is taken, the company may also, of course, be exposed to civil claims by third parties, such as consumers, investors or shareholders.

8.6 Can an individual or corporate commence a private prosecution? If so, can they privately prosecute business crime offences?

Private prosecutions can be commenced in all States and Territories in Australia; however, the rules and limitations governing private prosecutions vary between jurisdictions. In some jurisdictions, for example, the right to bring a private prosecution is confined to summary offences (e.g. in Tasmania) or to only a limited number of specified offences (e.g. in Western Australia). Private prosecutions are available for Commonwealth offences, unless the contrary intention appears in relation to the particular offence provision in question. Private prosecutions are rare in Australia, although in early 2022, in a high-profile recent example, Australian mining billionaire Andrew Forrest commenced criminal proceedings against Facebook, alleging that it had committed offences against Australia's anti-money laundering laws by failing to take sufficient steps to stop scam advertisements that used his image. In most jurisdictions, the relevant Director of Public Prosecutions has the power to take over a private prosecution.

Subject to the limitations referred to above, and while the law on the availability of private prosecutions remains largely untested for many offences, private prosecutions are theoretically available for a number of business crime offences. However, private prosecutions are not available for offences under the *Corporations Act 2001* (Cth): *Coeur de Lion Investments Pty Ltd v Lewis* (2020) 4 QR 455.

9 Burden of Proof

9.1 For each element of the business crimes identified above in section 3, which party has the burden of proof? Which party has the burden of proof with respect to any affirmative defences?

The prosecution bears the legal burden of proof for each relevant element of an offence. The standard of proof on the prosecution is beyond reasonable doubt.

A legal burden can be placed on a defendant in certain circumstances; however, it must be express and need only be discharged to the standard of the balance of probabilities. An example is where the statute requires the defendant to prove a matter.

A defendant who relies on an exception, exemption, excuse, or justification provided by the law creating the offence (i.e. as part of the definition of the ground of criminal liability) bears an evidential burden to point to evidence that suggests a reasonable possibility that the matter exists or does not exist (this can include evidence that is led by or tendered through the prosecution). Once that burden has been discharged, the prosecution bears the legal burden of disproving the matter.

9.2 What is the standard of proof that the party with the burden must satisfy?

See the response to question 9.1 above.

9.3 In a criminal trial, who is the arbiter of fact? Who determines whether the party has satisfied its burden of proof? If a jury or group of juries determine the outcome, must they do so unanimously?

In a prosecution for a federal indictable offence in a superior

court, the jury is the arbiter of fact and determines whether a legal burden has been discharged. If a federal indictable offence proceeds summarily in a Magistrates' Court, then the presiding Magistrate is the arbiter of fact. The same situation applies for State/Territory offences unless there is provision for a superior court trial by a judge alone, in which case the superior court trial judge is the arbiter of fact.

The decision of a jury in a trial for a federal indictable offence must be unanimous. Majority verdicts are permitted in all State/Territory jurisdictions (except the Australian Capital Territory) where a jury has not reached a unanimous verdict after deliberating for a period of time that the judge considers reasonable.

10 Conspiracy / Aiding and Abetting

10.1 Can a person who conspires with or assists another to commit a business crime be liable? If so, what is the nature of the liability and what are the elements of the offence?

Under the *Criminal Code Act 1995* (Cth), a person who conspires with another person to commit a Commonwealth offence is guilty of the offence of conspiracy to commit that offence and faces the same punishment as if they committed the substantive offence. To be found guilty: they must have entered into an agreement with one or more other persons; the parties to the agreement must have intended that an offence would be committed; and at least one party to the agreement must have committed an overt act pursuant to the agreement. Conspiracy is also an offence under the various State/Territory laws.

A person is also taken to have committed a substantive offence if they aided, abetted, counselled, or procured the commission of that offence by another person, and is punishable accordingly.

Importantly, that person may be found guilty even if the other person has not been prosecuted or has not been found guilty.

11 Common Defences

11.1 Is it a defence to a criminal charge that the defendant did not have the requisite intent to commit the crime? If so, who has the burden of proof with respect to intent?

The prosecution must prove that the defendant had the requisite state of mind to commit an offence. Without proof of this requisite state of mind, the person will be acquitted. While this will typically be intent for the most serious business crimes, there are a growing number of offences where the requisite state of mind is not intent but knowledge, recklessness, or negligence.

For some offences that impose strict or absolute liability, the prosecution does not need to prove intent or any other state of mind. In regard to these offences, the prosecution must merely prove that the conduct occurred, the circumstance arose, or the result happened, as the case may be.

11.2 Is it a defence to a criminal charge that the defendant was ignorant of the law, i.e., that he did not know that his conduct was unlawful? If so, what are the elements of this defence, and who has the burden of proof with respect to the defendant's knowledge of the law?

A mistake or ignorance of the law is not a defence to a criminal charge in most circumstances. However, some offence definitions specifically provide for a mistake of law to constitute an excuse. In such cases, the defence bears the evidential burden of proof, while the prosecution bears the legal burden of disproving the defence.

11.3 Is it a defence to a criminal charge that the defendant was ignorant of the facts, i.e., that he did not know that he had engaged in conduct that was unlawful? If so, what are the elements of this defence, and who has the burden of proof with respect to the defendant's knowledge of the facts?

An honest and reasonable mistake of fact may render the defendant's conduct innocent and be a defence to criminal responsibility, unless this defence is excluded by the statutory offence.

The defence bears the evidential burden of proof, while the prosecution bears the legal burden of disproving the defence (unless the legislation specifically provides for a reasonable mistake of fact defence, in which case the defence bears the legal burden).

12 Voluntary Disclosure Obligations

12.1 If a person or entity becomes aware that a crime has been committed, must the person or entity report the crime to the government? Can the person or entity be liable for failing to report the crime to the government? Can the person or entity receive leniency or "credit" for voluntary disclosure?

As a general rule, there is no obligation to report a crime in Australia. However, there are certain exceptions. For example, in NSW, it is an offence for a person (including a company) who knows or believes that another person has committed a serious indictable offence to fail, without reasonable excuse, to report that matter to the NSW Police. Furthermore, certain industries may be subject to specific legislative or regulatory requirements that require reporting in certain circumstances, such as the breach reporting obligations imposed on Australian financial services licensees or the suspicious matter reporting obligations imposed on reporting entities by the *Anti-Money Laundering and Counter-Terrorism Financing Act 2006* (Cth).

See the response to question 13.1 below regarding the consequences of voluntary disclosure.

13 Cooperation Provisions / Leniency

13.1 If a person or entity voluntarily discloses criminal conduct to the government or cooperates in a government criminal investigation of the person or entity, can the person or entity request leniency or "credit" from the government? If so, what rules or guidelines govern the government's ability to offer leniency or "credit" in exchange for voluntary disclosures or cooperation?

As a general rule, an offender who discloses that they have

engaged in criminal conduct will still be prosecuted, subject to there being a *prima facie* case, reasonable prospects of conviction and that it is in the public interest to prosecute (but see the response to question 8.4 above). Nevertheless, the defendant can expect to receive a significantly moderated sentence because pleading guilty, cooperating with authorities and showing contrition (including by making reparation for any injury, loss or damage caused by the defendant's conduct) are all mitigating factors that a court must take into account during the sentencing process. Cooperation by companies will often take the form of voluntarily providing documents, witness statements and facilitating interviews with employees, as well as undertaking to provide future assistance of a similar nature to aid the prosecution of individuals.

Published prosecution policies, guidelines and conventions, as well as statutes, provide for various legal mechanisms that can apply to persons who voluntarily disclosed their criminal conduct. This includes the granting of immunity from prosecution in extraordinary circumstances, or the investigating authority accepting an induced witness statement that cannot be used against the deponent.

The CDPP and the ACCC also have a publicly available policy that recognises that it is in the public interest to offer immunity from prosecution to a party who is willing to be the first to break ranks with cartel participants by exposing the illegal conduct and fully cooperating with both the ACCC and the CDPP.

In February 2021, ASIC released an immunity policy that is available in market misconduct cases arising under Part 7.10 of the *Corporations Act 2001* (Cth). Under the policy, an individual (not a corporation) who has engaged with others to manipulate the market, commit insider trading, or engage in dishonest conduct when operating a financial services business can now, in certain circumstances, seek immunity from both civil penalty and criminal proceedings.

The AFP also encourages companies to self-report foreign bribery and related offences. Criminal and/or civil action under the *Proceeds of Crime Act 2002* (Cth) will be considered through the AFP and CDPP Best Practice Guidelines: Self-Reporting of Foreign Bribery and Related Offending by Corporations.

13.2 Describe the extent of cooperation, including the steps that an entity would take, that is generally required of entities seeking leniency in your jurisdiction, and describe the favourable treatment generally received.

There are some regulatory authorities, like the ACCC and ASIC, that issue public statements about the advantages of cooperating with them in both civil and criminal matters. Notwithstanding that the CDPP will take the views and recommendations of the relevant authority into account, it is ultimately for the CDPP (or its State/Territory counterparts where relevant) to make an independent determination about whether charges should be laid and the appropriate charges for most criminal matters.

See the response to question 13.1 above regarding the ability of defendants who plead guilty to obtain a further discount to their sentence for cooperating with the relevant investigating authority.

14 Plea Bargaining

14.1 Can a defendant voluntarily decline to contest criminal charges in exchange for a conviction on reduced charges, or in exchange for an agreed-upon sentence?

Prosecution policies and guidelines provide a foundation for the prosecution and the defendant to negotiate what charges should be proceeded with. Charge negotiations are encouraged and may result in the defendant agreeing to plead guilty to fewer than all the charges they are facing, or to a less serious charge(s), with the remaining either not being proceeded with or taken into account without proceeding to conviction. The prosecution and defendant may also agree upon the facts on which the defendant will be sentenced.

Agreements on sentence are not enforceable or binding upon a sentencing court. Determining the appropriate sentence is entirely a matter for the court. The High Court has made it clear that the prosecution is not required, and should not be permitted, to proffer even a sentencing range to a sentencing judge (*Barbaro v the Queen* (2014) 253 CLR 58), and this decision will make it extremely difficult for the prosecutor and defendant to ever agree on a sentence in exchange for a plea bargain. The High Court has also held that these restrictions do not apply to civil penalty proceedings (*Commonwealth v Director, Fair Work Building Industry Inspectorate and Others* (2015) 258 CLR 482).

14.2 Please describe any rules or guidelines governing the government's ability to plea bargain with a defendant. Must any aspects of the plea bargain be approved by the court?

The ability to plea bargain is constrained by prosecution policies and guidelines of the CDPP and its State/Territory counterparts that provide that:

- the charges to be proceeded with should bear a reasonable relationship to the nature of the criminal conduct of the defendant;
- the charges provide an adequate basis for an appropriate sentence in all the circumstances of the case; and
- there is evidence to support the charges.

The prosecution policies set out that agreements with respect to charge negotiation proposals must consider all the circumstances of the case. The approval of the court is not required, although, as noted in the response to question 14.1 above, it is for the sentencing judge alone to decide the sentence to be imposed.

15 Sealing

15.1 Are there instances where the court proceedings or investigation files are protected as confidential or sealed?

Generally, Australian courts operate in accordance with the principle of "open justice". Accordingly, anything said in open court, and any documents tendered during proceedings, will generally be publicly available. However, the courts have powers to make closed court orders, suppression orders and/or non-publication orders where it is necessary to secure the proper administration of justice. The test is a stringent one, and such an order should operate for no longer than is reasonably necessary to achieve the purpose for which it is made.

Examples of where such an order is likely to be granted include where it is in the interests of national security, where it is necessary to protect the safety of another person, or it is otherwise necessary in the public interest for the order to be made and that public interest significantly outweighs the public interest in open justice.

16 Elements of a Corporate Sentence

16.1 After the court determines that a defendant is guilty of a crime, are there any rules or guidelines governing the court's imposition of a sentence on the defendant? Please describe the sentencing process.

Australia has complex legislated sentencing regimes that require each judge to impose a sentence with a level of severity appropriate to all the circumstances of the offence. The starting point for any sentence is the maximum penalty prescribed by law that indicates the seriousness of the offending. The sentencing court must consider certain relevant matters, identified in legislation, that are known to it and, in effect, relate to both aggravating and mitigating issues. In respect to business crimes, general deterrence is a particularly important consideration. A sentence of imprisonment generally requires the court to specify a minimum period of time in actual custody (a non-parole period). There is an array of options for sentencing and orders that sentencing courts are empowered to make, so that offenders are adequately punished.

16.2 Before imposing a sentence on a corporation, must the court determine whether the sentence satisfies any elements? If so, please describe those elements.

The same sentencing principles that apply to individuals will apply to a corporation that is convicted, unless it is not capable of application. Statutes prescribe statutory formulas that convert terms of imprisonment into significant financial penalties, which can be imposed on corporations where the only penalty expressly provided for is imprisonment. Furthermore, some offence provisions will expressly provide for a specific maximum financial penalty and/or formula to calculate such a penalty.

16.3 Do victims have an opportunity to be heard before or during sentencing? Are victims ever required to be heard? Can victims obtain financial restitution or damages from the convicted party?

In all Australian jurisdictions, victims have an opportunity to make a voluntary "victim impact statement" in connection with the sentencing of an offender. Such a statement may be submitted in writing or read out in open court by the victim, in each case after conviction but prior to sentencing. As far as financial restitution is concerned, in NSW, a victim of business crime can apply for an order that a convicted offender pay compensation for losses sustained through or by reason of the offence(s), up to the maximum amount of the relevant court's civil jurisdiction. The application is typically made in the relevant criminal proceedings shortly after an offender has been convicted. The legislative regimes of other States/Territories only provide for compensation (which is government funded) to be paid to victims of violent (and not business) crimes.

17 Appeals

17.1 Is a guilty or a non-guilty verdict appealable by either the defendant or the government?

Appeal rights are a creature of statute. The defendant has a right of appeal in respect of a conviction that has arisen from a guilty verdict. Some, but not all, Australian jurisdictions enable the relevant prosecution authority to appeal (or otherwise seek leave to appeal) an acquittal that has arisen from a not guilty verdict in constrained circumstances. Where an appeal statute permits an appeal against an acquittal, it only does so on a constrained basis.

17.2 Is a criminal sentence following a guilty verdict appealable? If so, which party may appeal?

Both the defendant and the prosecution have certain statutory appeal rights in relation to a sentence imposed by a judge. In some jurisdictions, the party appealing a sentence must first be granted leave to appeal. Generally, courts will allow appeals against sentence where the sentence is found to be “manifestly inadequate” or “manifestly excessive”, or where some other error of fact or law is demonstrated, warranting appellate intervention. In general, where an appeal against a sentence is allowed, the re-sentencing can be done by the appeal court or remitted back to the original sentencing court to be dealt with further according to law.

17.3 What is the appellate court’s standard of review?

The standard of review will be determined by the relevant statutory provisions in each jurisdiction. However, generally speaking, an appeal court may allow an appeal against a conviction if: the verdict is unreasonable or cannot be supported having regard to the evidence; there was a wrong decision on a question of law by the trial judge; or there was a miscarriage of justice on any other ground. Nonetheless, in most jurisdictions, if any of these grounds are established, an appeal may still be dismissed if the appellate court considers that no substantial miscarriage of justice has actually occurred.

17.4 If the appellate court upholds the appeal, what powers does it have to remedy any injustice by the trial court?

Appellate courts generally have broad appeal powers to remedy an injustice at the trial. These include the power to: order a re-trial; set aside a conviction; or to enter a judgment of acquittal or of conviction for another offence.



Tobin Meagher is a Partner within the Commercial Litigation Practice at Clayton Utz. He specialises in complex commercial litigation and disputes, and fraud/white-collar crime matters, with particular expertise in contractual disputes, property disputes, foreign bribery matters, restrictive trade practices litigation and regulatory investigations. Tobin has been involved in a number of significant commercial litigation matters for a variety of clients across a wide range of industries, including financial services, retail, telecommunications and energy and resources. He has also advised and represented a number of clients subject to regulatory investigation and enforcement proceedings. Tobin also has extensive experience in a variety of white-collar crime matters, including matters involving the payment of secret commissions, bribery, conspiracy to defraud, theft and fidelity insurance claims.

Clayton Utz

Level 15, 1 Bligh Street
Sydney NSW 2000
Australia

Tel: +61 2 9353 4842

Email: tmeagher@claytonutz.com

LinkedIn: www.linkedin.com/in/tobin-meagher-b219725b



Andrew Moore is Special Counsel within the Commercial Litigation Practice at Clayton Utz. He specialises in complex commercial litigation, as well as investigations, asset recovery actions, fidelity insurance claims and disputes arising from the payment of secret commissions, bribery, corruption, misappropriation of assets and conspiracy to defraud. He has acted for a variety of clients in fraud matters ranging from multinationals, Australian publicly listed companies, Australian private companies, as well as high-net-worth individuals. He has also authored various articles in this area. Andrew's other main focuses include real estate and telecommunications disputes as well as public inquiries.

Clayton Utz

Level 15, 1 Bligh Street
Sydney NSW 2000
Australia

Tel: +61 2 9353 4299

Email: amoore@claytonutz.com

LinkedIn: www.linkedin.com/in/andrew-moore-7954814



William Stefanidis is a Senior Associate within the Commercial Litigation Practice at Clayton Utz. He maintains a broad dispute resolution practice spanning complex commercial litigation, international arbitration, white-collar crime, and regulatory investigations. His experience includes having acted for private and public sector clients in commercial contract and joint venture disputes and liquidators' recovery actions before the Australian courts, and for multinational corporations, as well as directors, in civil and criminal regulatory investigations concerning breaches of directors' duties, bribery, corruption, money laundering and financial services law.

Clayton Utz

Level 15, 1 Bligh Street
Sydney NSW 2000
Australia

Tel: +61 2 9353 5744

Email: wstefanidis@claytonutz.com

LinkedIn: www.linkedin.com/in/wstefanidis



Joy Chen is a lawyer within the Commercial Litigation Practice at Clayton Utz. She has experience in complex commercial litigation, including disputes involving contractual issues and breaches of directors' duties. Her practice also involves white-collar crime and regulatory investigations, administrative law, civil fraud, and insolvency law. Joy is a former Associate to the Hon. Justice Perry of the Federal Court of Australia.

Clayton Utz

Level 15, 1 Bligh Street
Sydney NSW 2000
Australia

Tel: +61 2 9353 4503

Email: joychen@claytonutz.com

LinkedIn: www.linkedin.com/in/joy-chen-759646b3

Clayton Utz is a leading Australian law firm, known for the strength of its independent culture and its confident and engaging approach. With over 170 partners and 1,600 employees across six offices, we continue to build on our reputation for confident, innovative, and incisive legal advice.

With a genuine commitment to client service, we are trusted advisers to a diverse base of private and public sector organisations. Our clients include many of Australia's top financial institutions, multinational corporations operating in a range of sectors, and State and Australian government departments and agencies.

Clayton Utz's Litigation and Dispute Resolution lawyers form a top-tier commercial litigation practice, the largest in Australia. Our reputation for undertaking the most complex, significant, and high-profile matters, and delivering excellent results for our clients, is second to none.

Clayton Utz's national multidisciplinary Investigations and Crisis Management team understands the different requirements of and types of investigations, including general competition investigations, antitrust/

misuse of market power, cartel investigations, anti-bribery, corruption and fraud, ASIC, the ACCC, APRA and tax investigations, and regulatory investigations following pollution, or health and safety incidents. Whether our clients are conducting an internal investigation only, or are also the subject of investigation by regulators in Australia or overseas, we work closely with them, and often also with their overseas legal advisers, to manage the legal, ethical, commercial and reputational risks arising.

www.claytonutz.com

CLAYTON UTZ

The **International Comparative Legal Guides**

(ICLG) series brings key cross-border insights to legal practitioners worldwide, covering 58 practice areas.

Business Crime 2025 features three expert analysis chapters and 18 Q&A jurisdiction chapters covering key issues, including:

- General Criminal Law Enforcement
- Organisation of the Courts
- Particular Statutes and Crimes
- Corporate Criminal Liability
- Statutes of Limitations
- Initiation of Investigations
- Procedures for Gathering Information from a Company
- Initiation of Prosecutions / Deferred Prosecution / Civil Dispositions
- Burden of Proof
- Conspiracy / Aiding and Abetting
- Common Defences
- Voluntary Disclosure Obligations
- Cooperation Provisions / Leniency
- Plea Bargaining
- Sealing
- Elements of a Corporate Sentence
- Appeals