

The Ethics of Whistleblowing in the Legal Profession

Kagaba Amina G.

Faculty of Business, Kampala International University, Uganda

ABSTRACT

Whistleblowing within the legal profession is fraught with complex ethical dilemmas, particularly as it intersects with principles of client confidentiality, trust, and the public good. This paper critically examines the ethical and legal considerations surrounding whistleblowing by legal practitioners. It provides a historical overview, examines the ethical conflicts inherent in such actions, and analyzes the regulatory frameworks and protections available to whistleblowers in the legal profession. Through case studies, it illustrates the personal and professional challenges faced by whistleblowers, offering insight into the broader implications for the legal profession. The paper concludes with recommendations for balancing the protection of client confidentiality with the need for accountability, ensuring that whistleblowers can act ethically without undue professional or personal repercussions.

Keywords: Legal Ethics, Whistleblowing, Confidentiality, Professional Responsibility, Legal Profession, Accountability.

INTRODUCTION

Whistleblowing may be defined as the act of bringing an organization's attention to something that is happening within it that is illegal, dishonest, unsafe, or generally poses a risk to the public interest. Whistleblowing allows accountability and regulatory activity, and thus, its significance is in its ability to serve an ethical function. Whistleblowing brings to light an organization's behavior that might be less desirable to the community and privatizes an activity that was formerly kept behind closed doors within the organizational regulator and subsidiary. Whistleblowers are usually faced with deciding whether or not to break their contract and bring some wrongdoing to an outside authority. Given that this is an organization that is responsible for upholding and enforcing the law when a decision is made to whistleblow or not, particular ethical and legal considerations can arise. Therefore, whistleblowing brings special issues more directly to the legal profession [1, 2]. Continual debate and ongoing discourse are indications that imperatives to protect ethics and informants remain contentious. As this is so, it is of consequence to dwell more thoroughly on this issue, particularly as it pertains to the legal profession. This is because of several reasons. First, few areas within the legal interpretations or workplace relations deal exclusively with the ethical dilemmas of 'whistleblowing.' Second, this too has implications that differ in the regulatory environment of permissiveness or distinct rigidity to the reporting, fighting against evasion. The essay has two objectives. It will first critically examine and explore some of the principal ethical underpinnings of the lateral theories surrounding whistleblowing and the attorney's responsibility to inform and examine the stakeholders in this decision-making procedure. Finally, the essay will proceed to a comprehensive and detailed legal analysis and a comparative regulatory examination of the regulations. This will highlight contemporary trends and attempts to deal with problems in a rapidly changing commercial environment [3, 4].

Historical Overview of Whistleblowing in the Legal Profession

Nearly 2500 years ago, a Greek military surgeon refused to conduct life-saving surgery on the Persian emperor because of his loyalty to the Greek states, violating his oath by choosing not to treat the ill emperor. More than one thousand years ago, the prologue to a historical document described the laws

and customs of older England, including injunctions governing the disclosure of the secrets of lawyers. In 1353, a common law judge wrote, "Discretion (or prudence) is a part of a lawyer's tradecraft, for as his client must put his life in his lawyer's hands, a lawyer may do his client no wrong. And if a lawyer hates such a client, the lawyer may not disclose facts damaging to the client." A year later, in 1499, in advising a client who wished to remarry about providing his intended with a copy of his prior marriage record, an attorney provided an early glimpse of the traditional duties of client loyalty and confidentiality that would later form the ethical framework of the legal profession [5, 6]. In 1789, a significant act passed in the second Congress extended the right to remove state causes to the Supreme Court. In 1796, the first president engaged the concept of executive privilege when he classified documentary information about a treaty from the House of Representatives. And, in 1797, an act allowed administrative agencies to conduct broad-ranging secret investigations in the service of subpoenas around the state. As the forerunners of the modern legal profession contributed to the development of the common law, critical, as well as prescriptive, discussions on the proper boundaries encircling the provision of legal services also persisted. In the United States, some of the issues in a volume of discussion and debate on the proper professional roles and responsibilities of lawyers reveal an often-critical viewpoint of the role of law and its practitioners in society. An address detailed a history of common law development of whistleblower protections. It traced the concept of judicial reliance on documentary information, often provided by a narrator, to an early fourteenth-century English case. It described how certain mechanisms empowered judges to determine if certain petitions requiring the waiving of the seal of confidentiality would be open courts, with the record open to public scrutiny, proprietary or curricular, which had court resolution but not publication or extra lateral records with decisions kept secret. Early use of documentary information in America was described as follows: when smallpox entered the state and a believer in vaccine legislation informed that a known vaccination had spread smallpox. "Look at their bills here," said a governor, privately handing a physician's documents from its carelessly kept folder; they spoke before them trailing onward. And the state counsel was asked: "What does the medical record say?" He too at first declined to disclose it, whereupon the governor, waving the parchment, said: "As governor of a state stricken with a deadly pestilence, I can say I do not recognize a medical record that the people have not a right to see" [7, 8].

Ethical Considerations for Whistleblowing in the Legal Profession

There are various possible ethical dilemmas arising from whistleblowing within the legal profession. While there is a moral obligation to whistleblower, particularly when an individual becomes aware of serious misconduct or criminal activity, these obligations must be balanced with principles of trust and confidentiality. Breaching client confidentiality or trust can have serious consequences for the legal profession, and potential benefits for clients, whistleblowers, and the public must be balanced against such consequences. Whistleblowing can also have serious consequences for whistleblowers, leading to enforcement and emotional harm. Whistleblowing is particularly risky in the legal profession given that practitioners depend on their professional networks and the reputations of themselves and their colleagues for work, cases, and clients [9, 10]. Therefore, are there any circumstances in which lawyers should whistleblower? Are the penalties for breaching client confidentiality too severe in the legal profession, and do such penalties threaten the integrity of the legal profession if they discourage lawyers from speaking out? This section addresses these questions, utilizing ethical reasoning and analyzing the results from a survey of lawyers' professional judgment and the psychology of whistleblowing, with a particular focus on the effect of organizational culture on decision-making. Two case studies are assessed to explicate appropriate ethical responses to breaches of client confidentiality, breaches of the Professional Rules of Conduct, and an ethical mishap [11, 12].

Legal Protections and Pitfalls for Whistleblowers in the Legal Profession

Whistleblower laws provide a confusing patchwork of legal protections, exclusions, and requirements. The most relevant protection to members of the legal profession is the federal Whistleblower Protection Act, protecting government employees who disclose illegalities, gross waste, fraud, abuse of authority, and substantial and specific danger to public health or safety. It applies to many of the federal government's officers and employees. State and local public employees are other key beneficiaries. Numerous exclusions and grandfather clauses apply, along with technicalities of jurisdiction and administrative procedures. Statutory and regulatory protection has significant gaps in its coverage. Legal professionals have access to much confidential information and potential investment information, but their eligibility for protection against adverse action may be unclear [13, 14]. Apart from whistleblowing

up a confidential attorney-client communication, there is scant discussion of whistleblowing by attorneys in professional responsibility rules for attorneys. Attorneys labeling the conduct of other lawyers as criminal have differing obligations from those with merely civil reporting requirements. A lawyer who knows that another lawyer has committed a violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct that raises a substantial question as to that lawyer's honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness as a lawyer in other respects shall inform the appropriate professional authority. Failure to report is a violation of the ethics rules. State law likely governs a lawyer's duty to report a crime, which is not governed by most of the rules of professional responsibility. Reporting attorney misconduct is required and not optional, and states have a diverse array of reporting requirements. Legal sanctions for improper whistleblowing can be severe. The employer may legally fire working whistleblowers who protect the wrong being whistle blown. The unauthorized release of confidential information, even if it is evidence of a crime or unethical behavior, can lead to disbarment or other professional sanctions. Career repercussions for proper whistleblowing can be severe. Legal scholarship suggests that legal whistleblowers in general and lawyer whistleblowers, in particular, are great risks to themselves and need to lay low and stop looking for ways to win for the rest of their careers. Legal advice about legal whistleblowing is extensive. There are few cases discussing the fate of those reporting wrongdoing of the employer. However, the fate of legal whistleblowers has been the subject of several published opinions and is discussed in the professional legal literature. The fate of legal whistleblowers also receives some attention. The deep pockets of law firms do not deter some aggrieved attorneys from blowing the whistle if the wrong is serious enough. The likely whistleblower should seek legal counseling to explore employment law, and ethical, and professional issues beforehand. The case law discussed below is of value to attorneys looking to protect their rights [15, 16].

Case Studies and Analysis

Whistleblowing may lead to retribution and personal risk for legal practitioners. Whistleblowers highlight the ethical challenges in the workplace, protecting employees and the public and uncovering malfeasance. The themes that come up time and again in these case studies include: that whistleblowers face very real emotional, financial, personal, and professional risks; and that the decision to blow the whistle is often framed in terms of a sense of betrayal of the juridical or ethical responsibilities of the workplace for justice; and that many whistleblowers lack resources, sometimes creating a risk that senior people may accordingly seek to shift blame to the most vulnerable people in the workforce. A practitioner might have studied law and its institutions of practice wanting to make a difference for the public good and equality before the law. In practice, disillusioned and worn down by the sheer weight of their caseloads, they find evidence of malfeasance that they cannot ignore or turn their backs on. They might have been brave enough to blow the whistle to protect their clients. Despite early fears not to do so, they might carry on whistleblowing because, whether they know it from the start or not, by the time of their decision to report, the ethical breach is such that it is now larger than themselves. They want to know that they believe in something much larger than themselves, that they have tried to act on a worthy view of work and professional relations, and have attempted to manage the consequences with dignity and respect for others [17, 18].

CONCLUSION

Whistleblowing within the legal profession presents a unique intersection of ethical, legal, and professional challenges. While the protection of client confidentiality is a cornerstone of legal practice, it cannot always supersede the need for accountability, particularly when public interest or justice is at stake. Legal professionals who consider whistleblowing must navigate a patchwork of legal protections and potential career risks, underscoring the importance of clear guidelines and robust protections. This paper highlights the need for a more unified approach to the regulation of whistleblowing in the legal profession, balancing the ethical obligation to report wrongdoing with the preservation of professional integrity and client trust. By fostering a culture that supports ethical decision-making and provides adequate safeguards for whistleblowers, the legal profession can strengthen its commitment to justice and accountability while upholding its ethical standards.

REFERENCES

1. Quayle A. Whistleblowing and accounting for the public interest: a call for new directions. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*. 2021 Sep 10;34(7):1555-80.
2. Onyango G. Whistleblower protection in developing countries: a review of challenges and prospects. *SN Business & Economics*. 2021 Nov 24;1(12):169.

3. Smaili N, Vandekerckhove W, Arroyo Pardo P. Handling whistleblowing reports: The complexity of the double agent. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 2023 Aug;186(2):279-92.
4. Kampourakis I. Whistleblowers as regulatory intermediaries: Instrumental and reflexive considerations in decentralizing regulation. *Regulation & Governance*. 2021 Jul;15(3):745-59.
5. Zimmermann P. Governing by protection: Studying the problematization of whistleblower protection in the EU. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*. 2023 Jul 3;45(3):211-29.
6. Sunshine JS. The Parthenogenesis of Wigmore: A Humble History of How a Confidentiality Requirement Arose Ex Nihilo to Become the Sine Qua Non of Attorney-Client Privilege. *UIC L. Rev.*. 2021;54:429.
7. Zimmermann P. Governing by protection: Studying the problematization of whistleblower protection in the EU. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*. 2023 Jul 3;45(3):211-29.
8. Latan H, Chiappetta Jabbour CJ, Ali M, Lopes de Sousa Jabbour AB, Vo-Thanh T. What makes you a whistleblower? A Multi-country Field Study on the determinants of the intention to Report Wrongdoing. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 2023 Mar;183(3):885-905. [springer.com](https://www.springer.com)
9. Brough P, Lawrence SA, Tsahuridu E, Brown AJ. The effective management of whistleblowing: The whistleblowing response model. In *Handbook on Management and Employment Practices 2022 Feb 25* (pp. 437-458). Cham: Springer International Publishing. [\[HTML\]](#)
10. Levi M. Making sense of professional enablers' involvement in laundering organized crime proceeds and of their regulation. *Trends in Organized Crime*. 2021 Mar;24(1):96-110.
11. Singh B, Kaunert C. Integration of cutting-edge technologies such as Internet of Things (IoT) and 5G in health monitoring systems: a comprehensive legal analysis and futuristic outcomes. *GLS Law Journal*. 2024 Jan 1;6(1):13-20.
12. Hesch JD. Whistleblower Rights and Protections: Critiquing Federal Whistleblower Laws and Recommending Filling in Missing Pieces to Form a Beautiful Patchwork Quilt. *Liberty UL Rev.*. 2011;6:51.
13. Olujobi OJ. Whistleblowers Protection Act: Can It Be the Panacea to Corruption in the Nigeria's Petroleum Sector. *Achievers University Law Journal AULJ*. 2022;2(1):59-99.
14. Shope ML. Lawyer and judicial competency in the era of artificial intelligence: Ethical requirements for documenting datasets and machine learning models. *Geo. J. Legal Ethics*. 2021;34:191.
15. Ritonga ML. Juridical Review Consumer Legal Against Labeling of Food Products Based on Law No. 8 Year 1999. *Journal of Law Science*. 2021 Oct 30;3(4):153-63.
16. Kenny K, Fotaki M. The costs and labour of whistleblowing: Bodily vulnerability and post-disclosure survival. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 2023 Jan;182(2):341-64.
17. Lee K, Kleiner B. Whistleblower retaliation in the public sector. *Public Personnel Management*. 2011 Dec;40(4):341-8.
18. O'Rourke M. Whistleblower retaliation on the rise. *Risk Management*. 2012 Oct 1;59(8):44-5.

CITE AS: Kagaba Amina G. (2025). The Ethics of Whistleblowing in the Legal Profession. Eurasian Experiment Journal of Arts and Management, 7(1):33-36