

International **Comparative** Legal Guides



Practical cross-border insights into business crime law

Business Crime **2022**

12th Edition

Contributing Editors:

Ryan Junck & Andrew Good
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP

ICLG.com

Expert Analysis Chapters

- 1** **Enforcement Under the Biden Administration and Outlook for the Second Half of 2021**
Ryan Junck, Andrew Good & Oyere Etta, Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP
- 6** **The Business Crime Landscape**
Aziz Rahman, Nicola Sharp & Syedur Rahman, Rahman Ravelli
- 17** **Why Corporate Culture is Key in the Fight Against Fraud**
Richard Shave & Kaley Crossthwaite, BDO LLP
- 21** **Who Owns a Bribe? And Why Should You Care?**
Andrew Stafford QC & Evelyn Sheehan, Kobre & Kim
- 26** **APAC Overview**
Dennis Miralis, Phillip Gibson, Jasmina Ceic & Lara Khider, Nyman Gibson Miralis

Q&A Chapters

- 33** **Argentina**
R.&R. Durrieu: Dr Roberto Durrieu & Lautaro A. Elorz
- 44** **Australia**
Clayton Utz: Tobin Meagher, Andrew Moore & William Stefanidis
- 54** **Austria**
IBESICH: Michael Ibesich
- 63** **Brazil**
Joyce Roysen Advogados: Joyce Roysen & Veridiana Vianna
- 76** **China**
Global Law Office: Alan Zhou, Jacky Li & Jenny Chen
- 86** **Czech Republic**
JŠK, advokátní kancelář, s.r.o.: Zuzana Valoušková & Helena Hailichová
- 95** **France**
Debevoise & Plimpton LLP: Antoine Kirry & Alexandre Bisch
- 106** **Germany**
Hengeler Mueller: Dr. Constantin Lauterwein, Dr. Maximilian Ohrloff, Dr. med. Mathias Priewer & Friedrich Florian Steinert
- 116** **Greece**
Anagnostopoulos: Ilias G. Anagnostopoulos & Jerina (Gerasimoula) Zapanti
- 126** **Hong Kong**
Haldanes: Felix Ng, Vanessa Wong & Emily Cheung
- 137** **India**
Kachwaha and Partners: Sumeet Kachwaha & Tara Shahani
- 149** **Italy**
Studio Legale Pisano: Roberto Pisano
- 161** **Japan**
Nagashima Ohno & Tsunematsu: Yoshihiko Matake, Tomohiro Hen & Shin Mitarai
- 170** **Malaysia**
Skrine: Lim Koon Huan & Manshan Singh
- 180** **Netherlands**
De Roos & Pen: Niels van der Laan & Brendan Newitt
- 191** **Nigeria**
AO2LAW: Bidemi Daniel Olumide & Kitan Kola-Adefemi
- 198** **Poland**
Sołtysiński Kawecki & Szlęzak: Tomasz Konopka & Katarzyna Randzio-Sajkowska
- 209** **Romania**
ENACHE PIRTEA & Associates S.p.a.r.l.: Simona Pirtea & Mădălin Enache
- 218** **Singapore**
Kalidass Law Corporation: Kalidass Murugaiyan, Chua Hock Lu, Ashvin Hariharan & Nithya Devi
- 226** **Slovenia**
Zdolšek – Attorneys at Law: Stojan Zdolšek
- 234** **Spain**
Geijo & Associates SLP: Arantxa Geijo Jiménez, Louise Lecaros de Cossio & Elena Bescos Gracia
- 243** **Switzerland**
Kellerhals Carrard: Dr. Florian Baumann, Dr. Claudia Götz Staehelin, Dr. Omar Abo Youssef & Marlen Schultze
- 257** **USA**
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP: Ryan Junck, Andrew Good & Oyere Etta

APAC Overview

Nyman Gibson Miralis



Dennis Miralis



Phillip Gibson



Jasmina Ceic



Lara Khider

1 Introduction

The Asia-Pacific ('APAC') jurisdictions reviewed in this overview represent a cross-section of countries in the APAC region. These countries represent a balance between States that have established legal systems in the common law and civil law traditions. The countries selected for review are: Australia; India; Japan; South Korea; Taiwan; and Singapore. Business crimes are, of course, not always geographically limited to one jurisdiction. Indeed, with respect to crimes of money laundering, terrorist financing as well as foreign bribery and corruption, often multiple jurisdictions may be impacted by complex transactions that implicate corporations or their directors, office-holders or employees.

This overview will examine the established regulatory and law enforcement frameworks that govern business crimes in the APAC region, with a focus on the role of inter-governmental organisations and the increased trends of international cooperation.

2 Prosecuting Authorities and Enforcement

Prosecuting authorities

In the APAC jurisdictions reviewed, countries generally have a primary body/bodies to prosecute crime, with specialised agencies investigating specific areas.

For example, Australia and India have a primary federal body to prosecute crimes, with specialised agencies for specific matters, such as the Australian Taxation Office, the Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission and the Securities and Exchange Board of India. Australia has separate state and territory prosecuting authorities. In India, each state has a police force that primarily handles investigations.

In South Korea, Japan, Hong Kong and Taiwan, there is no split between national and regional authorities. However, these jurisdictions maintain a primary body of prosecution; for example, the Public Prosecutors Office in Japan, the District Prosecutors Offices in Taiwan, the Hong Kong Police Force and Department of Justice, and the Supreme Prosecutors' Office in South Korea. Under each investigative body, there are relevant agencies or specialist units to investigate specific classifications of crime.

Determining competence for investigation and prosecution

In the APAC region, there is a variety of systems for deciding which body will investigate and prosecute a matter, but there

is a generally available path for business crime matters to be forwarded to specialised agencies.

Australia generally relies on its primary federal and state bodies, but specific entities that are responsible for the administration of legislation in an area have general responsibility to investigate; for example, the Australian Taxation Office for the investigation of tax crimes. Similarly, Hong Kong and Singapore rely on the Department of Justice and Attorney-General's Chambers, respectively, for general criminal prosecution, and each have specific agencies for particular business crimes.

In India, specialised government agencies can assist the Central Bureau of Investigation by obtaining a state's consent or direction from a higher court to investigate a crime in that state.

In Japan and Taiwan, each investigative authority has discretion to investigate a matter, often leading to investigation by the appropriate specialist agency.

Civil and administrative enforcement

In Japan, South Korea and Taiwan, there is no current civil enforcement of business crimes. However, the APAC jurisdictions reviewed generally have agencies to enforce administrative penalties, such as imposing surcharges and fines for such crimes.

3 Courts and Juries

Most of the APAC jurisdictions reviewed do not have specialised criminal courts, although typically higher courts will hear more serious crimes. In contrast, India and Taiwan have exclusive criminal courts with specialist divisions dedicated to specific offences.

In Japan, India, Singapore and Taiwan, there is no jury system. South Korea espouses a system similar to a jury, although the jury decision is not binding on courts.

In Australia, there is often, but not always, a right to jury. In certain circumstances, an accused may apply for a trial by judge only. In Hong Kong, the right to jury is only available in the High Court.

4 Prosecuting Statutes and Inchoate Crimes

The APAC jurisdictions reviewed each have several separate statutes to deal with specific categories of business crimes. For example, Australia has the Corporations Act 2001 (Cth), Hong Kong has the Securities and Futures Ordinance and India has the Securities and Exchange Board of India Act 1992, each dealing with crimes like securities fraud and insider trading and prescribing a fault element akin to intention to defraud or deceive.

Japan and South Korea only punish inchoate crimes where it is specifically criminalised, unlike in Australia, Taiwan, India and Hong Kong, where persons can be held liable for inchoate crimes if acts taken are more than preparatory.

5 Entity, Personal and Successor Liability

Entity liability for criminal offences

The APAC jurisdictions reviewed generally prescribe entity liability for certain criminal offences, but use different legal frameworks.

Japan, Taiwan and South Korea allow entity liability where specific provisions provide for joint liability, which attach liability to both corporations and the natural person who commits the offence.

Hong Kong treats corporations as legal persons, which can be liable for crimes where physically possible. India adopts a similar legal definition for corporations, save that most statutes also cover criminal liability of corporations.

Australia has offences specifically prescribed to corporations. Generally, an employee's conduct will be imputed to the corporation where the corporation is seen to have permitted or tolerated the employee's conduct. Australia has considered aligning its regime of combatting corporate crime to that of the United Kingdom by introducing the Crimes Legislation Amendment (Combatting Corporate Crimes) Bill 2019 which, amongst other things, introduces the offence of failure of a corporation to prevent foreign bribery by an associate, which includes an officer of the corporation or an employee.

Personal liability for managers, officers and directors

In Australia, India and Hong Kong, there is personal liability for company officers with requirements in each jurisdiction that the officer must have contributed, planned or aided the company's offence, or in some cases, the offence being due to the officer's negligence. In Australia and India, for a person to be criminally liable, the prosecution must also charge the company.

There is liability for officers in Japan, Taiwan and South Korea in cases of joint liability provisions. Japan also recognises 'triple liability provisions', where offenders can be liable for not taking measures to prevent a crime.

As regards preference for pursuing entity vs individual liability, the approaches in the APAC jurisdictions reviewed differ. Australia does not prefer entity or personal liability, but considers prospects of conviction and public interest. In India, usually both entity and person are pursued. In Hong Kong and Japan, there is no written policy on whether to prosecute an entity or individual, and the decision is based on discretion. In Taiwan, natural persons are prioritised due to corporations only being charged when a natural person is under joint liability provisions.

Successor liability

In South Korea and Taiwan, successor liability can apply. Hong Kong is similar, except only civil liabilities can apply. In Japan, there has been no detailed legal discussion on the topic, but successor liability cannot be ruled out. In India, it depends on the mode of merger; court-approved mergers only prescribe successor liability in specific circumstances.

In Australia, successor liability is not specifically recognised, and successor entities are generally organised to avoid liability.

6 Statutes of Limitations

In all the APAC jurisdictions reviewed, save for Singapore, there are various limitations to enforcing or prosecuting criminal offences. These limitations are prescribed by statute and will generally depend on the type and amount of the statutory penalty.

For example, in Australia and New Zealand, there are limitations periods for the prosecution of summary offences. Similarly, in Hong Kong, where offences are triable in the Magistrates' Courts, proceedings should be commenced within six months from the time of the offence.

In all the APAC jurisdictions reviewed, where an offence occasions death, no limitations period is enforced.

Regarding certain economic offences and business crimes, India and Australia prescribe a legislative framework where limitations may not apply. In India, the Economic Offences (Inapplicability of Limitation) Act 1974 provides that the limitation provisions in the Code of Criminal Procedure shall not apply in relation to various statutes, including those governing certain taxes.

Similarly, in Australia, under the Crimes Act 1914 (Cth), no limitations period applies for prosecution of offences by companies against a law of the Commonwealth where the maximum penalty exceeds A\$31,500.

In Australia, Singapore and Hong Kong, a charge of conspiracy to commit a serious offence is not subject to a limitations period. For offences of a continuing nature, typically countries that do prescribe limitations periods, including Japan, Taiwan and India, calculate the limitations period as commencing from the time the final act constituting an offence occurs.

In Australia and Hong Kong, the limitations period cannot be tolled. However, in Japan, Korea and India, there may be limited circumstances under which the limitations period is tolled; for instance, where the offender is absent from the State and purposely avoiding or concealing themselves from prosecution.

7 Initiation of Investigations – Domestic and Extraterritorial

In all the APAC jurisdictions reviewed, laws on extraterritorial jurisdiction are in place that apply to nationals of the State, primarily where the crime committed is classified as one of a serious nature. This means that States will generally have extraterritorial jurisdiction over nationals for crimes committed in a foreign country.

In Japan, territorial reach is extended to persons who are considered aliens or non-nationals of the State that has committed an offence against a Japanese nation, outside the territory of Japan. Under article 3-2 of the Penal Code of Japan, the territorial reach is exclusive to the commission of a limited number of offences, such as homicide and kidnapping.

All the APAC jurisdictions reviewed are signatories to the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organised Crime and the Protocols Thereto ('UNTOC'), which stipulates, under article 4(1) thereof, that the parties shall not undertake in the territory of another State the exercise of jurisdiction and performance of functions that are reserved exclusively for the authorities of that other country by its domestic law. Such enforcement activities against transnational crimes therefore require international cooperation and are expressly encouraged under article 18 of UNTOC on the provision of Mutual Legal Assistance between States.

In all the APAC jurisdictions reviewed, government authorities typically commence an investigation upon receipt of a complaint where there is a reasonable suspicion of any form of crime or misconduct.

Investigations may also be commenced where there have been reports from other administrative organs. For example, Hong Kong's Securities and Futures Commission monitors the stock market through its Market Surveillance System, for the purposes of identifying any irregular and unusual market activities that may require investigation.

Cooperation with foreign enforcement authorities

All the APAC jurisdictions reviewed have executed agreements to facilitate Mutual Legal Assistance and cooperation with foreign countries regarding criminal matters.

Various international treaties also facilitate the provision of cooperation in international assistance for criminal matters, which most countries in the broader APAC region have signed. For example, under articles 18 and 13 of UNTOC, States agree to provide assistance and cooperation on the taking of evidence, the tracing of proceeds of crime, and the enforcement of foreign confiscation orders in other territories.

8 Gathering Information from a Company

Law enforcement authorities in the APAC jurisdictions reviewed have a range of investigative tools and powers that facilitate the gathering of information when investigating business crimes. Generally, these include powers to conduct searches and seize materials where a properly executed warrant has been issued by a relevant authority.

Document gathering

Besides courts issuing search warrants, some APAC jurisdictions allow for certain authorities to issue notices, which compel companies or individuals to produce documents or provide information to the authority.

In Australia, this power is provided to governmental agencies, such as the Australian Securities and Investments Commission, the Australian Competition & Consumer Commission, the Australian Tax Office, and the Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission.

In Singapore and Hong Kong, police may issue a written order to require the company to produce or give the police access to documents or information. The general criteria for this are a reasonable suspicion that an offence has been committed or that the recipient of the notice is in possession of such information or documents.

In all the APAC jurisdictions reviewed, save for Japan, Taiwan and Korea, legal professional privilege or attorney-client privilege expressly exists in legislation or common law to protect confidential communications between a client and a lawyer.

All the APAC jurisdictions reviewed have in force relevant legislation governing personal data protection and privacy. Generally speaking, corporations or entities are not, in principle, permitted to transfer personal data to a third party without the data subject's consent. A general exception to this principle is where the collection of personal data is necessary for any reason authorised under the respective laws of each jurisdiction.

For example, in Singapore, under the Personal Data Protection Act 2012 (No. 26 of 2012) ('PDPA'), such collection is permissible if necessary for any investigation or proceedings, and if it is reasonable to expect that seeking the individual's consent would compromise the availability or accuracy of the personal data (paragraph 1(e), Second Schedule, PDPA).

In Australia, Korea and India, there are currently no blocking statutes or domestic laws that may impede cross-border disclosure. However, in 2019, the Parliament of India introduced the Personal Data Protection Bill, which when enacted, will create provisions that, amongst other developments, govern the norms for cross-border transfer of personal data.

Questioning of individuals

In all the APAC jurisdictions reviewed, save for Japan and Korea, there are relevant investigative agencies that have compulsory examination powers. These powers enable the relevant investigative agency to compel an individual, whether on behalf of a company or otherwise, to submit to questioning.

In other jurisdictions, the government cannot compel an employee, officer, or director of a company to submit to questioning, unless they are under arrest or detention.

The interview typically takes place at the offices of the government authorities concerned.

Regarding the compulsion of third parties, in Hong Kong and Korea, those who are not arrested cannot be compelled to attend interviews for questioning. However, other powers, as mentioned in the first paragraph of this section, may be exercised to compel third parties to provide information.

In India, Singapore and Japan, there is no right to be represented during questioning. In some instances, the right arises depending on the capacity in which the interview is undertaken. In Taiwan, witnesses are not entitled to be accompanied by legal representatives upon questioning.

The right to silence of an accused individual is embedded in the criminal justice systems of India, Japan, Hong Kong, Australia and South Korea.

9 Initiation of Prosecutions / Deferred Prosecution / Civil Dispositions

Initiation of criminal cases

In all of the APAC jurisdiction reviewed, procedural laws exist to address the manner in which criminal cases are initiated.

In Australia, Singapore, India and Hong Kong, criminal cases are typically initiated by an arrest or a summons to attend court. The relevant prosecuting authority would lay charges against the defendant.

In Japan and Korea, criminal proceedings are initiated by filing an indictment with a criminal court.

The existence of set prosecution guidelines across the APAC jurisdictions varies. In Australia, publicly available prosecution policies exist to guide most aspects of the prosecution procedure, including the decision to lay a charge and formulating the offence. The overarching consideration in this decision-making process is whether there is public interest to prosecute and whether there is a reasonable prospect of conviction.

In Japan, Singapore and Korea, there are no set guidelines published, though various matters are considered in the exercise of the prosecutor's discretion to lay a charge, including the public interest and likelihood of conviction.

In Hong Kong, the Prosecution Code prescribes two key requisites for the bringing of a charge: the sufficiency of evidence; and the public interest. Various factors are considered in weighing public interest, including, but not limited to, the seriousness, nature and circumstance of the offence, and the offender's age, criminal history, etc.

Deferred prosecution and civil penalties/remedies

In all the APAC jurisdictions reviewed, save for Australia, South Korea and India, there is a process of deferred prosecution. In Japan, the process involves the prosecutor entering into an agreement with a suspect or a defendant, that may include a corporate entity, with the consent of his/her attorney, under which the prosecutor agrees to drop or reduce criminal charges, or provide favourable treatment only when the suspect or defendant cooperates in the investigation against other individuals or companies with respect to certain types of crimes.

In Singapore, deferred prosecution agreements are only available to companies, and not individuals.

In all the APAC jurisdictions reviewed, save for Singapore, that espouse deferred prosecution agreements, there is no requirement to seek judicial approval for enforcement.

In all the APAC jurisdictions reviewed, a defendant can be subjected to civil penalties or remedies. However, civil penalties or remedies cannot be used as a substitute for the criminal disposition. A key remedy available across jurisdictions for civil wrongdoing is damages.

10 Burden of Proof

In all of the APAC jurisdictions reviewed, the prosecution or the government bears the burden of proof for each element of an offence to the standard of 'beyond reasonable doubt' in criminal matters.

In Australia, Hong Kong and Singapore, the defendant bears the burden of proving any affirmative defences to the standard of a balance of probabilities. In India, the defendant bears the burden of proving any affirmative defences to the standard of a preponderance of probabilities. In Japan and Korea, if a defendant asserts affirmative defences, the public prosecutor or the government bears the burden of proving the non-existence of such defences.

In Taiwan, the law is silent on whether the defendant has the burden of proof with respect to his or her affirmative defences, although, in practice, he or she may request the criminal court to investigate and consider evidence in support of any affirmative defences.

In Australia, 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 applies for state/territory offences unless there is a provision for a superior court trial by a judge alone, in which case the superior court trial judge is the arbiter of fact.

In Hong Kong, the magistrate or judge are arbiters of both fact and law in the Magistrate's Court and the District Court, whereas the jury is the arbiter of fact and the judge is the arbiter of law in the High Court.

In India, Japan, Korea, Singapore and Taiwan, the judge, or the panel of judges and lay judges in certain cases, is the arbiter of fact and determines whether the burden of proof is satisfied.

11 Conspiracy / Aiding and Abetting

In all of the APAC jurisdictions reviewed, a person who conspires with or assists another to commit a business crime can be criminally liable.

For example, in Australia, 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 be committed; and at least one party to the agreement must have committed an overt act pursuant to the agreement.

12 Common Defences

In all of the APAC jurisdictions reviewed, it is a defence to a criminal charge that the defendant did not have the requisite intent to commit the crime. Generally, the prosecution or the government bears the burden of proof with respect to intent to the standard of 'beyond reasonable doubt' in criminal matters.

In some of the APAC jurisdictions reviewed, such as Australia, India, Japan and Taiwan, if the requisite state of mind for an offence is not intent, but knowledge, recklessness or negligence, then the prosecution or the government generally does not need to prove intent.

In all of the APAC jurisdictions reviewed, it is generally not a defence to a criminal charge that the defendant was ignorant of the law, i.e., that they did not know that their conduct was unlawful, unless it is otherwise recognised and allowed by law.

Generally, in all of the APAC jurisdictions reviewed, it is a defence to a criminal charge that the defendant was ignorant of the facts, i.e., that they did not know that they had engaged in conduct that they knew was unlawful, unless this defence is explicitly excluded.

For example, in India, sections 76 and 79 of the Indian Penal Code provide for a mistake of fact as an exception and a complete defence to a criminal charge. To successfully assert this defence, the defendant must show that the act was due to ignorance of fact and done in good faith, i.e. he or she exercised reasonable care and caution in doing the act. Please see section 10 above regarding the burden of proof.

13 Voluntary Disclosure Obligations

In Australia, Hong Kong, Japan, Korea and Taiwan, as a general rule, there is no obligation on a person or entity to report a crime to the government, subject to various exceptions in these APAC jurisdictions for public or government officials and certain indictable offences, e.g. money laundering, drug trafficking and terrorism.

In India and Singapore, there is a positive obligation on a person or entity to report a crime to the police. In these APAC jurisdictions, a person who is legally bound to give information of an offence but intentionally omits to do so may be punished with an imprisonment term of up to six months, or a fine, or both.

Whether a person or entity receive leniency or 'credit' in exchange for voluntary disclosure is discussed in the following section.

14 Cooperation Provisions / Leniency

In general, all of the APAC jurisdictions reviewed have adopted similar attitudes towards voluntary disclosure of criminal conduct. Australia, Hong Kong and Singapore have similarly considered voluntary disclosure as a powerful mitigating factor with policies and programmes guiding the relevant law enforcement agencies or investigating authorities. To encourage self-reporting, immunity may be granted in extraordinary circumstances.

Japan and Taiwan rely on codified legislation. The extent of leniency or discount applicable as to the penalties varies for different offences. In contrast, Korea does not have any system or procedure in place leniency.

Besides voluntary disclosure, recent years have seen the development of mechanisms in providing protection for whistleblowers. For example, in 2019, the Treasury Laws Amendment

(Enhancing Whistleblower Protections) Act 2019 was enacted in Australia, broadening the scope of people being subject to protection for corporate crimes.

In most of the APAC jurisdictions reviewed, the extent of cooperation and determination on leniency are often made on a discretionary basis without definitive criteria. For example, in Hong Kong, reduced sanctions will be determined on a case-by-case basis by different authorities, while in Australia the Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions has the ultimate say and may consider the views and recommendations of relevant authorities. In Japan, the Antimonopoly Act stipulates a leniency programme, detailing the percentage of penalty reduction which is generally determined by the Japan Fair Trade Commission.

15 Plea Bargaining

In general, a defendant is allowed to negotiate with the prosecution to a guilty plea in most of the APAC jurisdictions reviewed. No specific criteria have been carved out for business crimes. Rather, the general principles under the criminal law of each country are applied.

Matters including terms of sentences, reduction of charges, and amount of compensation to the victims are commonly negotiated. In Australia, agreements on sentencing between the defendant and prosecution are unenforceable or non-binding upon a sentencing court.

For business crimes, governments tend to create a separate programme or system to provide clarity on the plea-bargaining process and benefits available for the participants pursuant to policies and guidelines without the involvement of the court.

Unlike the majority of the APAC jurisdictions reviewed, in Taiwan, the agreement reached during the plea-bargaining process is endorsed by the court and the sentence shall be kept within the scope of such an agreement. Indian courts play a more active role in the plea-bargaining process by setting requirements for filing of an application for plea bargaining, examining the defendant, considering the evidence, and directing the prosecutions to reach a mutually acceptable settlement.

16 Elements of a Corporate Sentence

In general, courts in most of the APAC jurisdictions have wide discretion in sentencing, legislative frameworks specifying the range of penalties, and mitigating or aggravating factors for the sentencing judge to consider.

In South Korea and Taiwan, no specific legislation or regulations are available for sentencing judges to consider. Taiwanese judges are mindful to consider existing judgments and precedents in their internal database when making a determination. Korean judges follow sentencing guidelines published by the Supreme Court of Korea.

Sentencing principles are similarly applicable to both individuals and corporations. Penalties that can be laid against a corporation are usually pecuniary in nature, such as fines or confiscations of the company assets. Notwithstanding, courts are asked to consider all relevant factors in decision-making. In jurisdictions such as Singapore and Australia, there is legislation or regulations that provide guidance for the calculation of fines or other monetary penalties that could be imposed.

17 Appeals

Appeals are generally allowable for both the defendant and prosecution if there are reasonable grounds. Generally, in most of the APAC jurisdictions reviewed, a defendant has fewer restrictions surrounding an appeal against a guilty judgment in comparison to a prosecutor's appeal against an acquittal.

In Hong Kong, an appeal is not available for the prosecution against a non-guilty verdict. However, the 'case stated' approach is adopted if there is an error of law or jurisdictional issues.

Appealable rights and procedures in terms of criminal sentencing vary from country to country. Generally, rights to appeal against sentence are available in most of the APAC jurisdictions reviewed for both prosecutors and defendants. The approach adopted in Taiwan is quite unique in that a sentencing procedure is combined with a fact-finding procedure.

Standards for review and court remedies

Although the threshold for an appeal is generally low in the sense that an appeal can be filed as long as reasonable grounds are stated, whether an appeal is allowable is a matter for the court to determine.

Most of the APAC jurisdictions reviewed only accept an appeal for error of law. Appeal judges are bound by legislative frameworks or practice guidelines in considering whether an appeal should be allowed.

In Australia, an appeal may still be dismissed if the appellate court, in its contemplation, cannot find any substantial miscarriage of justice in the previous sentencing. In Hong Kong, however, an appeal against a conviction must be allowed if any of the legislative elements for an appeal are satisfied.

A wide range of remedies are available in the appellate court of the APAC jurisdictions reviewed, including an order for retrial, reversing the findings and quashing the decision of conviction and entering a verdict of acquittal.

18 Recent Developments

UN General Assembly special session against corruption

The United Nations General Assembly resolution 73/191 of December 2018, titled 'Special session of the General Assembly against corruption', calls for the convening of a special session on challenges and measures to prevent and combat corruption and strengthen international cooperation.

On 2–4 June 2021, the first UN General Assembly Special Session against Corruption was held at the United Nations' Headquarters in New York. As part of this special session, Member States adopted a political declaration, centred on increased efforts to combat corruption, agreed in advance through a consensus of intergovernmental negotiations under the auspices of the Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption.

COVID-19 impacts

Governments across the globe continue to combat the pernicious health and economic impacts exacerbated by the coronavirus ('COVID-19'). Along with this, COVID-19 has fostered a landscape in which crime groups have had to adopt more agile approaches in response to international restrictions.

By way of example, the emerging threats in money laundering and terrorism financing have implicated corporations through the use of seemingly legitimate businesses used to facilitate financial fraud and exploitative schemes – these include an increase in online fraud of medical supplies, fake charity scams and the misuse of public funds by businesses taking advantage of government stimulus (e.g. under the JobKeeper Payment scheme in Australia).

Despite these threats, however, there are various countries in the APAC region that have been recorded as top performers in combatting corruption. The 2020 data from Transparency International's Corruption Perceptions Index ('CPI') on the level of corruption in the public sector per country has scored New Zealand, Australia and Hong Kong as top performers both in the APAC region and globally.

Myanmar, Korea, and China were also considered significant improvers on the 2020 CPI against scores of previous years. However, Transparency International did identify legal and structural gaps with respect to human rights issues in Myanmar and continued bribery concerns in the Chinese public sector.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Joshua Lye, Judy Zhou and Sarfraz Khan for their invaluable assistance in the preparation of this chapter.



Dennis Miralis is a leading Australian defence lawyer and partner at Nyman Gibson Miralis. Dennis specialises in international criminal law, with a focus on complex multi-jurisdictional investigations and criminal prosecutions. His areas of expertise include bribery and corruption, global tax investigations, proceeds of crime, anti-money laundering, worldwide freezing orders, cybercrime, national security law, Interpol Red Notices, extradition and mutual legal assistance law.

Nyman Gibson Miralis
Level 9, 299 Elizabeth Street
Sydney NSW 2000
Australia

Tel: +61 2 9264 8884
Email: dm@ngm.com.au
URL: www.ngm.com.au



Phillip Gibson is one of Australia's leading defence lawyers, and is a partner at Nyman Gibson Miralis. He has over 30 years' experience in all areas of defence work. Phillip's practice focuses on complex criminal cases and international cross-border investigations. His experience includes dealing with investigations in multiple jurisdictions including the United Kingdom, USA, China, Hong Kong, Vietnam, South Korea, Sweden, Czech Republic, South Africa, BVI and New Zealand.

Nyman Gibson Miralis
Level 9, 299 Elizabeth Street
Sydney NSW 2000
Australia

Tel: +61 2 9264 8884
Email: pg@ngm.com.au
URL: www.ngm.com.au



Jasmina Ceic is a partner and defence lawyer at Nyman Gibson Miralis. She holds a Master of Laws and is an accomplished criminal trial advocate, having completed advocacy training with the Australian Advocacy Institute. Jasmina advises and acts in complex criminal law matters at all levels of the court system, with a specialist focus on serious matters that proceed to trial in the Superior Courts, as well as conviction and sentence appeals heard in the Court of Criminal Appeal.

Nyman Gibson Miralis
Level 9, 299 Elizabeth Street
Sydney NSW 2000
Australia

Tel: +61 2 9264 8884
Email: jc@ngm.com.au
URL: www.ngm.com.au



Lara Khider is an international criminal lawyer specialising in corporate and financial crime, anti-money laundering, anti-bribery and corruption, extradition (including INTERPOL Red Notices) and mutual legal assistance law.

Nyman Gibson Miralis
Level 9, 299 Elizabeth Street
Sydney NSW 2000
Australia

Tel: +61 2 9264 8884
Email: lk@ngm.com.au
URL: www.ngm.com.au

Nyman Gibson Miralis is an international, award-winning criminal defence law firm based in Sydney, Australia. For over 55 years it has been leading the market in all aspects of general, complex and international crime, and is widely recognised for its involvement in some of Australia's most significant criminal cases. Its international law practice focuses on white collar and corporate crime, transnational financial crime, bribery and corruption, international money laundering, cybercrime, international asset freezing and forfeiture, extradition, and mutual assistance law.

Nyman Gibson Miralis strategically advises and appears in matters where transnational investigations and prosecutions are being conducted in parallel jurisdictions, involving some of the largest law enforcement agencies and financial regulators worldwide. Working with international partners, we have advised and acted in investigations involving the US, Canada, the UK, the EU, China, Hong Kong, Singapore, Taiwan, Macao, Vietnam, Cambodia, Russia, Mexico, South Korea, the British Virgin Islands, New Zealand, and South Africa.

www.ngm.com.au

ngm
NYMAN
GIBSON MIRALIS
Defence Lawyers and Advisors est. 1966

ICLG.com

Current titles in the ICLG series

Alternative Investment Funds	Franchise
Anti-Money Laundering	Gambling
Aviation Finance & Leasing	Insurance & Reinsurance
Aviation Law	International Arbitration
Business Crime	Investor-State Arbitration
Cartels & Leniency	Lending & Secured Finance
Class & Group Actions	Litigation & Dispute Resolution
Competition Litigation	Merger Control
Construction & Engineering Law	Mergers & Acquisitions
Consumer Protection	Mining Law
Copyright	Oil & Gas Regulation
Corporate Governance	Patents
Corporate Immigration	Pharmaceutical Advertising
Corporate Investigations	Private Client
Corporate Tax	Private Equity
Cybersecurity	Product Liability
Data Protection	Project Finance
Derivatives	Public Investment Funds
Designs	Public Procurement
Digital Business	Real Estate
Digital Health	Renewable Energy
Drug & Medical Device Litigation	Restructuring & Insolvency
Employment & Labour Law	Sanctions
Enforcement of Foreign Judgments	Securitisation
Environment & Climate Change Law	Shipping Law
Environmental, Social & Governance Law	Technology Sourcing
Family Law	Telecoms, Media & Internet
Fintech	Trade Marks
Foreign Direct Investment Regimes	Vertical Agreements and Dominant Firms