Journal of Intellectual Property Rights
Vol 31, September 2026, pp 703-713
DOI: 10.56042/jipr.v31i5.19187

Balancing Trade Secret Protection and Whistleblower Safeguards: Legal Challenges and Reform Imperatives in India

Keshav, Asheesh Yadav, Vaishali Verma and Raj Kumar Yadav[†]
Department of Law, School of Legal Studies, Central University of Punjab, Bathinda — 151 401, India

Received: 28th April 2025; revised: 11th June 2025

In India, the growing tension between protecting trade secrets, which drive innovation, and supporting whistleblowers must not impede vital public welfare disclosures, requiring a balanced approach to foster corporate progress and ethical accountability. This paper analyzes the effectiveness of Indian law, particularly the Whistle Blowers Protection Act of 2014, through a mixed-method approach of doctrinal analysis and a survey of 325 respondents, which includes researcher/academician, legal professionals and corporate executives. It evaluates current legal gaps and perceptions regarding the balance between trade secret protection and whistleblower rights. Global frameworks like the Defend Trade Secrets Act, 2016, Dodd-Frank Act, 2010, and the EU Whistleblower Protection Directive, 2019 and other relevant legislations have been examined for their relevance to India. The study advocates for an independent statutory agency to mediate between trade secret holders and whistleblowers, adjudicate disputes, and protect public interest disclosures. Drawing from international cases such as Waymo v Uber, Enron, and Volkswagen, the paper proposes legal reforms and impartial oversight mechanisms to support ethical disclosures without compromising confidentiality.

Keywords: Trade Secret, Whistleblower, Corporate Accountability, Legal Protection, Public Interest, Business Ethics

In the world of commerce, some of the most powerful assets are not physical; they are intangible, invisible and closely guarded. These are trade secrets, confidential recipes, sophisticated algorithms, strategic blueprints and business methods that quietly drive a company's innovation and provide a competitive edge.[1] Mishra (2024) emphasizes the need to safeguard trade secrets in the modern economy for companies' growth and innovation, as this private information and highly guarded data drive their development.[2] It is also called confidential business information. Whistleblowing refers to the ethical and legal challenges employees face when they report dubious behaviour or maintain loyalty to their company's confidential interests.

A whistleblower is an insider who is motivated by public interest or moral obligation and exposes misconduct within an organization. The roots of whistleblower protection go back to the American Revolutionary era. In 1777, ten officers aboard the United States Ship (denoted as USS) Warren [a Continental Navy warship named for Revolutionary War Hero Dr. Joseph Warren] accused their commander, Commodore Esek Hopkins, of mistreating prisoners and violating military protocol. Fearing retribution, they appealed to the Continental Congress, which enacted the world's first whistleblower protection law in 1778.[3] This bold legislative move recognized truth-tellers' value in powerful institutions and aimed to protect them from retaliation.

Additionally, the legal recognition of trade secrets emerged as businesses grew during the Industrial Revolution. In the landmark case of *Peabody* v *Norfolk (1868)*,[4], the Supreme Court of Massachusetts concluded that trade secrets are a category of commercial property with a specific classification. The Court observed that the person legally entitled to utilize the property could suffer serious and irreparable injury due to this unlawful disclosure. Consequently, this decision laid the foundation for legal theories that continue to affect the jurisprudence that pertains to trade secrets in the present day.

The conflict arising from the need to safeguard trade secrets while enabling those who blow the whistle is much more pronounced in India. Trade secret protection in India is based on common law, in contrast to the Defend Trade Secrets Act (DTSA) that is in place in the United States. Unlike DTSA, Common laws protect trade secrets in India. However,

[†]Corresponding author: Email: rajkumar.yadav@cup.edu.in

the Whistleblower Protection Act, designed to protect whistleblowers, has been criticized for its narrow scope, particularly in the business sector.

Importance of Trade Secret

In contrast to patents, trade secrets do not require formal registration or public disclosure. It helps companies to keep their competitive edge for an infinite length of time as long as the data is kept under cover-off. This affordable and efficient protection motivates companies to create particular procedures and expertise without regard for speedy competition copying, fostering innovation. Trade secrets cover more ground than patents, including ideas that cannot be patented such as organizational strategies or marketing approaches that fall beyond their scope. That is why trade secrets are also considered quite flexible assets.

Trade secret preservation is crucial since the publication of such material may have negative effects like loss of competitive advantage, financial damage, legal disputes and damage to reputation. When made public, a trade secret loses its value irreversibly, and rivals can use it without restrictions. Sensitive data protection requires companies to follow strict policies, including access restrictions, employee training programs, confidentiality agreements, and regular audits.[5] These actions are crucial to stop the identified hazards. Following these preventive steps ensures the lifetime of trade secrets and protects their financial value.

Protection of trade secrets not only fosters innovation inside businesses but also enhances the total efficiency of the innovation environment.[6] Discouragement of anti-competitive behaviour like espionage and abuse helps foster fair competition. Proper management of trade secrets motivates rivals and inventors to engage in research and development activities, fostering ongoing economic progress and technical innovation.

The Role of Whistleblower

Whistleblowers have long been the invisible guardians of individuals who risk everything to expose what powerful institutions choose to hide. Their role, as defined by *Peter B. Jubb*, is fundamental to creating scrutiny, transparency and accountability in both the government and corporate sectors.[7] In India, whistleblowers have consistently exposed entrenched corruption and abuse of power. The case of Shanmugam Manjunath, who exposed fuel adulteration in Uttar Pradesh, is a reminder of the grave personal cost of speaking out.[8] His assassination, though tragic, raised a cry for reform and prompted ministries to strengthen internal audits and enhance monitoring. *The Whistle Blowers Protection Act*, No. 17 of 2014, emerged as India's legislative answer to such tragedies. It seeks to protect individuals from retaliation and encourages disclosures related to fraud, corruption and abuse of power. Although the Act covers only public entities and has significant gaps in its enforcement, it has advanced the quality of governance.

Parallel to legal safeguards, India's Right to Information Act, 2005 has played a vital role in enabling whistleblowing by giving citizens the right to access information held by the government.[9] Empowered by these legal channels, whistleblowers have exposed tax evasion, corporate fraud, and even environmental crimes. Their revelations have exposed not just individual misconduct but also deep-rooted systemic failures. Satyam Computers was involved in a well-publicized incident exposing corporate fraud and the need for private-sector regulatory surveillance. This event made regulatory surveillance necessary.[10] Meanwhile, watchdog bodies such as the Central Vigilance Commission have slowly moved to curb corruption in public transactions, based largely on disclosures by whistleblowers.[11] However, despite these gains, India's whistleblowing framework remains riddled with loopholes. Most notably, the private sector lacks dedicated protection, leaving corporate whistleblowers vulnerable. Whistleblowers face significant threats, including retaliation and weak institutional support.

Status of Trade Secret and Whistle Blower-Worldwide and India

Trade secrets are one of modern corporation’s most valuable intangible assets. Trade secrets constitute a significant category of valuable intangible assets for modern corporations and play an important role in innovation and competition.[12]

These secrets form the backbone of innovation and competition. The United States, through its Economic Espionage Act, has estimated that trade secret theft costs the country about $300 billion annually.[13] At the same time, the whistleblower system in the United States has demonstrated remarkable success. The Association of Certified Fraud Examiners also mentioned in its report that whistleblowers aid in detecting fraud in 43% of cases, leading to substantial loss reduction.[14] However, even in relatively robust systems, retaliation remains a serious concern. The 2018 Ethics and Compliance Initiative report found that 69% of employees witnessed misconduct, while nearly half faced retaliation after reporting it.[15]

Whistleblowers often face retaliation within weeks of reporting, a universal deterrent to disclosure. Despite encouraging frameworks, fear of retaliation, job loss and isolation deters reporting. *Global Integrity Report*[16] Reflects this clearly: 52% of employees cited a lack of trust in problem resolution, 50% pointed to loyalty to the organization, and 38% reported pressure from management to keep quiet. Additionally, the survey found that 51% of whistleblowers have either been retaliated against or witnessed retaliation against them in their organizations. Transparency International's 2023 report reveals that only 35% of individuals in India who report wrongdoing believe the current legal system adequately protects them, fostering a culture of fear and silence.[17] These statistics reflect the widespread perception that existing protections are inadequate and that whistleblowers often have to navigate an ethical minefield alone.

Regulations and Legislation for the Protection of Trade Secrets and the Safeguards for Whistle Blowers in India

India's legal system for protecting trade secrets and whistleblowers is complex and evolving, influenced by judicial interpretation, scattered provisions, and new legislative initiatives.

The Legislation to Protect the Trade Secret

India currently has no dedicated statute for trade secrets. Instead, legal protection derives from contractual principles, common law and select statutory provisions. Indian courts have protected confidential business information through contractual obligations, principles of equity and breach of confidence, subject to the facts and circumstances of each case. Various laws provide indirect or sector-specific safeguards. Sections 72 and 72A of the Information Technology Act, 2000 provide limited statutory protection against unauthorised disclosure of information in specified circumstances. Similarly, Section 316 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 deals with criminal breach of trust involving property or dominion over property entrusted to a person.

Intellectual property laws provide limited protection, including Sections 13 and 63 of the Copyright Act, when confidential information is embodied in creative works, such as literary works or software. Although the Patents Act, 1970 is based on disclosure of inventions, it contains specific secrecy provisions for inventions relevant to defence purposes under Sections 35–42, while Section 39 regulates applications for patents outside India by residents.

Earlier legislative efforts, such as the proposed innovation law, aimed to codify protections for undisclosed information in research and business environments but were not implemented.[18] The definition and regulation of trade secrets have been recently added to the proposed legislation draft. This includes mechanisms for injunctive relief, damages, and public interest exceptions.

Laws to Safeguard the Whistleblower

India's whistleblower protection framework is based on a combination of statutory, regulatory and institutional measures to promote accountability while protecting whistleblowers. Section 11 of the Whistle Blowers Protection Act, 2014 provides safeguards against victimisation, while Section 13 deals with protection of the identity of the complainant, subject to the exceptions provided under the Act. It empowers competent authorities to maintain the confidentiality of whistleblowers and protect them from retaliatory consequences, subject to exceptions provided within statutes.

In the private sector, legal obligations for whistleblower mechanisms arise from corporate governance requirements. Companies must establish internal reporting systems and vigilance mechanisms to enable disclosures by employees and directors. Oversight bodies within corporate structures play a vital role in effectively redressing complaints and ensuring ethical compliance. Corporate governance norms also assign responsibilities to nomination committees, ensuring ethical leadership and integrity at managerial levels.[19] The regulatory role of the Securities and Exchange Board of India strengthens the statutory framework. Regulations relating to insider trading mandate the establishment of compliance mechanisms and internal controls, including safe avenues for disclosure. Additional listing obligations require companies to implement formal monitoring mechanisms and promote transparent disclosures on relevant platforms. These regulations enhance audit independence and strengthen anti-retaliation safeguards for whistleblowers.[20]

Draft Bill Impact on Balancing both Secrecy and Public Disclosure

Harmonizing it with whistleblower protection as India progresses toward formalizing trade secret protection through a comprehensive legislative framework is also essential. The proposed legislation draft on trade secrets introduces mechanisms for civil remedies, including injunctive relief, compensation and public interest exclusions. As given in the exception section, it shows how it prevents trade secret laws from putting restrictions on ethical disclosures.[21]

The protection of whistleblowers lets people reveal misbehaviour without thinking about repercussions, preserving openness. The proposed framework provides safeguards for public interest, which aligns with global best practices that recognize the societal value of such reporting.[11] This ensures that the *legal shield granted to trade secrets is not absolute* but rather proportionate and compatible with democratic accountability.

Global Legal Framework for Trade Secret Protection

Trade secrets are recognized globally as intellectual property, and domestic laws and international changes conventions provide the basis for their legal protection. TRIPS Agreement 1994, Articles 39.1 and 39.2 establishes minimum standards that member countries must adopt to prevent the unauthorized use or disclosure of trade secrets. The agreement encourages innovation by emphasizing confidentiality and commercial integrity and preventing unfair practices like industrial espionage. The European Union (EU) Trade Secrets Directive seeks to harmonize trade secrets between member countries by defining trade secrets as commercially valuable confidential information and requiring appropriate measures to be taken to protect it.[22] The Uniform Trade Secrets Act 1979 (as amended 1985) offered a model for state-level protection in the United States. Meanwhile, the Defend Trade Secrets Act (DTSA) provides a federal remedy for misappropriating trade secrets. These mechanisms provide rights holders with legal tools to obtain civil remedies, including injunctive relief and damages. The Economic Espionage Act (EEA), 1996 (US) criminalizes certain forms of trade-secret misappropriation, including conduct intended to benefit a foreign government, instrumentality or agent, subject to the statutory requirements. These legislative instruments strengthen the enforcement of trade secret rights across various jurisdictions and consistently protect multinational corporations.

Global Legislations/Policies for Whistleblower Safegaurds

Whistleblower protection is embedded in legal frameworks worldwide to promote transparency, integrity, and ethical governance. These laws safeguard individuals reporting illegal, unethical, or improper activities, prohibiting retaliation and offering remedies such as reinstatement or compensation. Significant global whistleblower protection legislations are as follows:

European Union

Whistleblower Protection Directive (2019): This directive mandates EU member states to protect individuals reporting breaches of EU law, covering public interest disclosures, including confidential business information. It prohibits retaliation and ensures remedies like reinstatement and compensation.[23]

United States

Sarbanes-Oxley Act (2002) protects whistleblowers reporting corporate misconduct in publicly traded companies. It prohibits retaliation and provides remedies such as reinstatement and back pay for affected employees.[24]

Dodd-Frank Act (2010) safeguards whistleblowers reporting securities violations to the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC). It offers anti-retaliation protections and potential monetary rewards for qualifying disclosures.[25]

Defend Trade Secrets Act (2016): DTSA includes a whistleblower immunity provision that protects certain disclosures of trade secrets made in confidence to government officials or attorneys for the purpose of reporting or investigating suspected violations of law, and certain disclosures made in legal proceedings under seal.[26]

United Kingdom

Public Interest Disclosure Act (PIDA) (1998): It protects workers from retaliation for making "protected disclosures" about wrongdoing, such as criminal offences or health and safety violations. It applies to employees, contractors, and agency workers, offering remedies like compensation for unfair dismissal.[27]

Australia

Public Interest Disclosures Act (2013) establishes a framework for public sector whistleblowers to report misconduct, such as corruption or maladministration, in federal agencies. It prohibits reprisals and provides protections like anonymity and legal remedies.[28]

Canada

Public Servants Disclosure Protection Act (PSDPA): Enacted in 2005 and amended in 2007, the PSDPA protects federal public servants reporting wrongdoings, such as misuse of public funds or breaches of law. It establishes a Public Sector Integrity Commissioner to investigate disclosures and prohibits reprisals.[29]

South Africa

Protected Disclosures Act (2000): This Act safeguards employees in public and private sectors who disclose unlawful or irregular conduct by employers or colleagues. It prohibits occupational detriments like dismissal or harassment and provides remedies through labour courts.[30]

India

Whistleblowers Protection Act (2014) provides a mechanism to protect individuals reporting corruption or willful misuse of power by public servants. It establishes safeguards against victimisation and protection of the identity of complainants, although its implementation remains limited.[31]

Japan

Whistleblower Protection Act: Enacted in 2004 and effective from 2006, this Act protects whistleblowers in public and private sectors who report illegal activities in the public interest. It prohibits dismissal or disadvantageous treatment and applies to employees, contractors, and suppliers.[32]

Harmonizing Laws Trade Secret Protection with Whistleblower Rights

The Trade Secrets Directive of the European Union is one such balance since it allows disclosures to expose misbehaviour or protect public welfare. It is an attempt to balance trade secret enforcement with the protection of whistleblowers. Likewise, the DTSA in the United States ensures that whistleblowers are immune from liability when reporting wrongdoing through proper channels. This dual approach recognizes that a strong trade secret regime fosters innovation and competition, while the protection of whistleblowers enhances accountability. Together, they contribute to a regulatory ecosystem where legal compliance, ethical transparency, and economic security coexist.

Problems encountered by Whistleblowers

Whistleblowing is a necessary evil for exposing unethical or illegal activities going on in corporations. However, individuals who become whistleblowers are heavily penalized, ranging from disciplinary action in the work environment to adversity in the court system. Although there are laws in the EU, US, UK, Australia, Canada, South Africa, India and Japan to protect whistleblowers, many still feel disheartened and suffer both emotional and professional pain. The plight of the Whistleblower can be classified into three categories: legal, professional and ethical. Each group is generous to whistleblowers who choose to expose wrongdoing.

One of the most immediate effects that whistleblowers face is the loss of trust within the workplace. If problems are hidden or downplayed, there is recourse to seeking redress through alternative channels. Typically, organizations use internal processes to encourage employees to report crimes. Due to this, employees are isolated from their co-workers, experience hostility at the management level, and, in some cases, are asked to resign. Most employees who would otherwise complain are forced to keep quiet for fear of being labelled troublemakers, creating a culture of silence where unethical behaviour can thrive. Even where legal remedies are available, retaliation against whistleblowers is still rampant.[33]

Whistleblowers who expose abuse often face retaliatory treatment such as dismissal, demotion, professional blocklisting, and ostracism. The National Whistleblower Center claims that many whistleblowers face long-term career uncertainty. For instance, *Suchir Balaji*, who had previously collaborated with Open AI, passed suddenly on November 26, 2024. There has been a lot of recorded information on his passing, which was much covered. Suchir reportedly was a researcher who raised issues about unethical behaviour in artificial intelligence research and corporate governance abuses. Reports of his being subjected to a great degree of professional pressure and social exclusion immediately following his performance abound. His family has now asked the FBI to look into his death since the chronology of events leading up to it shows contradictions. Originally, the reports claimed, his death was first described as a tragic suicide. The continuous investigation of the matter sheds light on the psychological suffering whistleblowers experience, which can have disastrous results. The police department and related offices have closed the case, but his family still raise concerns and seek further inquiry into the case. However, there is no link between his death and the reported concern as such till now. The case highlights the personal and organisational stress faced by whistleblowers.[34] In particular, whistleblowing can overturn an organization's hierarchical nature when employees violate internal protocols to expose misconduct outside the firm. While it may be unavoidable in cases where effective internal reporting is lacking, it can result in a lack of trust among leadership and internal conflict.

Organizations that lack solid and clear frameworks risk losing the trust of their stakeholders and employees when it comes to reporting. Managers who stand up for ethics may treat whistleblowers as adversaries rather than allies. There will be less internal reporting and a greater tendency to hide things, which could have negative consequences. A company that engages in illegal activity may face significant financial penalties and legal issues due to the report. Common penalties include financial fines imposed by regulatory bodies, damage to reputation, and loss of investor confidence. The Hervé Falciani scandal, in which a former HSBC employee went public with large-scale tax evasion plots in Europe, is just one of the complications of whistleblower disclosure.[35] HSBC faced regulatory fines, worldwide investigations and court cases because of its disclosures, which indicates the economic and legal consequences that will surely fall on whistleblowers worldwide. Although openness to wrongdoing inside an organization is essential for ethical leadership, whistleblowing can also cause unanticipated disturbances for staff members who were not involved in the misconduct. Most people who come forward with misbehaviour face ethical questions when deciding whether or not to reveal it. Their conscience may be disturbed if they lie to their colleagues or damage the company's brand. John Kopchinski, a former Pfizer sales representative, is a prime example of such a scenario. Kopchinski was horrified to discover that Pfizer was marketing the painkiller Bextra outside of FDA-approved parameters.[36] He was fired from the company for raising concerns, but years later, at great personal expense, he was able to expose the wrongdoing and secure a $51.5 million settlement. This is a great example of the potential benefits and hazards of alerting companies to unethical activity. The main function of trade secrets is safeguarding sensitive and valuable information, which keeps a business competitive. The maintenance of competition depends on trade secrets. Protecting trade secrets encourages innovation and research and allows businesses to hide substantial intellectual property from the public. Despite existing laws protecting whistleblowers, enforcement loopholes leave most vulnerable to retaliation. Corporations often use indirect methods, including performance-related terminations, to punish whistleblowers.

Published by Public Citizen, a group supporting the defence of consumer rights, a study reveals that since 1991, pharmaceutical companies have paid fines under the False Claims Act, totalling almost $19.8 billion overall. Over the past ten years, the cases brought forward by whistleblowers have accounted for 67% of the compensation paid. Though this is the case, most people who blow the whistle lack legal remedies, emphasizing the need for more comprehensive protection systems. Whistleblowers must be given extra legal protections, corporate responsibility rules, and open internal reporting systems to help them avoid reprisals for exposing information on unethical behaviour. Authorities should impose more sanctions against retaliatory firms to make it safer for whistleblowers to expose corporate misconduct. Whistleblowers are good defenders of accountability and transparency, but they still face major obstacles, including isolation in the workplace, legal repercussions, and dismissal.[37]

Exceptional circumstances to Trade Secret

The main goal of trade secrets is to safeguard important and private information, which is necessary to guarantee that a business keeps its competitive edge in the marketplace. In addition to allowing companies to retain valuable intellectual property without disclosing it to the public, trade secret protection encourages innovation and research. Conversely, trade secrets can be protected indefinitely, provided that appropriate confidentiality measures are maintained. There are circumstances where the disclosure of trade secrets becomes necessary, such as when public health, safety or vital public interests are at stake. Legal frameworks should carefully regulate such disclosures and the protection of whistleblowers against any retaliation who are acting in good faith. Whistleblowers are essential to exposing unethical behaviour, corruption or public harm, and legal systems should ensure their protection through anonymity, immunity and access to legal remedies. Certain legal theories exempt trade secret liability where the information is independently discovered or obtained through reverse engineering. Legitimate reverse engineering may constitute an exception to trade-secret liability in some jurisdictions, particularly where the product has been lawfully acquired; however, its permissibility depends on applicable law and contractual restrictions.[38] It restricts the enforceability of reverse engineering prohibitions through contractual agreements, although enforcement varies in different jurisdictions.

Moving employees also presents challenges. Workers retain the right to broad knowledge and experience acquired on the job, even as businesses attempt to protect confidential company information. Businesses, therefore, frequently use non-disclosure clauses and confidentiality agreements to deal with this. Non-compete agreements, which prohibit employees from joining competitors after leaving their jobs, are increasingly viewed suspiciously by courts; nations generally have strict enforcement regulations.

Courts have sometimes permitted the disclosure of trade secrets in the interest of public welfare. In *Detroit Medical Center* v *GEAC Computer Systems (2000)*, the Court prioritized the public interest in healthcare delivery over contractual confidentiality, granting access to the hospital's stock control system under limited conditions despite a strict non-disclosure arrangement.[39] Legislative whistleblower protections provide another important exception. The legal system protects whistleblowers who disclose misconduct or illegal activity involving confidential business information, provided such disclosures are in the public interest. These laws are intended to prevent trade secret protection from becoming a means of concealing corporate wrongdoing.

Obstacles to Trade Secret

A major obstacle to effective trade secret protection is reconciling competing legal interests. Whistleblower protections, mandatory disclosure requirements, and employee rights to mobility must coexist with trade secret laws. Modern legal systems, therefore, recognize exceptions allowing disclosure in circumstances of illegality, misconduct, or public risk.[40] The great variations in trade secret laws between nations are another major issue. Legal definitions, enforcement rules, and public interest exclusions vary; thus, it is challenging to guarantee that trade secrets get adequate protection worldwide and enforce criteria and public interest exclusions. This is true regarding cross-border transactions and multinational economic activity in particular. Furthermore, there is a greater chance that trade secrets will be exposed to new threats due to the increasing digitization of commercial activities. Issues like data breaches, cyberattacks, and unauthorized access to personal data are growing more common. Strict technological, contractual, and operational security policies are necessary for businesses to maintain confidentiality and protect private information in the digital world.

Improvements in Trade Secrets Protection and Whistleblower Provisions: International Best Practices

Using a critical analysis, one can improve the text of the Trade Secrets Protection Bill by augmenting protection for those who blow the whistle and providing more exact definitions and laws covering trade secrets. The Bill could create a society where reporting ethical misbehaviour is encouraged, and real trade secrets are protected simultaneously. Reducing present shortcomings and implementing global best practices will help one to achieve this. The Bill must protect those who disclose unethical, illegal behaviour and those who break the law. This will allow more extensive reporting and lead to a culture of responsibility. More protection must be provided to the confidentiality and anonymity of whistleblowers. Effective whistleblower schemes can maintain trust and encourage individuals to report without worrying about employer repercussions. The Bill should have robust anti-retaliation provisions with greater penalties for employers guilty of retaliating against whistleblowers. The provisions would ensure that it is safer for individuals to report information about illegal acts.

Laws protecting trade secrets should be dynamic and continuous, involving identifying possible trade secrets, value assessment, risk and vulnerability analysis, and construction of sensible security policies. These measures can be technical tools like access control and encryption or legal ones like non-disclosure agreements. However, these measures should not exist in isolation. They must be supported by mechanisms that constantly monitor for leaks or breaches and respond to emerging threats promptly. This identification, evaluation, implementation and monitoring cycle provides a baseline model for how trade secret protection can work.

More specific definitions would improve the law, and clear definitions would also distinguish between proprietary information and information available in the public domain.[41] Whistleblowers can report trade secret violations with legal confidence, as rules clarify public interest in revealing trade secrets, especially in the rise of digital technology, requiring explicit cybersecurity measures. The Bill should address cyberattack vulnerabilities and unapproved access, considering the impact of emerging technologies like AI and blockchain on trade secret protection and handling, ensuring it remains relevant in an ever-evolving context.

The Trade Secrets Protection Bill aims to protect whistleblowers and legitimate trade secrets by establishing a clear policy framework, promoting awareness, and implementing strong privacy safeguards. Independent reporting channels should ensure impartiality, while transparent investigations promote accountability. Continuous feedback mechanisms strengthen trust in the process. An open enforcement process and a wider range of legal remedies for victims of trade secret theft and whistleblower retaliation would empower individuals and companies to pursue justice effectively.[42]

Civil remedies such as damages, injunctions, and legal cost coverage would also be provided. Promoting ethical corporate governance practices would promote a transparent and accountable culture.[43] Businesses should be encouraged to establish internal structures for reporting and resolving potential breaches of trade secret laws. Employee training programs on trade secret management and whistleblower protections can educate the workforce about ethical behaviour. Public awareness campaigns can facilitate compliance and reporting of violations. Financial rewards for whistleblowers reporting antitrust infractions can increase the chances of reporting illicit activities.[44] Inducing educational campaigns on antitrust legislation can reduce the likelihood of questionable business practices.

Critical Analysis of Research Data

This research paper is based on survey data from 325 individuals, including Corporate Executives, Legal Professionals, Compliance Officers, Whistleblowers, and Researchers/Academicians.The study adopted mixed approach with doctrinal part that focuses on examining the domestic and international legal framworks and empirical part that focuses on collecting responses from above mentioned participants regarding trade secret protection and whistleblower safeguards.

The survey shows that most respondents (44.8%) believe trade secrets are not adequately protected against misappropriation and unauthorized disclosures, with concerns about internal threats like employee leaks and insider misconduct. Non-disclosure agreements (NDAs) are the most widely adopted protective mechanism, followed by restricted access protocols and employee training initiatives. The proposed Trade Secret Protection Draft, 2024, received mixed reactions, with 59.4% deeming it highly or moderately effective.

Whistleblowers face barriers such as fear of job loss (66.2%), apprehensions about legal consequences (45.1%), anonymity breaches (37.0%), and social stigma (27.7%). Perceptions of retaliation against whistleblowers are also troubling, with half of the respondents believing that whistleblowers face frequent reprisals. Legal immunity for whistleblowers disclosing trade secrets in the public interest is supported by a majority (53.2%), while an additional 39.0% advocate for immunity under strict legal oversight.

The survey data reveals clear reform priorities, with stronger legal protection for whistleblowers (64.2%) and stricter trade secret laws (55.4%). Other proposals include establishing an independent authority/ agency to investigate whistleblower complaints (43.0%) and imposing stricter penalties on companies retaliating against whistleblowers (37.7%).

Findings

The survey findings reveal critical concerns about India's trade secret and whistleblower protection frameworks. Regarding trade secret protection, respondents expressed significant dissatisfaction, with *44.8% considering the current framework inadequate*. The primary risks identified include *internal vulnerabilities, particularly employee leaks and insider threats (9.2%)*, though *cyber espionage (24%)* remains a notable external threat. To counter these risks, organizations rely heavily on *restricted access policies (49.9%), non-disclosure agreements (52.2%), and employee training (37.2%)*. However, *only 0.6% resort to litigation*, suggesting limited confidence in legal recourse or a preference for preventive measures.

On the proposed Trade Secret Protection Draft, 2024, *59.4% of respondents expect it to be moderately or highly effective*. *Nevertheless, 21.2% remain unsure*, and *17.3% are sceptical*, highlighting the need for clearer legislation and stronger enforcement to build confidence.

Parallel challenges exist in whistleblower protection, where *fear of job loss (66.2%)* emerges as the primary barrier, followed by *apprehensions about legal consequences (45.1%), breach of anonymity (37.0%), and social stigma (27.7%)*. Additionally, *50.0% of respondents believe retaliation against whistleblowers is frequent*, discouraging ethical disclosures. Regarding solutions, *53.2% support legal immunity for whistleblowers acting in the public interest*, while *39.0% favour conditional immunity*. The current Whistleblower Protection Act of 2014 is widely criticized, with *54.2% rating it ineffective or highly ineffective,* underscoring the urgent need for reform.

The findings highlight significant gaps in India's trade secret and whistleblower protection frameworks. Addressing *internal and external threats to trade secrets*, building trust in *new legislative proposals,* and overcoming *barriers to whistleblowing* through robust, enforceable laws are critical to establishing a balanced system that protects organizational interests while encouraging ethical disclosures.

Way Forward

India should develop a structured legal framework that secures trade secrets and whistleblower protection, promoting ethical corporate governance. A dedicated trade secret protection law is imperative, providing precise definitions, civil remedies for misuse, and public interest exceptions. At the same time, it is important to amend the Whistleblowers Protection Act of 2014 to enhance protection against retaliation, formally recognize anonymous reporting, and enhance judicial immunity for disclosures made in good faith.

International best practices provide valuable models. The Defend Trade Secrets Act, 2016 (DTSA) includes a whistleblower immunity provision protecting certain confidential disclosures of trade secrets made for reporting or investigating suspected violations of law. Similarly, the European Union Whistleblower Protection Directive, 2019 (EUWPD) obliges member countries to protect whistleblowers who expose wrongdoing, even when confidential information is involved.

Case law further highlights this need. In *Waymo LLC* v *Uber Technologies Inc.* (2018), a US$245 million settlement emphasized protecting proprietary information and the risks of anti-competitive abuse of trade secret laws.[45] From a whistleblower's perspective, the Enron scandal (2001) exposed systemic financial fraud and retaliatory threats against insiders and contributed to the enactment of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act (SOA) of 2002. Subsequently, the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010 introduced additional whistleblower protections and incentives in the securities sector.[46] Similarly, the Volkswagen emissions case (2015) demonstrated the important role of whistleblowers in exposing corporate misconduct, resulting in financial penalties and regulatory reforms.[47]

Beyond legislation, companies should establish independent reporting mechanisms involving third-party compliance officers or ombudsman panels to handle concerns internally. Adopting monetary incentives for whistleblowers, like the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission's (SEC) Whistleblower Program (2010), can promote disclosures while discouraging frivolous claims.[48] Combined with oversight agencies and compliance audits, these reforms can create a culture where corporate confidentiality and ethical accountability coexist.

Conclusion

India's corporate landscape requires a nuanced approach to balance trade secret protection and whistleblower protection measures. A well-established framework integrating clear legislation and corporate governance reforms is essential to promote innovation and ethical conduct. By learning from international best practices and high-profile case studies, India can establish a system where corporate confidentiality coexists with public interest disclosure. This will result in a business environment characterized by transparency, accountability, and ethical integrity, fostering trust and ensuring long-term competitiveness.

References

1 Myers D D, Introduction to Trade Secrets, University of Missouri Extension (1993) www.semanticscholar.org/paper/c1bbc5a13a2a48010b8508e3d344ee821228f76c (accessed on 10 March 2025).

2 Mishra A K, *Demystifying the Trade Secret Protection Act*, Global IP Convention (2024), available at www.web.archive.org/web/20250207175044/www.globalipconvention.com/blog/demystifying-the-trade-secret-protection-act-key-insights-and-implications (accessed on 27 April 2025).

3 Klein C, *U.S. Whistleblowers First Got Government Protection in 1777*, History.com, available at www.history.com/news/whistleblowers-law-founding-fathers (accessed on 10 March 2025).

4 Peabody v *Norfolk, 98 Mass. 452 (1868).*

5 Robertson K M, Hannah D R and Lautsch B A, Keeping secrets: The impact of trade secret protection on corporate competitive advantage, *Organizational Dynamics*, 24 (2) (2004) 62.

6 Almeling D S, Seven reasons why trade secrets are increasingly important, *Berkeley Technology Law Journal*, 27 (4) (2012) 1104.

7 Jubb P B, Whistleblowing: A restrictive definition and interpretation, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 21 (1) (1999) 77.

8 Baruah A, *Not Just Amarmani, Whistleblower Manjunath's Killer Also Set Free by UP—A Trend Hard to Combat*, The Print (2024), www.theprint.in/feature/not-just-amarmani-whistleblower-manjunaths-killer-also-set-free-by-up-a-trend-hard-to-combat/1738700/ (accessed on 10 March 2025).

9 Pande S, *Dying for Information: Right to Information and Whistleblower Protection in India*, U4 Anti-Corruption Resource Centre (6 April 2015), www.u4.no/publications/dying-for-information-right-to-information-and-whistleblower-protection-in-india (accessed on 10 March 2025).

10 Sanyal S & Tiwari D, *Ex-Insider Blew the Lid Off Satyam Scam*, The Econ: Times, www.economictimes.indiatimes.com/tech/software/ex-insider-blew-the-lid-off-satyam-scam/articleshow/4411924.cms (accessed on Mar. 10, 2025).

11 Joshi G P, *The Central Vigilance Commission and the Central Bureau of Investigation: A Brief History of Some Developments*, Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, www.humanrightsinitiative.org/publications/police/cvc_cbi_some_developments_a_brief_history.pdf (accessed on 10 March 2025).

12 Durana A, *S&P 500 Companies in 2025: Full List and Performance*, NerdWallet, www.nerdwallet.com/article/investing/sp-500-companies (accessed on 10 March 2025).

13 Pappas P C, *Protecting Our Trade Secrets Is Vital to Economic Growth*, The Hill, www.thehill.com/ blogs/ congress-blog/economy-budget/266472-protecting-our-trade-secrets-is-vital-to-economic-growth/ (accessed on 10 March 2025).

14 McGowan D & McNeal A, *Fighting Fraud: A Shared Responsibility*, Center for Audit Quality, www.thecaq.org/aia-fighting-fraud-a-shared-responsibility (accessed on 10 March 2025).

15 Ethics & Compliance Initiative, *The State of Ethics & Compliance in the Workplace*, March 2018, available upon request at www.ethics.org (accessed on 11 March, 2025).

16 *Global Integrity Report – India Edition*, 2024.

17 Transparency Int'l, *Global Corruption Barometer – Asia* (2023), www.transparency.org/en/gcb/asia/asia-2023 (accessed 10 March 2025).

18 Draft National Innovation Act, 2008, Department of Science & Technology, Government of India.

19 Companies Act, 2013 (Act No. 18 of 2013), Section 177(9) & Section 178 and Companies (Meetings of Board and its Powers) Rules, 2014, Rule 7.

20 Securities and Exchange Board of India, Securities and Exchange Board of India (Prohibition of Insider Trading) Regulations, 2015, Regs 7D, 9A (6); Securities and Exchange Board of India (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015, Regs 18, 22, 46 and 62.

21 22nd Law Commission of India, *Trade Secrets Protection Draft Bill*, *2024*, Sections 2, 4, 7 and 9, available at: www.cdnbbsr.s3waas.gov.in/s3b2f5578af51ed3a7c1e13f49e6f8f3b0/uploads/2024/02/2024-TSPB.pdf (accessed on 11 March 2025).

22 Directive (EU) 2016/943 of the European Parliament and the Council on protecting undisclosed know-how and business information (Trade Secrets Directive).

23 European Parliament and Council, Directive (EU) 2019/1937 on the protection of persons who report breaches of Union law, Official Journal of the European Union, 62 (2019) 17–39, https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/ ?uri=CELEX:32019L1937 (accessed 25 April 2025). See also Directive (EU) 2019/1937 of the European Parliament and the Council on protecting persons who report breaches of Union law (Whistleblower Protection Directive), 2019. The European Union has adopted the Whistleblower Protection Directive, which obliges member states to protect individuals who report law violations. The directive covers disclosures made in the public interest involving confidential business information.

24 United States Congress, Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, Public Law 107-204, 116 Stat. 745 (2002) 745-809, https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/PLAW-107publ204/pdf/PLAW-107publ204.pdf (accessed on 25 April 2025). *See also* Title 18, Section 1514A

25 United States Congress, Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, Public Law 111-203, 124 Stat. 1376 (2010) 1376-2223, https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/PLAW-111publ203/pdf/PLAW-111publ203.pdf (accessed 25 April 2025). *See also* Title 15, Section 78u-6.

26 United States Congress, Defend Trade Secrets Act of 2016, Public Law 114-153, 130 Stat. 376 (2016) 376-382, *See also*, Title 18, Section 1833(b). https://www.congress.gov/114/plaws/publ153/PLAW-114publ153.pdf (accessed on 25 April 2025).

27 United Kingdom Parliament, Public Interest Disclosure Act 1998, Chapter 23 (1998) 1-10, https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1998/23/contents (accessed on 25 April 2025).

28 Australian Parliament, Public Interest Disclosures Act 2013, No. 133 (2013) 1-78, https://www.legislation.gov.au/Details/C2021C00339 (accessed on 25 April 2025).

29 Parliament of Canada, Public Servants Disclosure Protection Act, S.C. 2005, c. 46 (2005) 1-34, https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/P-31.9/FullText.html (accessed on 25 April 2025).

30 Parliament of South Africa, Protected Disclosures Act, 2000, No. 26 of 2000 (2000) 1-14, https://www.gov. za/sites/default/files/gcis_document/201409/a26-000.pdf (accessed on 25 April 2025).

31 Parliament of India, Whistleblowers Protection Act, 2014, No. 17 of 2014 (2014) 1-12, https://www.indiacode.nic.in/

bitstream/ 123456789/2014/1/A2014-17.pdf (accessed on 25 April 2025).

32 National Diet of Japan, Whistleblower Protection Act, Act No. 122 of 2004 (2004) 1-15, https:// www.cas.go.jp/jp/ seisaku/hourei/data/WPA.pdf (accessed on 25 April 2025).

33 Baljija S K & Min K, Evaluating the Effectiveness of Whistleblower Protection: A New Index, Data & Policy, vol. 5, 2023, p. e28, doi: 10.1017/dap.2023.20.

34 Entin B**,** Family of Dead AI Whistleblower Suchir Balaji Speaks Out: Exclusiv**e,** *NewsNation*, 17 March 2025, www.newsnationnow.com/business/tech/ai/family-ai-whistleblower-suchir-balaji (accessed on 18 March 2025).

35 Keefe P R, Hervé Falciani's Great Swiss Bank Heist, The New Yorker, www.newyorker.com/magazine/ 2016/05/30/ herve-falcianis-great-swiss-bank-heist (accessed on 11 March 2025)

36 Pfizer (Bextra) Whistleblower John Kopchinski, www. phillipsandcohen.com/pfizer-bextra-whistleblower-john-kopchinski (accessed on 11 March 2025).

37 Nieweler A, *5 Top Challenges in California Whistleblower Protection and How to Overcome Them*, www.blog. whistleblowersecurity.com/blog/5-top-challenges-in-california-whistleblower-protection-and-how-to-overcome-them (accessed on 11 March 2025).

38 Vethan Law Firm PC, Reverse engineering as an exception to trade secrets claims, www.vethanlaw.com/blog/ 2024/10/ reverse-engineering-as-an-exception-to-trade-secrets-claims (accessed on 12 March 2025).

39 *Detroit Medical Center* v *GEAC Computer Systems*, 103 F. Supp. 2d 1019 (E.D. Mich. 2000).

40 Saltzman S, et al., Non-competes around the world: top issues and strategies for enforcement, www.dlapiper.com/ en/insights/publications/2023/09/non-competes-around-the-world (accessed on 12 March 2025).

41 U.S. Department of Justice, 18 U.S.C. § 1831: Element Three—The Information Was a Trade Secret, Criminal Resource Manual (2015), available at: www.justice.gov/ archives/jm/criminal-resource-manual-1127-18-usc-1831-element-three-information-was-trade-secret (accessed on 12 March 2025)

42 Kirwan P, *Trade Secret Theft Could Snare, Corporate Wrongdoers*, *Daily Journal*, www.dailyjournal.com/articles/ 383427-trade-secret-theft-could-snare-corporate-wrongdoers (accessed on 12 March 2025).

43 Krayem A, *The Role of Ethics in Corporate Governance*, www.governanceatwork.io/blog/ethics-in-corporate-governance (accessed on 12 March 2025).

44 Cieslak J, *Congress Creates New Protections for Antitrust Whistleblowers*, Bona Law PC, www.theantitrustattorney.com/ congress-creates-new-protections-for-antitrust-whistleblowers (accessed on 12 March 2025).

45 *Waymo LLC* v *Uber Techs.*, Inc., 17-cv-00939-WHA (JSC).

46 Arbogast S V, *Whistleblowing Before Imploding in Accounting Scandals: A Case Study in Accounting Fraud Whistleblowing Pre-Sarbanes Oxley*, C.T. Bauer College of Business, University of Houston.

47 Hotten R, *Volkswagen: The Scandal Explained*, BBC News, 10 December 2015, www.bbc.com/news/business-34324772 (accessed on 12 March 2025).

48 U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) Whistleblower Program, 2010.