BEYOND THE VIGIL MECHANISM: EXAMINING THE LEGAL ENFORCEABILITY OF ANTI-RETALIATION REMEDIES FOR CORPORATE WHISTLEBLOWERS IN INDIA

Nandhini S, SRM School of Law, SRMIST, Chennai.

Sailesh Kumar, SRM School of Law, SRMIST, Chennai.

ABSTRACT

Whistleblowing, which enables employees to report fraud, corruption and other corporate misconduct, is crucially important for promoting corporate transparency, accountability and ethical governance. However, corporate whistleblowers in India often face retaliation in the form of termination, demotion, workplace harassment and other adverse employment action. The present research deals with the legal enforceability of anti-retaliation remedial measures available to corporate whistleblowers under the Indian legal framework. Also discusses Section 177(9) and Section 177(10) of the Companies Act, 2013, Rule 7 of the Companies (Meetings of Board and its Powers) Rules, 2014 and Regulation 22 of the SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015. The study adopts doctrinal research methodology by analyzing statutory provisions, regulations, judicial decisions and relevant secondary sources. It critically examines the gap between establishment of internal vigil mechanism and availability of effective individual remedies including reinstatement, compensation and other appropriate relief. The study also suggests practical challenges in proving retaliation, the lack of confidentiality, conflicts of interest, and uncertainty as to the appropriate legal forum. It highlights the inadequacies of the current system particularly regarding safeguarding employees in the private corporate sector. To enhance anti-retaliation protection, the study calls for a comprehensive legal framework, independent investigations, accessible complaint procedures and clearer remedial provisions. It finds that effective whistleblower protection requires not only mechanisms for reporting, but also real and enforceable legal remedies against retaliation.

Keywords: Corporate Whistleblowers, Whistleblower Protection, Anti-Retaliation Remedies, Companies Act 2013, Vigil Mechanism, SEBI Regulations, Corporate Governance, Victimisation, Legal Enforceability, Employment Law.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS:

S NO	ABBREVIATION	FULL FORM
1	**SEBI**	Securities and Exchange Board of India
2	**LODR**	Listing obligations and disclosure requirements
3	**ACT**	Legislation enacted by parliament.
4	**Sec.**	Section
5	**Rule**	Rule of a Statute or Regulation
6	**Reg.**	Regulation
7	**Co.**	Company
8	**Pvt. Ltd.**	Private Limited.
9	**e.g.**	For example

LIST OF STATUTES:

1.Companies Act, 2013 – Section 177(9),(10).

2.Companies (Meetings of Board and its Powers) rules, 2014 – Rule 7.

3.SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements), 2015 India.

4.Whistle Blowers Protection Act, 2014 -Discussed in relation to its scope and limitations.

INTRODUCTION:

Whistleblowing is an important tool to promote corporate transparency, accountability and ethical governance[1]. Financial fraud, corruption, regulatory violations and managerial misconduct are often best detected by employees and other insiders in modern corporate organizations. But whistleblowers who report such misconduct may be retaliated against by being fired, demoted, harassed at work, isolated by coworkers, or denied promotions. The fear of these consequences may deter individuals from reporting misconduct, thereby undermining

[1] *Bhavya Gupta & Kumar Rishabh Parth, Protection of Whistle-Blowers in India: A Need,1 Law Colloquy J. Legal Stud., no. 2, apr.2021, at 1-15.*

corporate accountability. Thus, successful whistleblower protection needs to not only offer reporting channels, but also effective legal protection against retaliation. In India, the legal regime for corporate whistleblower protection is mainly governed by Section 177(9) and Section 177(10) of the Companies Act, 2013[2] read with Rule 7 of the Companies (Meetings of Board and its Powers) Rules, 2014.

These provisions mandate certain classes of companies to establish a vigil mechanism and offer protection against victimization[3]. Similarly, Regulation 22 of Securities and Exchange Board of India (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015 requires listed entities to have a vigil mechanism with appropriate safeguards. These provisions recognise the importance of protecting those who make genuine disclosures, but the existence of a formal process does not necessarily ensure adequate protections against retaliation. The key challenge is the disparity between the protection provided by law and the remedies that can be effectively enforced. Although there are protections against victimisation in corporate legislation, the issue of the availability of appropriate legal remedies, mechanisms to challenge retaliatory action and the practical difficulties whistleblowers may face in getting redress are still matters for discussion. An employee who is fired, demoted, or harassed after reporting corporate misconduct may not know what legal protections are available, what forum to seek relief in, or whether he or she will actually receive remedies like reinstatement or compensation. These challenges raise questions about whether existing safeguards are sufficiently deterrent to retaliation and whether whistleblowers can effectively exercise their rights.

In India, the whistleblower protection regime is implemented through various legal and regulatory regimes, the applicability of which is dependent on the nature of the disclosure, status of the company and nature of employment relationship. The Whistle Blowers Protection Act, 2014 deals primarily with the disclosures relating to the public servants and public authorities and does not provide a general statutory remedy to all employees of private companies. This distinction draws attention to considering the protections available to corporate whistleblowers especially, and the extent to which existing company law, securities regulation, employment law and other applicable legal remedies protect against retaliation.

[2] *Companies Act,No 18 of 2013 – Section 177(9), (10) India.*
[3] *Companies (Meetings of Board and its Powers) rules, 2014, r. 7(India).*

Against this backdrop, the present study examines the legal enforceability of anti-retaliation remedies for corporate whistleblowers in India. It examines the current statutory and regulatory framework, identifies potential gaps in the protection against victimization and assesses the adequacy and accessibility of available remedies. The study also looks into the need to have stronger enforcement mechanisms, clearer remedial provisions and appropriate legal reforms to ensure that individuals exposing corporate wrongdoings are not left without effective protection. The ultimate goal of this research is to examine the extent to which India's corporate governance regime provides meaningful legal protection to whistleblowers, or whether there is room for further reforms to close the gap between formal safeguards and effective legal redress.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEMS

Indian company law and securities regulation recognize the importance of protecting corporate whistleblowers, but the effectiveness of these safeguards remains a significant legal concern.[4] Vigil Mechanisms and Safeguards against Victimization Section 177(9) and Section 177(10) of the Companies Act, 2013 and Regulation 22 of the SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015. However, these mechanisms are not necessarily effective in providing legal redress for whistleblowers facing retaliation.

The key issue is whether the existing legal regime provides clear, accessible and enforceable remedies against retaliatory actions such as dismissal, demotion and workplace harassment. The lack of clarity around whether such remedies are available and enforceable could undermine corporate accountability and weaken whistleblower protections. Hence, this study critically analyses the adequacy of the existing anti-retaliation framework in India, highlights the legal lacunae and assesses the need of reforms to provide effective and enforceable protection to corporate whistleblowers.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. How far does the current Indian legal framework ensure the enforceability of anti-retaliation remedies for corporate whistleblowers other than the vigil mechanism?

2. What are the legal and practical barriers that limit the availability and enforcement of

[4] *SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulation, 2015, reg.22 (India).*

remedies available to corporate whistleblowers facing retaliation in India?

3. What are the legal and regulatory changes needed to enhance the enforceability of anti-retaliation remedies for corporate whistleblowers in India?

OBJECTIVES

1. To analyze the legal framework of anti-retaliation protection available to corporate whistleblowers in India, especially under the Companies Act, 2013 and SEBI regulations.

2. To explore the legal and practical challenges that affect the enforceability of remedies available to corporate whistleblowers who suffer retaliation.

3. To propose legal and regulatory reforms to improve the effectiveness and enforceability of anti-retaliation remedies in India.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study adopts a doctrinal research methodology, based on the systematic analysis of primary and secondary legal sources. Primary Source are Relevant statutory provisions, rules, SEBI regulations, judicial decisions, and regulatory enforcement materials pertaining to corporate whistleblower protection in India. Secondary sources are books, scholarly journal articles, research papers and legal commentaries on corporate governance and anti-retaliation protection. This article uses a qualitative and analytical approach to analyze the interpretation and enforceability of anti-retaliation remedies, the adequacy of existing legal protections, and gaps in the current legal framework. On the basis of these findings, the study proposes appropriate legal and regulatory reforms to improve the protection of corporate whistleblowers in India.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE:

1. Bhavya Gupta & Kumar Rishabh Parth, Protection of Whistle-Blowers in India: A Need?,1 Law Colloquy J. Legal Stud.,no.2,apr.2021,at 1-15.

Bhavya Gupta and Rishabh Parth Kumar, in their research paper "Protection of Whistle-Blowers in India: A Need?" published in the Law Colloquy Journal of Legal Studies, April 2021, address the significance of whistleblower protection in promoting corporate

transparency, accountability and ethical governance in India.[5] The authors have examined the Companies Act, 2013, the relevant SEBI regulations and the Whistle Blowers Protection Act, 2014 and also the risks faced by individuals who expose corruption, fraud and organizational misconduct. They point out that the Companies Act provides for a vigil mechanism and safeguards against victimization, but the effectiveness of these protections is compromised by uncertainties in implementation, investigation procedures and enforcement.

The comparative discussion of whistle-blower protection in the United States and the United Kingdom further emphasizes the need for effective legal protection against retaliation. The present study is relevant since it shows the gap between formal recognition of whistleblower protection and its practical implementation. It is, however, mainly concerned with the general need for whistle-blower protection and the inadequacies of the present legal framework. It stops short of addressing the enforceability of specific remedies for corporate whistleblowers who are dismissed, demoted or harassed at work in retaliation. The present study seeks to fill this gap by examining the availability, accessibility and enforceability of anti-retaliation remedies under Indian company law, SEBI regulations and other relevant legal structures and proposing reforms to improve effective legal redress for corporate whistleblowers.

2. *E. Ramya, Whistleblower Protection and Corporate Governance in India: A Critical Analysis of the Effectiveness of the Vigil Mechanism, 8 Int'l J. Legal Sci.& Innovation, no.1, 2026, at 1-14.*

Dr. E. Ramya, in her research paper titled "*Whistleblower Protection and Corporate Governance in India: A Critical Analysis of the Effectiveness of the Vigil Mechanism*", studies the role of whistleblowing in promoting corporate transparency, accountability and ethical governance in India.[6] The author discusses the legal framework under Section 177(9) and Section 177(10) of the Companies Act, 2013, Rule 7 of the Companies (Meetings of Board and its Powers) Rules, 2014 and Regulation 22 of the SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015. The study points out that although these provisions mandate some companies to have vigil mechanisms and protection against victimization, practical

[5] *Gupta & Kumar, supra note 1.*
[6] *E. Ramya, Whistleblower Protection and Corporate Governance in India: A Critical Analysis of the Effectiveness of the Vigil Mechanism, 8 Int'l J. Legal Sci.& Innovation,no.1,2026,at 1-14.*

effectiveness is frustrated by issues of confidentiality, management influence, conflict of interest and independence of investigations. The author underscores that a formal whistleblower policy does not necessarily mean meaningful protection of those reporting corporate misconduct.

The research also shows that retaliation is a major obstacle to effective whistleblowing, particularly when employees are fired, demoted, harassed, given negative performance evaluations or otherwise professionally disadvantaged after disclosures. "The current framework does not provide adequate remedies for retaliation, uniform procedures for investigations or effective external escalation mechanisms," Dr Ramya notes. It additionally emphasizes the fragmented nature of private sector whistleblower protection in India and calls for stronger anti-retaliation safeguards, independent investigations, increased confidentiality, effective oversight by Audit Committees and the need to build a comprehensive legal framework. The author ultimately argues that whistleblower protection needs to go beyond formal regulatory compliance to substantive protection that allows employees to report wrongdoing without undue fear of adverse consequences.

This paper is directly relevant to the present study, "Beyond the Vigil Mechanism: Examining the Legal Enforceability of Anti-Retaliation Remedies for Corporate Whistleblowers in India" as it identifies the limitations of existing vigil mechanisms and the uncertainty regarding protection from retaliation. But the article is mainly on the efficacy of the vigil mechanism and the bigger scheme of corporate governance. This article builds on this analysis, focusing on the legal enforceability of anti-retaliation remedies, the availability of suitable forums in which to seek redress, and the practical difficulties of obtaining relief against retaliatory employment actions. It also seeks to analyze whether the current legal framework offers sufficiently clear and accessible remedies, and to suggest legal and regulatory reforms to fill the gap between statutory safeguards and effective legal protection for corporate whistleblowers.

3. Sathyanarayana Reddy P. & V. Balachandran, Corporate Whistleblowing/Vigil Mechanism in India: A Strong Tool for Detection and Deterrence of Insider Trading, 4 Int'l J. Advanced Rsch. Mgmt. & Soc. Scis., no.5,may.2015,at 163-76.

Sathyanarayana Reddy P. and Prof. V. Balachandran, in their research paper "*Corporate Whistleblowing / Vigil Mechanism in India: A Strong Tool for Detection and*

Deterrence of Insider Trading," address the significance of corporate whistleblowing as a means to detect and deter insider trading and other securities violations.[7] The authors point out that employees and others with access to sensitive corporate information can be an important source of information about illegal activity. The vigil mechanism under Section 177(9) and 177(10) under the Companies Act, 2013 has been discussed and it has been highlighted that safeguards against victimization are of utmost importance in this study. Further, it discusses SEBI's role in motivating whistleblowers to report securities violations and compares India's approach to the US whistleblower incentive framework.

The authors also point out the professional and personal risks that whistleblowers face, including being fired, demoted, subjected to retaliation at work, and having trouble finding future jobs. They argue the lack of proper protections and limited incentives may discourage people from exposing corporate misconduct. The study calls for stronger whistleblower protection and financial incentives to encourage disclosures and improve detection of insider trading. The article emphasizes the need for whistleblower protection as an integral part of good corporate governance and securities regulation.

The study does mention victimization and the need for better whistleblower protection, but the focus is more on detecting and deterring insider trading and providing incentives to report securities violations. It does not undertake a comprehensive review of the legal enforceability of anti-retaliation remedies or the procedures by which corporate employees may challenge retaliatory employment actions. The present study takes the discussion forward by examining the legal protection of corporate whistleblowers in India, the remedies and forums available in the event of retaliation, and the effectiveness of the existing statutory safeguards in providing adequate redress to negative employment consequences.

4. Tisha, Whistleblower Protection in Companies, 3 J. Legal Rsch. & Analysis,no.2,May 2026.

In the Journal of Legal Research and Analysis, Volume III, Issue II, May 2026, a research paper titled "Whistleblower Protection in Companies" emphasizes the need for whistleblower protection for transparency, accountability and ethical corporate governance in India.[8] The author talks about the legal framework for corporate whistleblowing especially

[7] *Sathyanarayana Reddy P. & V. Balachandran, Corporate Whistleblowing/Vigil Mechanism in India: A Strong Tool for Detection and Deterrence of Insider Trading, 4 Int'l J. Advanced Rsch. Mgmt. & Soc. Scis., no.5,may.2015,at 163-76.*

[8] *Tisha, Whistleblower Protection in Companies, 3 J. Legal Rsch. & Analysis,no.2,May 2026.*

Section 177(9) and Section 177(10) of the Companies Act, 2013 and Regulation 22 of the SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015. The paper also notes the role of vigil mechanisms in empowering directors and employees to report corporate fraud, insider trading, corruption and other unethical practices. It also discusses the Whistle Blowers Protection Act, 2014 and compares aspects of India's framework with whistleblower protection laws in the United States and the United Kingdom.

The paper discusses some of the challenges to effective implementation of whistleblower protection in India, such as fear of reprisal, lack of confidentiality, delay in investigations, poor enforcement and limited protection of employees in the private corporate sector. The document states that whistleblowers can be dismissed, demoted, harassed, intimidated and suffer damage to their reputations after reporting wrongdoing. The author contends that the existence of statutory provisions and internal reporting mechanisms does not guaranty effective protection in practice. The paper proposes stronger anti-retaliation protections, independent investigation procedures, confidential reporting channels, appropriate penalties for victimization and reform to strengthen the existing legal framework.

This paper is related to the current study, "Beyond the Vigil Mechanism: Analyzing the Legal Enforceability of Anti-Retaliation Remedies for Corporate Whistleblowers in India" as it brings to light significant gaps in the existing corporate whistleblower protection framework. But the primary focus is on the whistleblower protection, corporate governance and general implementation challenges. It does not fully explore the legal enforceability of specific anti-retaliation remedies, the forums available for corporate employees to challenge retaliatory employment actions, or the availability of relief such as reinstatement or compensation. This paper seeks to contribute to this debate by critically examining the effectiveness and enforceability of Indian legal protections currently available to corporate whistleblowers facing retaliation, and proposing legal and institutional reforms needed to close the gap between statutory protections and real redress.

RESEARCH GAP:

The existing literature on whistle-blowing protection in India has mainly focused on the importance of whistle-blowing, corporate governance, vigil mechanism and the need to protect the whistle-blowers reporting corporate misconduct. While these studies raise issues of victimization, confidentiality and lack of enforcement, more legal analysis is needed to assess

whether current safeguards offer effective and enforceable remedies for corporate whistle-blowers who are retaliated against.

The main research gap is the disconnection between the duty of companies to put in place vigilance mechanisms and the individual legal remedies for whistleblowers who suffer negative consequences after they have made a disclosure. The Companies Act, 2013 and the SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements), Regulations, 2015, have safeguards against victimization. However, relief to an individual would be subject to applicable law, nature of retaliation, the employee's legal status and the forum approached.

This study fills this gap by examining ***the legal enforceability of anti-retaliation protection***, especially the availability of remedies such as reinstatement, compensation and other appropriate relief. It distinguishes between internal corporate procedures, regulatory enforcement and individual legal redress to assess the effectiveness of the current framework in providing an effective route for whistleblowers to seek protection.

The study also examines the clarity of existing legal protections, the ease of obtaining a remedy, the effectiveness of enforcement mechanisms and the practical challenges faced by affected whistleblowers. It seeks to identify the gaps in the current framework and suggest targeted reforms to improve the enforceability of anti-retaliation protection in the Indian corporate sector.

SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS OF STUDY:

The present study investigates the legal enforceability of anti-retaliation remedies available to corporate whistleblowers in India. It deals with Section 177(9) and Section 177(10) of Companies Act, 2013, Rule 7 of Companies (Meetings of Board and its Powers) Rules, 2014 and Regulation 22 of SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015 and relevant employment laws, judicial decisions and regulatory mechanisms.

The study takes into account a range of types of retaliation, including dismissal, demotion, workplace harassment and victimization. It explores the legal forums for redress, the conditions under which reinstatement or compensation may be granted and the practical difficulties in enforcing such remedies. It also discusses possible reforms for better protection of whistleblowers in India.

The methodology of this research is the doctrinal approach using primary sources such as legislation, regulations, decisions of courts and regulatory materials, and secondary sources such as academic articles, books and legal commentaries. The appropriate reforms may be identified through comparative reference to selected foreign jurisdictions. The study is restricted to legal and regulatory analysis and does not include empirical surveys or interviews. It recognizes that the availability of remedies depends on variables such as the employment status of the whistleblower, the nature of the retaliation, the organization concerned and the law applicable. It therefore examines the legal grounds and limitations of available remedies without presuming, for instance, that all whistleblowers are automatically entitled to reinstatement, compensation or other specific relief.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK GOVERNING CORPORATE WHISTLE BLOWER PROTECTION IN INDIA:

SECTION 177(9) AND SECTION 177(10) OF COMPANIES ACT, 2013

Section 177(9) of the Companies Act, 2013, requires certain companies to establish a vigil mechanism to allow directors and employees to report genuine concerns[9]. Section 177(10) provides that there should be adequate safeguards against victimization and in appropriate cases[10], there should be a direct access to the Chairperson of the Audit Committee. These provisions are intended to encourage reporting of corporate misconduct to increase transparency and accountability. However, establishing a vigil mechanism does not automatically ensure individual relief for employees who experience retaliation. Reinstatement, compensation or other relief is available depending on the applicable law and the circumstances of the case.

RULE 7 OF THE COMPANIES (MEETINGS OF BOARD AND ITS POWERS) RULES, 2014

Rule 7 complements Section 177 and provides for the establishment and operation of vigil mechanisms[11]. It applies to listed companies and those accepting public deposits or borrowing beyond the prescribed limit from banks and public financial institutions. The rule

[9] *Companies Act, No 18 of 2013 – Section 177(9) India.*
[10] *Id,sec 177(10)*
[11] *Companies (Meetings of Board and its Powers) rules, 2014, r. 7(India).*

provides for oversight by the Audit Committee or a director nominated for the purpose, as applicable, and requires safeguards against victimization. Rule 7 provides an internal reporting mechanism for concerns, but does not guaranty reinstatement or compensation to an employee affected by the concerns. Its effectiveness must therefore be measured against the need to have recourse to adequate legal remedies and internal protection.

REGULATION 22 OF THE SEBI (LISTING OBLIGATIONS AND DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS) REGULATIONS, 2015

Regulation 22 mandates listed entities to put in place a vigil mechanism for directors and employees to report bona fide concerns[12]. It also requires safeguards against victimization and provides for direct access to the Chairperson of the Audit Committee in appropriate circumstances. The regulation enhances corporate responsibility and encourages reporting of misconduct that impacts listed entities. However, the duty to maintain a vigil mechanism is to be distinguished from an individual's right to get relief after retaliation. The remedies available depend on the applicable legal provisions and the jurisdiction of the relevant forum.

WHISTLE BLOWERS PROTECTION ACT, 2014: SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS

The Whistle Blowers Protection Act, 2014 was enacted for providing a mechanism for disclosures regarding corruption, misuse of power and specified offenses by public servants. Its reach doesn't extend to providing a wide anti-retaliation remedy for all employees of a private company.[13] The Central Government in a reply to a parliamentary question on 12 December 2024 stated that the scope and non-commencement of the Act limit its applicability when considering corporate whistleblower protection. Thus, employees in the private sector typically must look to the corporate, securities, employment, and other laws that apply to their situation when looking for protection from retaliation.

OTHER APPLICABLE LEGAL REMEDIES

Depending on the circumstances of the dispute and their employment status, corporate whistleblowers who suffer victimization, demotion, dismissal or other forms of victimization may seek relief under applicable employment laws, contractual provisions or other relevant

[12] *SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulation, 2015, reg.22 (India).*
[13] *Whistle Blowers Protection Act, No.17 of 2014, sec1(3),4 (India).*

legal mechanisms. Regulatory complaints may also be relevant if the misconduct reported involves breaches of securities laws or other regulatory requirements. Regulatory action against a company may not offer any personal compensation or reinstatement for the whistleblower. Thus, the availability of an effective remedy depends on identifying the applicable legal basis, approaching a competent forum and establishing the facts necessary to obtain relief. This distinction between internal safeguards and enforceable individual remedies forms the basis of the analysis of anti-retaliation protection in India.

LEGAL ENFORCEABILITY OF ANTI-RETALIATION REMEDIES FOR CORPORATE WHISTLEBLOWERS IN INDIA

Difference Between Internal Protection and Legal Remedies

The Companies Act, 2013 and the SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015 mandate the formulation of vigil mechanism with adequate safeguards against victimization by the prescribed companies and listed entities. But an internal reporting mechanism does not in and of itself assure individual legal relief for retaliation.[14] The effectiveness of the protection depends on the ability of an affected employee to approach a competent forum and seek an appropriate remedy under the applicable law. This distinction between corporate duties and enforceable individual rights is central to the present study.

Retaliation Against Corporate Whistleblowers: Forms

Corporate whistleblowers may be fired, suspended, demoted, denied promotion, harassed, intimidated, transferred to unfavorable locations and excluded from professional opportunities. Such actions could deter employees from reporting corporate misconduct. The legal issue is whether the adverse action was related to the disclosure. Relevant evidence may include employment records, communications, timing of the action, and the reasons given by the employer.

Legal Forums to Seek Redress

The appropriate forum will depend on the nature of the retaliation, the employee's status and the law that applies.[15] Whistleblowers can approach the company's vigil mechanism

[14] *Companies Act,No 18 of 2013 – Section 177(9), (10) India.*
[15] *Id.sec 177(10); SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulation, 2015, reg.22 (India).*

or the Audit Committee to report victimization. In case the allegations are regarding any matter within the regulatory jurisdiction of SEBI, it may be approached. There may also be employment-related forums and courts or tribunals that have jurisdiction over legally recognized claims. But going to an internal authority or regulator doesn't automatically mean the whistleblower gets their job back or is compensated. The availability of relief is dependent on the powers of the forum and the legal basis of the claim.

Remedies Available

Corporate whistleblowers' available remedies depend on the applicable law and the circumstances of the case. Where legally permissible, they may include reinstatement, compensation, back wages, correction of employment records or other appropriate relief. Regulatory or disciplinary action may also be taken by the relevant authority in its jurisdiction if any violations are found. It should not be construed that there will be automatic reinstatement or compensation in each case either under Section 177 of the Companies Act, 2013 or under Regulation 22 of the SEBI LODR Regulations, 2015. The aggrieved person must have a legal basis for the relief sought.

Implementation of Anti-Retaliation Safeguard

There are a number of challenges in enforcing the anti-retaliation protection, including the difficulty of establishing a link between a disclosure and adverse employment action, limited access to relevant evidence, fear of further victimization and uncertainty as to the appropriate legal forum. Also, internal investigations may be compromised by conflicts of interest, especially when the allegations are about senior management. These difficulties show that formal safeguards are not necessarily effective protection. It is important to have accessible complaint procedures, independent investigations and clear legal remedies to enable whistleblowers to seek meaningful redress**.**

Judicial and Regulatory Methods

Courts and tribunals hear claims arising under laws within their jurisdiction, and regulatory authorities oversee compliance with applicable corporate and securities regulations. It is necessary to distinguish their roles, since regulatory action against a company does not necessarily entail compensation or reinstatement of an affected whistleblower.

The examination of relevant judicial decisions and regulatory provisions helps to determine the extent to which existing law addresses retaliation and provides remedies to employees affected by it.It is important to distinguish between protection of whistleblowers in the public sector and the legal remedies available to employees in the private sector. The core issue is whether India's existing legal framework offers an effective and enforceable means for corporate whistleblowers to obtain individual relief when they are victims of retaliation for reporting corporate wrongdoing.

CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE EXISTING LEGAL FRAMEWORK

The gap between statutory protection and enforceable remedy:

Section 177 of the Companies Act, 2013 and Regulation 22 of the SEBI (LODR) Regulations, 2015 provides for vigil mechanisms as a safeguard for the corporate whistleblowers. 10. However, these provisions do not automatically ensure an effective individual remedy in case of retaliation. A major disadvantage of the current framework is the dissonance between internal protection and legal relief.

Adequacy of Protection under Companies Act and SEBI Regulations

The current provisions require protection against victimization but do not provide a uniform remedial procedure for every whistleblower.[16] Availability of relief depends on the type of retaliation, the legal status of the employee, and the governing law. So statutory compliance does not automatically translate into effective individual redress.

Limits on Remedies Available to Private-Sector Employees

Employees in the private sector may have to use employment laws, contractual rights or other legal remedies that are available to them to challenge retaliation. Variations in employment status and legal protection can lead to uncertainty about the proper forum and the availability of reinstatement or compensation. This underlines the need for greater clarity regarding the legal remedies available to affected whistleblowers.

[16] *Companies Act,No 18 of 2013 – Section 177 (10) India; SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulation, 2015, reg.22 (India).*

Efficacy of existing enforcement mechanisms

Where investigations are not independent, complaints are not confidential or involve senior management, internal mechanisms may not be effective. Likewise, regulatory action taken against a company does not necessarily provide personal relief to the whistleblower. It is therefore necessary to assess the effectiveness of the existing framework in terms of the accessibility and enforceability of remedies, rather than merely the existence of reporting mechanisms.

SUGGESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- India should consider developing a comprehensive legal framework that clearly addresses protection of corporate whistleblowers from retaliation. Such a framework should define retaliatory conduct that is prohibited, identify the individuals who are eligible for protection and provide clear procedures by which redress may be sought.[17]

- The law should clarify the remedies available to whistleblowers who suffer retaliation, including compensation, reinstatement where appropriate, and other appropriate relief. The conditions for obtaining such remedies should be clearly specified so as to reduce uncertainty and to improve access to justice.

- Companies should ensure that whistleblower complaints are investigated fairly, particularly when allegations relate to senior management or members of the Audit Committee. Independent oversight and adequate external escalation procedures would help to reduce conflicts of interest and increase confidence in the reporting process.

- Companies should have good confidentiality measures and procedures for identifying and dealing with retaliation. Appropriate accountability for breaches of the whistleblower protection requirements should be enhanced in line with the applicable law.

- Whistleblowers should be provided with clear information on the appropriate forum, applicable procedures and potential remedies[18]. Prompt consideration of complaints

[17] *Id.sec 177; Whistle Blowers Protection Act, No.17 of 2014, (India).*
[18] *SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulation, 2015, reg.22 (India).*

and appropriate interim protection, where legally available, may help to avoid further harm while a dispute is being considered.

- Regulatory authorities should promote effective compliance with existing whistleblower protection requirements by means of appropriate monitoring, guidance and enforcement within their statutory powers. Greater clarity on the relationship between corporate compliance obligations and individual remedies would help strengthen the practical effectiveness of the framework.

CONCLUSION

The whistleblower protection is key to ensuring transparency, accountability and ethical corporate governance in India. The Companies Act, 2013 and SEBI (LODR) Regulations, 2015 provide for establishment of vigil mechanisms and provide for safeguards against victimization, but these do not in themselves provide for effective individual remedies against retaliation[19]. The availability of reinstatement, compensation, or other relief will depend on the applicable law, the nature of the retaliation, and the forum sought. Internal reporting mechanisms and regulatory action may not always provide direct relief to whistleblowers who are affected. India needs therefore more transparent anti-retaliation protections, independent investigations, accessible complaint procedures and effective legal remedies. The real value of whistleblower protection is not the creation of reporting channels, but the provision of meaningful and enforceable protection against retaliation.

[19] *Companies Act, No 18 of 2013 – Section 177(9), (10) India.; SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulation, 2015, reg.22 (India).*

REFERENCES:

I. STATUTES AND REGULATIONS:

1. Companies Act, No 18 of 2013 – Section 177(9), (10) India.
2. Companies (Meetings of Board and its Powers) rules, 2014, r. 7(India).
3. SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulation, 2015, reg.22 (India).
4. Whistle Blowers Protection Act, No.17 of 2014, sec1(3),4 (India).

II. JOURNALS ARTICLES:

1. Bhavya Gupta & Kumar Rishabh Parth, Protection of Whistle-Blowers in India: A Need?,1 Law Colloquy J. Legal Stud.,no.2,apr.2021,at 1-15.
2. E. Ramya, Whistleblower Protection and Corporate Governance in India: A Critical Analysis of the Effectiveness of the Vigil Mechanism, 8 Int'l J. Legal Sci.& Innovation,no.1,2026,at 1-14.
3. Sathyanarayana Reddy P. & V. Balachandran, Corporate Whistleblowing/Vigil Mechanism in India: A Strong Tool for Detection and Deterrence of Insider Trading, 4 Int'l J. Advanced Rsch. Mgmt. & Soc. Scis., no.5,may.2015,at 163-76.
4. Tisha, Whistleblower Protection in Companies, 3 J. Legal Rsch. & Analysis,no.2,May 2026.

III. GOVERNMENT AND INSTITUTIONAL SOURCES:

1. Ministry of Corporate Affairs, Government of India, Companies Act, 2013 (India), available at India code.
2. SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulation, 2015, reg.22 (India), available at SEBI.
3. Ministry of personnel, Public Grievances and pensions, Government of India , Whistle Blowers Protection Act,2014 (India).