

Analysis

High Court Whistleblower Case Is Bigger Than Wall Street

₽ ₽ f in

By Jessica Corso \cdot (\mathbf{Q}) Listen to article

Law360 (May 2, 2023, 7:32 PM EDT) -- The U.S. Supreme Court's decision to hear the case of a former UBS employee who claims he was fired for alerting his boss to potential illegal activity could reverberate beyond the financial industry to determine the future success of whistleblower retaliation claims pressed by employees in the transportation, nuclear energy and food safety sectors.

The Supreme Court on Monday **agreed to hear** an appeal brought by former UBS employee Trevor Murray, who says he was fired after telling higher-ups about being pressured to alter research he conducted on UBS' commercial mortgage-backed securities business.

A Manhattan federal jury who heard the case in 2017 **awarded Murray** \$903,300 but the Second Circuit **overturned that verdict** in August, saying that the judge failed to instruct the jury that they needed to find that UBS acted with "retaliatory intent" in firing the analyst.

UBS says that Murray's position was cut as part of a round of layoffs the company undertook due to its poor financial performance in 2011.

It's now up to the Supreme Court to decide if the Second Circuit improperly contradicted four other circuit courts that have imposed lesser standards of proof on alleged whistleblowers, as Murray and his supporters contend.

"I do think that the Murray decision has made a mess of the pretty well-understood causation analysis in these cases," Alexis Ronickher, a partner at Katz Banks Kumin LLP who specializes in representing whistleblowers, told Law360.

The high court is being asked to look specifically at the whistleblower protections incorporated into the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, which was passed by Congress after the collapse of Enron exposed reporting deficiencies at publicly traded companies.

It is intended to protect those alerting Congress, federal regulators or their employers to potential securities fraud, according to a text of the law posted to the Department of Labor's website.

But that whistleblower protection language is not unique to Sarbanes-Oxley. A Supreme Court ruling in Murray v. UBS could have spillover effects for workers in the nuclear, aviation and railway industries, said R. Scott Oswald, a managing partner and whistleblower attorney at The Employment Law Group.

"These are areas where there is real danger to the public of these employers not operating at the

Useful Tools & Links

Q

Add to Briefcase
Save to PDF & Print
Rights/Reprints
Editorial Contacts

Related Sections

Appellate	
Compliance	
Connecticut	\square
Employment	\square
Energy	\square
Food & Beverage	\square
Health	\square
New York	\square
Product Liability	\square
Public Policy	\square
Securities	\square
Transportation	\square

NEWSLETTERS

Case Information

Case Title

Trevor Murray, Petitioner v. UBS Securities, LLC, et al.

Case Number 22-660

Court Supreme Court

Nature of Suit 3790 LABOR LAWS-Other Litigation

Date Filed January 18, 2023

Law Firms

Bernabei & Kabat	
Gibson Dunn	
Herbst Law PLLC	
Kalijarvi Chuzi	
Katz Banks	
Seyfarth Shaw	
Stulberg & Walsh	
Companies	
Government Accountability Project	
Government Agencies	
Federal Aviation Administration	
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

highest level," Oswald said. "So we want whistleblowers to come forward."

In a February brief encouraging the Supreme Court to hear the case and overrule the Second Circuit, U.S. Sens. Chuck Grassley, R-Iowa, and Ron Wyden, D-Ore., listed 16 federal statutes that contain whistleblower provisions that are "virtually identical" to the one in the Sarbanes-Oxley Act.

In fact, the senators said that Congress modeled the Sarbanes-Oxley whistleblower provision after the one in the Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century, or AIR-21, which protects employees filing complaints with the Federal Aviation Administration.

AIR-21 itself incorporates language found in the Whistleblower Protection Act of 1989, which Grassley co-authored, the senators said.

Under the language in the statutes, which cover workers in the health care, nuclear energy, transportation, food manufacturing and other industries, the senators said that employees only need to demonstrate that their whistleblowing was a contributing factor to their firing.

The company can then defend itself by presenting "clear-and-convincing evidence" that it was planning on firing or taking adverse action against the employee, anyway, according to Wyden and Grassley's brief.

The Second Circuit overrode Congressional intent by requiring employees to prove "retaliatory intent" to make their case, the senators said.

"Reducing the burden on whistleblowers is sound policy because 'an employer will rarely admit retaliatory motives in firing an employee," the senators wrote, citing the Tenth Circuit's 1998 Sanjuan v. IBP Inc. () ruling, which dealt with a workplace injury dispute.

Ronickher of Katz Banks Kumin said the Supreme Court's decision could also impact whistleblower protections in states like California that use the same burden-shifting framework as AIR-21.

But not everybody agrees that the Second Circuit added to employees' burdens to prove their case or that the Murray decision contradicted what other courts have had to say.

UBS, for example, told the Supreme Court that the circuit split cited by Murray is "substantially overstated."

Two of the circuit courts in question never addressed retaliatory intent and another dealt directly with the Whistleblower Protection Act, which does not, like Sarbanes-Oxley, have a requirement to show discrimination, UBS wrote in a brief asking the Supreme Court not to hear the appeal.

"The Second Circuit's holding was expressly predicated on the established meaning of the word 'discriminate," the company said.

That the justices have decided to hear the appeal shows that they believe there is some conflict, Christopher Robertson of Seyfarth Shaw LLP said. U.S. Supreme Court

2023 Titans of the Plaintiffs Bar

Law360 Reveals Titans Of The Plaintiffs Bar

In the past year, companies like JUUL, Capital One and Southern California Edison have settled for millions if not billions of dollars in litigation that was high-profile and often groundbreaking in its impact on the law itself. Such cases and many others — which involved opioids, sexual harassment, kickbacks and data breaches — were led by attorneys whose accomplishments helped them earn recognition as Law360's Titans of the Plaintiffs Bar for 2023.

Top 10 trending in Appellate		
1	Skadden, O'Melveny Vets Among 4 District Court Picks	
2	Use Of 'Hot Mess' In High Court Brief Draws Ire, But Isn't New	
3	3rd Circ. Nixes Late Night Filings, Sets 5 PM Deadline	
4	Justices Won't Stay 10th Circ. Ruling On Split Jurisdiction	
5	High Court Whistleblower Case Is Bigger Than Wall Street	
6	4th Circ. Chief Judge Rips Into Feds Over FMLA Damages	
7	Senate Confirms California, NY District Court Picks	
8	6th Circ. Judge 'Befuddled' By Mich. Long- Arm Statute	
9	'Y'all Do Different Stuff,' Judge Says In \$48M Trademark Feud	
1	O Split 8th Circ. Backs Sheraton In Guest's Race Bias Suit	

Robertson, who advises companies facing whistleblower complaints, said he wasn't sure that the Second Circuit did anything more than explicitly state what was always required for an employee to prove their case at trial.

"Part of proving your case is convincing the trier of fact that the person who took the retaliatory action did so based upon the purported whistleblowing, and that necessarily has an element of intentional conduct," Robertson said.

But he admitted that the Supreme Court's decision could have an impact on whistleblower cases beyond Sarbanes-Oxley, depending on how the justices tailor their eventual ruling.

It's hard to say where the court's focus will be, however, until briefing and oral argument are complete, Robertson said.

"I'm curious to see where this goes," he said. "Is it really a strict statutory read? Or is there an effort on both sides to try to expand this more broadly?"

Murray is represented by Robert L. Herbst and Benjamin J. Ashmore Sr. of Herbst Law PLLC, Robert B. Stulberg and Patrick J. Walsh of Stulberg & Walsh LLP and Scott A. Korenbaum.

UBS is represented by Eugene Scalia, Gabrielle Levin, Thomas G. Hungar, Andrew G.I. Kilberg and Anna Casey of Gibson Dunn & Crutcher LLP.

Grassley and Wyden are represented by Thomas Devine and John Kolar of the Government Accountability Project, Jason Zuckerman of Zuckerman Law, George Chuzi and Richard Renner of Kalijarvi Chuzi Newman & Fitch PC and Lynne Bernabei and Alan Kabat of Bernabei & Kabat PLLC.

The case is Murray v. UBS Securities LLC et al., case number 22-660, in the U.S. Supreme Court.

--Editing by Emily Kokoll and Kelly Duncan.

Update: This story has been updated with additional counsel information.

For a reprint of this article, please contact **reprints@law360.com**.

0 Comments

Sign In To Comment

Related Articles

Justices To Hear Tipster's Case To Revive \$1M Retaliation Win

BUBS Tipster Wants 2nd Circ. To Revisit \$1M Retaliation Award

2nd Circ. Overturns Fired UBS Whistleblower's \$1M Award

2nd Circ. Wary Of Tossing UBS Whistleblower's \$1M Trial Win

B UBS Whistleblower Ruling Reignites Arbitration Debate

Here's What You Missed
Skadden, O'Melveny Vets Among 4 District Court Picks
Use Of 'Hot Mess' In High Court Brief Draws Ire, But Isn't New
3rd Circ. Nixes Late Night Filings, Sets 5 PM Deadline
FTC Accuses Meta Of Privacy Abuse, Pushes Data Profit Ban
Atty Who Called Judges 'Scumbags,' Slurs Faces Sanctions
MoFo Litigation Leader Jumps To Paul Hastings
Ghosting In BigLaw: Why Better Feedback Habits Are Needed
Former OpenSea Manager Convicted In NFT Homepage Fraud Case
Morgan Lewis Hires 10 Financial Services Attys From Stroock
Senate Confirms California, NY District Court Picks
4th Circ. Chief Judge Rips Into Feds Over FMLA Damages
Stryker Hires Counsel To Launch New Internal FCPA Probe
DOJ's Assa Abloy Merger Trial Paused Again And Again
Jury Clears Google In Long-Running \$46M Data Patent Row
Farmers Owes \$137M For Bias, Agent Name-Calling, Jury Told
Rape Trial Jury Told Trump Assaulted Author At Mar-A-Lago
Ed Sheeran Trial Loss Would Harm Musicians, Atty Warns
CFTC Inspector General Accused Of Outing Whistleblowers
'Y'all Do Different Stuff,' Judge Says In \$48M Trademark Feud
SEC Passes Rule To Require More Private Funds Disclosures

🜔 LexisNexis 💿 2023, Portfolio Media, Inc. | About | Contact Us | Legal Jobs | Advertise with Law360 | Careers at Law360 | Terms | Privacy Policy | Cookie Settings | Help | Site Map 🧟 RELX

Ask a question! >>