

ANTI-BRIBERY & CORRUPTION

France



Anti-Bribery & Corruption

Consulting editors

James G Tillen, Leah Moushey

Miller & Chevalier Chartered

Quick reference guide enabling side-by-side comparison of local insights, including into relevant domestic and international law, agencies, enforcement and sanctions; recent landmark investigations and decisions; and other recent trends.

Generated 17 February 2023

The information contained in this report is indicative only. Law Business Research is not responsible for any actions (or lack thereof) taken as a result of relying on or in any way using information contained in this report and in no event shall be liable for any damages resulting from reliance on or use of this information. © Copyright 2006 - 2023 Law Business Research

Table of contents

RELEVANT INTERNATIONAL AND DOMESTIC LAW

International anti-corruption conventions

Foreign and domestic bribery laws

Successor liability

Civil and criminal enforcement

Out-of-court disposal and leniency

FOREIGN BRIBERY

Legal framework

Definition of a foreign public official

Gifts, travel and entertainment

Facilitating payments

Payments through intermediaries or third parties

Individual and corporate liability

Private commercial bribery

Defences

Agency enforcement

Patterns in enforcement

Prosecution of foreign companies

Sanctions

Recent decisions and investigations

FINANCIAL RECORD-KEEPING AND REPORTING

Laws and regulations

Disclosure of violations or irregularities

Prosecution under financial record-keeping legislation

Sanctions for accounting violations

Tax-deductibility of domestic or foreign bribes

DOMESTIC BRIBERY

Legal framework

Scope of prohibitions

Definition of a domestic public official

Gifts, travel and entertainment

Facilitating payments

Public official participation in commercial activities

Payments through intermediaries or third parties

Individual and corporate liability

Private commercial bribery

Defences

Agency enforcement

Patterns in enforcement

Prosecution of foreign companies

Sanctions

Recent decisions and investigations

UPDATE AND TRENDS

Key developments of the past year

Contributors

France



Kiril Bougartchev

kbougartchev@bougartchev-moyne.com

Bougartchev Moyne Associés AARPI



Emmanuel Moyne

emoyne@bougartchev-moyne.com

Bougartchev Moyne Associés AARPI



Sébastien Muratyan

smuratyan@bougartchev-moyne.com

Bougartchev Moyne Associés AARPI



Nathan Morin

nmorin@bougartchev-moyne.com

Bougartchev Moyne Associés AARPI

RELEVANT INTERNATIONAL AND DOMESTIC LAW

International anti-corruption conventions

To which international anti-corruption conventions is your country a signatory?

The French anti-corruption legal framework is the result of the ratification and transposition by France of several conventions relating to bribery.

- The European Union Convention on the fight against corruption involving officials of the European Communities or officials of member states, signed on 26 May 1997 before its ratification was authorised by Law No. 99-423 of 27 May 1999 (the EU Convention).
- The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions, signed by France on 17 December 1997 before its ratification was authorised by Law No. 99-424 of 27 May 1999 (the OECD Convention).
- The Council of Europe criminal and civil law conventions on corruption of 27 January 1999 and 4 November 1999, respectively, the ratification of which was authorised by France by the Law of 25 April 2008.
- The additional protocol to the Council of Europe criminal law convention on international corruption, signed on 15 May 2003 before its ratification was authorised by Law No. 2007-1154 of 1 August 2007.
- The United Nations Convention against Corruption, signed by France on 31 October 2003, before its ratification was authorised by Law No. 2005-743 of 4 July 2005.

Law stated - 31 December 2022

Foreign and domestic bribery laws

Identify and describe your national laws and regulations prohibiting bribery of foreign public officials (foreign bribery laws) and domestic public officials (domestic bribery laws).

Incorporating the OECD Convention and the EU Convention, Law No. 2000-595 of 30 June 2000, which amended the Penal Code and the Code of Criminal Procedure with regard to the fight against corruption, introduced the offence of bribery of foreign public officials. Since then, numerous reforms have been adopted to effectively fight corruption. Thus, Law No. 2007-1598 of 13 November 2007 relating to the fight against corruption expanded the scope of criminal prosecution to tend towards greater assimilation between foreign bribery laws and domestic bribery laws. Then Law No. 2010-768 of 9 July 2010 focused on facilitating the seizure and confiscation of assets in criminal matters, especially in bribery cases. French law was thereafter enhanced by Law No. 2013-1117 of 6 December 2013 on combatting major economic and financial crimes, which increased possible penalties and created the National Financial Prosecutor.

Law No. 2016-1691 (Sapin II Law), signed on 9 December 2016 and entered into force on 11 December 2016 with regard to most of its provisions, strove to make further progress in the fight against corruption by providing:

- the introduction of a new duty to prevent bribery or influence-peddling in France or abroad for chairmen, chief executives and managers of large private and public companies, consisting of setting up a comprehensive compliance programme;
- the creation of the French Anti-Corruption Agency (AFA), an authority in charge of monitoring the quality and efficiency of compliance measures implemented within the companies and public entities concerned;
- the introduction of the offence of influence-peddling of foreign public officials and a new ancillary penalty consisting of a compliance programme;
- the extension of French judges' jurisdiction over acts of bribery and influence-peddling committed abroad; and

- the introduction of a new ADR mechanism called a public interest judicial convention, available for legal entities suspected of acts of bribery or influence-peddling, or laundering of tax fraud proceeds (extended to tax fraud in 2018 and to environmental offences in 2020 by Law No. 2020-1672).

Under French criminal law, the prosecution of bribery is based on the status of the person bribed, therefore a specific offence has been created for each type of person. Thus, the French Penal Code criminalises bribery of domestic public officials (articles 433-1 and 432-11 of the Penal Code), bribery of domestic judicial staff (article 434-9 of the Penal Code), bribery of private individuals (articles 445-1 and 445-2 of the Penal Code), bribery of foreign or international public officials (articles 435-1 and 435-3 of the Penal Code) and bribery of foreign or international judicial staff (articles 435-7 and 435-9 of the Penal Code).

In each situation, criminal law distinguishes between active bribery and passive bribery, it being specified that such a distinction allows the possibility to prosecute the bribe-giver independently from the bribe-taker and vice versa.

Regardless of the offence concerned, active bribery is defined as the acts of:

- unlawfully proposing, at any time, directly or indirectly, any offer, promise, donation, gift or advantage to a person (public official, judicial official or private individual), for the benefit of such person or of a third party, to induce or reward the performance or the non-performance by such person of an act pertaining to his or her position, duties, mandate or activities, or facilitated thereby; or
- accepting the proposal of a person (public official, judicial official or private individual) who unlawfully requests, at any time, directly or indirectly, such advantages in exchange for such acts.

In contrast, passive bribery can be defined as the act of a person (public official, judicial official or private individual) unlawfully requesting or accepting advantages as defined above, at any time, directly or indirectly, on his or her behalf or on behalf of a third party, inducing or rewarding the performance or the non-performance of an act pertaining to his or her position, duties, mandate or activities, or facilitated thereby.

Law stated - 31 December 2022

Successor liability

Can a successor entity be held liable for violations of foreign and domestic bribery laws by the target entity that occurred prior to the merger or acquisition?

Pursuant to the principle of individual criminal liability, only the perpetrator of an offence and the accomplice to the same offence can be prosecuted and sentenced for it (article 121-1 of the Penal Code).

Until recently, the Court of Cassation ruled that this principle implied that in the context of a transaction involving a loss of legal existence (eg, a merger, a total demerger or a dissolution), the successor entity could not be held liable for the violations of bribery laws committed by the organs or representatives of the other entity on behalf of the latter before the transaction if a final sentence had not been ordered before the date of the transaction (Court of Cassation, Crim. Ch., 20 June 2000, No. 99-86.742; Court of Cassation, Crim. Ch., 23 April 2013, No. 12-83.244). Conversely, the financial sanction could be transferred to the successor only if a final sentence had been pronounced before the date of the transaction.

In a recent decision, the Court of Cassation ruled that in the event of a merger falling within the scope of the Council Directive 78/855/EEC of 9 October 1978 concerning mergers of public limited liability companies, now part of the codified Directive 2017/1132 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 June 2017, the absorbing company

might be subject to a criminal penalty of a fine for offences committed by the absorbed company prior to the merger (Court of Cassation, Crim. Ch., 25 November 2020, No 18-86.955). The decision specifies that the absorbing company that might be convicted has the same rights as the absorbed company and can, therefore, raise the means of defence that the absorbing company could have raised.

In accordance with the principles of legal certainty and predictability, the Court of Cassation restricts the effects of this new interpretation of article 121-1 of the Penal Code to mergers closed after 25 November 2020. In other words, a company that has absorbed, before the date of the decision, another company having committed offences, cannot be held responsible for the acts of the absorbing company.

There is, however, an exception to this principle. For the first time, the Court ruled that when a merger transaction has been entered into in order to exempt the absorbed company from its criminal liability, it constitutes a fraudulent evasion of the law and the judge may pronounce a criminal penalty against the absorbing company. As this principle was not unpredictable, it applies immediately.

As a result, regardless of the form of the company (public limited liability company or simplified joint-stock company) or the date of the merger, if the merger constitutes a fraudulent evasion of the law, the absorbing company will not escape the transfer of the criminal liability of the absorbed company.

In a decision of 13 April 2022, the Court of Cassation recalled that this principle is applicable to mergers concluded from 25 November 2020 or to mergers concluded at any date when their objective was expressly to avoid the absorbed company's criminal liability (Court of Cassation, Crim. Ch., 13 April 2022, No. 21-80.653).

Law stated - 31 December 2022

Civil and criminal enforcement

Is there civil and criminal enforcement of your country's foreign and domestic bribery laws?

In France, the powers to prosecute and convict perpetrators of acts of corruption belong to judicial authorities.

The Public Prosecutor's Office is empowered to decide whether it is appropriate to institute proceedings, it being specified that civil claimants may also initiate prosecution. The investigating magistrate and the Criminal Chamber of the High Court, when the Public Prosecutor brings cases before them, have jurisdiction to handle bribery cases.

However, this general jurisdiction is shared with specific administrative authorities, prosecutorial agencies and specialised courts.

In 2014, a National Financial Prosecutor specialised in economic and financial offences, and more specifically in corruption and tax-fraud matters, was established. Cases investigated and prosecuted by the National Financial Prosecutor are brought to an investigating magistrate in Paris for deeper investigation or directly to dedicated Criminal Chambers of the Paris High Court (11th and 32nd Chambers) for trial.

Prosecutors at eight inter-regional specialised courts are also granted expanded territorial jurisdiction over a certain number of economic and financial offences, including some corruption offences, in highly complex matters. They may carry out a pretrial investigation before bringing the case to an investigating magistrate of the same inter-regional specialised court for deeper investigation or directly to a specialised criminal chamber of this court for trial.

These various prosecutorial bodies are assisted by a specialised investigative service: the Central Office for the Fight Against Corruption and Financial and Tax Offences (OCLCIFF). OCLCIFF is furnished with significant resources and specialised officers to act in matters involving offences to probity, tax fraud and, more broadly, financial offences, either on its own initiative or pursuant to a request for judicial assistance.

With respect to civil enforcement, civil action may be brought before civil courts or, together with the public action, before criminal courts.

The victim of an offence has the right to choose between civil and criminal proceedings. This choice is irrevocable (article 5 of the Code of Criminal Procedure), it being specified that irrevocability applies only when the victim brought the civil action before the civil courts in the first place (article 426 of the Code of Criminal Procedure) and that it is subject to some softening rules.

The civil action brought before the civil judge is governed by the rules of civil procedure. If the civil judge decides before the public action is initiated, the results will be independent. Conversely, if the public action is initiated before or during the civil proceedings, the criminal *res judicata* has authority over the civil: the judgment of the civil action may be suspended (article 4 of the Code of Criminal Procedure).

Law stated - 31 December 2022

Out-of-court disposal and leniency

Can enforcement matters involving foreign or domestic bribery be resolved through plea agreements, settlement agreements, prosecutorial discretion or similar means without a trial? Is there a mechanism for companies to disclose violations of domestic and foreign bribery laws in exchange for lesser penalties?

French law does not provide for a mechanism strictly equivalent to the US process of plea-bargaining. However, Law No. 2011-1862 of 13 December 2011 extended the scope of the 'appearance pursuant to a prior admission of guilt' procedure to corruption offences. Under this procedure, the Public Prosecutor's Office, or the investigating magistrate, is entitled to offer directly and without trial, on its own initiative or at the request of the accused or his or her lawyer, one or more penalties to a natural or legal person who acknowledges the acts of which he or she is accused (article 495-7 of the Code of Criminal Procedure). If the accused accepts the penalty(ies) proposed, those penalty(ies) must still be approved by the presiding judge of the High Court. The court judgment is deemed a conviction.

On 17 May 2022, the Criminal Chamber of the Court of Cassation confirmed the decision of the President of the Paris High Court to declare inadmissible the second homologation request submitted by a Public Prosecutor after the President had refused to approve the penalty proposed by the Public Prosecutor (French Court of Cassation, 17 May 2022, No 21-86.131). In this case, three months after the President's refusal, the Public Prosecutor had referred a new penalty proposal to the President, which the latter declared inadmissible. The Public Prosecutor's Office then appealed to the Court of cassation, which stated that after a first refusal to approve a CRPC, the prosecuting authorities cannot submit a new request for approval and must refer the case to an investigating judge or directly to a court.

Moreover, Law No. 2016-1691 of 9 December 2016 (the Sapin II Law) created a new transactional mechanism inspired by the US Deferred Prosecution Agreement (DPA): the public interest judicial convention (CJIP), which is only available for legal entities suspected of acts of bribery, influence-peddling and laundering of tax fraud proceeds, it being specified that (1) the Anti-Fraud Law of October 2018 extended the use of this mechanism to tax fraud offences (article 41-1-2 of the Code of Criminal Procedure) and (2) Law No. 2020-1672 relating to the European Public Prosecutor's Office, environmental justice and specialised criminal justice, signed on 24 December 2020 and entered into force on 26 December 2020, provided for the extension of this mechanism to environmental offences. Under this procedure, there is no acknowledgement of guilt. The Public Prosecutor and the investigating magistrate (article 180-2 of the Code of Criminal Procedure) are entitled to initiate a settlement, respectively before the initiation of prosecution or before the end of the investigation (in the latter case, at the request of, or in agreement with, the Public Prosecutor).

The accused legal entity is then offered to enter into an agreement with (1) the obligation to pay a public interest fine in proportion to the advantages gained from the offences within the limit of 30 per cent of the annual average turnover calculated on the basis of the last three turnovers available, with the possibility of spreading the penalty over a maximum of one year, (2) the obligation to set up a compliance programme for a maximum of three years under the supervision of the French Anti-Corruption Agency (AFA), or (3) the obligation to compensate any identified victims in an

amount and following modalities determined in the convention.

A subsequent validation hearing will take place, during which the judge decides whether to validate the proposed agreement. Once validated, the legal entity has 10 days to retract. Then, the validation judgment as well as the convention itself are published on the AFA website.

In the joint guidelines they published on 26 June 2019, the AFA and the National Financial Prosecutor's Office (PNF) encouraged companies to cooperate with the French authorities by self-reporting acts of corruption within a reasonable time frame and participating themselves in the determination of the truth through an internal investigation, and specified that such proactive approaches may reduce the amount of the public interest fine in the event of the conclusion of a public interest judicial convention. As the fate of the individuals involved is not settled by the agreement, prosecution authorities will decide whether a prosecution should be brought against them.

More recently, these authorities have published a draft practical guide on internal anti-corruption investigations. In this draft guide, the AFA and PNF expect companies to 'transmit the investigation report to the judicial authorities'. Much more surprisingly, the AFA and PNF consider that 'if internal control or audit activities reveal facts of a criminal nature, even before an internal investigation is initiated, the management body is advised to bring them to the attention of the judicial authorities without delay' and that 'the company should give priority to informing the judicial authority beforehand'. To compel the company outside of any legal obligation, the benefit of a CJIP is subordinated to 'the early and sincere denunciation by the company to the judicial authority of the criminal acts of which it has knowledge and the communication of the internal investigation'. Conversely, 'any delay in the transmission of information resulting from the internal investigation or any partial communication of the elements gathered by the company may be considered as an aggravating factor when calculating a possible CJIP fine'. Acting otherwise could lead the company to 'be held liable for the dissipation of evidence or fraudulent consultation' or 'for the dissipation of criminal assets that may be apprehended'.

With regard to cooperation, there is no other special treatment of perpetrators of offences who cooperate with investigators and prosecutors. However, the cooperation of the accused person during the investigation and throughout the proceedings, and, in the case of legal entities, the adoption of compliance measures may be taken into consideration as mitigating factors by a court when it determines the quantum of the penalty to be imposed.

That said, the Sapin II Law introduced the possibility for the perpetrators of, or the accomplices to, an offence of bribery of public officials or judicial staff only to have their imprisonment penalties reduced by half, if, by having informed the administrative or judicial authorities, they made it possible to put a stop to the offence or to identify other perpetrators or accomplices, if any (articles 432-11-1, 433-2-1, 434-9-2, 435-6-1 and 435-11-1 of the Penal Code).

Furthermore, the law exempts customs agents from penalties if they report acts of corruption they have committed (article 59 of the Customs Code).

Subject to these mechanisms, French law does not provide any leniency measure, it being specified that the judge has full discretion to choose, from among the penalties applicable, those he or she deems appropriate in light of the nature of the acts and the personality of the defendant as well as the quantum of the penalty.

Law stated - 31 December 2022

FOREIGN BRIBERY

Legal framework

Describe the elements of the law prohibiting bribery of a foreign public official.

The French Penal Code has criminalised active bribery of foreign public officials since the enactment of Law No. 2000-595 of 30 June 2000 (article 435-3 of the Penal Code) and, following Law No. 2007-1598 of 13 November 2007, passive bribery by such officials (article 435-1 of the Penal Code). French law also criminalises active and passive

bribery of international public officials (articles 435-1 and 435-3 of the Penal Code) as well as active and passive bribery of foreign or international judicial staff (articles 435-7 and 435-9 of the Penal Code).

As a prerequisite, the status of the person bribed falls within the scope of the provision at stake. The physical element consists of the bribe-taker's request for advantages or in his or her consent to the bribe-giver's offer (passive bribery) or in the acceptance of the bribe-taker's solicitation as well as in the bribe-giver offering for an advantage (active bribery). Lastly, the mental element is composed of:

- a general intent, deduced from the unlawful nature of the advantage received or granted and from the fact that the request, proposal, agreement or acceptance are necessarily intentional acts; and
- a special intent, which consists of the objective sought (ie, for the bribe-giver, conferring an advantage to obtain the benefit of the performance or non-performance of an act and, for the bribe-taker, to perform or refrain from performing such an act to obtain an advantage).

Neither the performance of the act nor receipt of the advantage are required for the offence to be characterised. The mere offering or agreeing to an advantage suffices for the commission of the offence of active bribery. In the same way, the mere fact of requesting or accepting an advantage is construed as an act of passive bribery. It explains why French law does not expressly criminalise attempted bribery.

Under French law, the conclusion of a corruption pact does not need to precede the performance or non-performance of the act expected. Such principle had been established by case law and confirmed by Law No. 2000-595 of 30 June 2000 and Law No. 2011-525 of 17 May 2011 to simplify and improve the quality of law.

These provisions are supplemented by the criminalisation of active and passive influence-peddling involving international officials and international judicial staff as well as, following the Sapin II Law, active and passive influence-peddling involving foreign public officials (articles 435-2, 435-4, 435-8 and 435-10 of the Penal Code).

Law stated - 31 December 2022

Definition of a foreign public official

How does your law define a foreign public official, and does that definition include employees of state-owned or state-controlled companies?

French law defines foreign public officials as persons who:

- hold public authority (eg, state representatives and civil servants such as police officers, teachers and tax administrators);
- have a public service mission; or
- hold public elected office; and
- perform their duties:
 - in a foreign state; or
 - within a public international organisation.

If the employee of a state-owned or state-controlled company has a public service mission (eg, has a general interest function designed to meet the collective needs of the public), he or she can therefore be included in the definition of a foreign public official.

French law also criminalises active and passive bribery of any:

- person who holds a judicial position in a foreign state or with an international court;
- civil servant with the registry of a foreign court or international court;
- expert appointed by any such court or by the parties to the proceedings;
- person appointed to act as a conciliator or mediator by any such court; and
- arbitrator who performs his or her duties under the arbitration law of a foreign state.

Law stated - 31 December 2022

Gifts, travel and entertainment

To what extent do your anti-bribery laws restrict providing foreign officials with gifts, travel expenses, meals or entertainment?

Regardless of the offence concerned, the scope of the French Penal Code is very broad, as a bribe can be defined as any offer, promise, donation, gift or reward unlawfully offered or requested, without any restriction as to the value of such an advantage. What matters is the intention that lies beneath the granting of, or the request for, an advantage.

This list covers many possibilities, specifying that French law does not include any specific provision that could help companies identify practices that may be prohibited. However, the French Anti-Corruption Agency (AFA), created by the Sapin II Law, has identified, in its non-legally binding recommendations on how to prevent and detect acts of corruption, several major risks including gifts, accommodations, entertainment, customer travel, donations, sponsorships and facilitation payments.

According to the case law, bribes may consist of a sum of money as well as of a non-cash benefit (eg, an apartment or a car) or a service (eg, a trip or a safari).

On 15 September 2022, the AFA released a guide entitled 'Public officials: the risks of breaches of probity concerning gifts and invitations', providing guidance to help public players and officials to identify the risk scenarios to which they may be exposed when accepting gifts and entertainment, and to protect themselves against them by defining a set of appropriate rules.

Law stated - 31 December 2022

Facilitating payments

Do the laws and regulations permit facilitating or 'grease' payments to foreign officials?

Facilitation payments are not allowed under French law and the offence of bribery can be characterised even if the amount at stake is small. As seen above, facilitation payments have been specifically identified as major risks by the AFA. That being said, should the amount be small, it may be considered as a mitigating factor by a court while determining the quantum of the penalty to be ordered.

Law stated - 31 December 2022

Payments through intermediaries or third parties

In what circumstances do the laws prohibit payments through intermediaries or third parties to foreign public officials?

Unlawful payments are prohibited whether they are made directly or indirectly. Therefore, criminal liability is incurred even if the payments are carried out through intermediaries or third parties, should the perpetrator have knowledge that

such intermediary or third party used the same payments to pay bribes. Such intermediary or third party may also be prosecuted, as the principal perpetrator of the offence or as an accomplice. For example, an intermediary who had deposited cheques into his own bank account on behalf of a mayor who had received bribes was convicted of aiding and abetting bribery (Court of Cassation, Criminal Chamber, 20 May 2009, No. 08-87.354).

Law stated - 31 December 2022

Individual and corporate liability

Can both individuals and companies be held liable for bribery of a foreign official?

Prior to the enactment of Law No. 2004-204 of 9 March 2004, adapting the justice system to changes in criminal behaviour, a specific provision was required to extend criminal liability to legal entities for a given offence, which was the case for bribery of public foreign officials. Since then, legal entities may be held liable in the same way as individuals for all criminal offences, including corruption offences, even if not expressly provided by law.

That being said, legal entities are criminally liable only for offences committed 'on their behalf' by their 'corporate bodies or representatives' (article 121-2 of the Penal Code). Legal entities' prosecution does not preclude individuals from also being prosecuted as perpetrators or accomplices where appropriate, at the discretion of the Public Prosecutor.

Law stated - 31 December 2022

Private commercial bribery

To what extent do your foreign anti-bribery laws also prohibit private commercial bribery?

Active and passive bribery of private individuals by other individuals is punishable by a five-year term of imprisonment and a fine of €500,000, which may be increased to double the proceeds generated by the offence (articles 445-1 and 445-2 of the Penal Code), as well as ancillary penalties (article 445-3 of the Penal Code), whereas legal entities are liable for a fine of €2.5 million, which may be increased to double the proceeds generated by the offence, as well as ancillary penalties (article 445-4 of the Penal Code).

Law stated - 31 December 2022

Defences

What defences and exemptions are available to those accused of foreign bribery violations?

French law does not provide for any specific defence. In this respect, the fact that a company has set up a very strong compliance programme that goes beyond legal requirements would not prevent the company from being prosecuted or convicted for foreign bribery.

A bill to strengthen the fight against corruption was submitted to the French National Assembly in October 2021. While this bill provides for the creation of a mechanism similar to the Anglo-Saxon 'failure to prevent bribery', it does not provide for a defence in the event that the compliance mechanisms put in place by the company are robust.

Law stated - 31 December 2022

Agency enforcement

What government agencies enforce the foreign bribery laws and regulations?

The Sapin II Law led to the creation of the AFA, the main duty of which is to monitor that certain legal entities (French companies that employ at least 500 employees and have an annual turnover or consolidated turnover of at least €100 million, as well as companies that belong to a group that employs at least 500 employees, and whose parent company is headquartered in France and have an annual turnover or consolidated annual turnover of at least €100 million) implement programmes to prevent and detect acts of corruption and influence-peddling. This authority has been empowered to refer cases to its Enforcement Committee for the prosecution and punishment of non-compliant legal entities. Legal entities that do not fulfil this obligation may be punished by a financial penalty of up to €1 million, whereas individuals may face a financial penalty of up to €200,000 (article 17 of the Sapin II Law).

To that purpose, the AFA agents may order the production of any document, as well as any helpful information, and to keep a copy thereof (article 4 of the Sapin II Law). They may also verify such information on the spot.

Thus, the AFA has jurisdiction only regarding French companies and their domestic and foreign subsidiaries, which explains why its president, Charles Duchaine, a former investigating magistrate, is promoting the expansion of the AFA's jurisdiction over foreign legal entities.

Since October 2017, the AFA has undertaken dozens of controls, notably within companies acting in the energy, aerospace and banking sectors.

On 4 July 2019, the Enforcement Committee of the AFA rendered its first decision. While the AFA had referred a company and its CEO on the grounds of breaches of the abovementioned measures, the Enforcement Committee dismissed the case. On 7 February 2020, it rendered its second decision, further to which a company was enjoined to comply with Sapin II Law requirements with respect to its code of conduct and to finalise the implementation of its accounting procedures. On 7 July 2021, the Enforcement Committee reviewed the injunctions issued on 7 February 2020 and thus clarified its expectations regarding the formalisation of the code of conduct.

The AFA is also in charge of issuing recommendations on how to prevent and detect acts of bribery and influence-peddling (article 3 of the Sapin II Law). Since the entry into force of the Sapin II Law, it has, therefore, published a dozen recommendations aiming to help public institutions and private companies to comply with their obligations under the law.

The last recommendations of the AFA are dated 12 January 2021.

Starting from the observation of an unmet need for cooperation with anti-corruption authorities at the operational level, the AFA, the Italian National Anti-Corruption Authority (ANAC) and the Serbian Anti-Corruption Agency launched an international network of corruption-prevention authorities, the NCPA Network. Their initiative aims to provide an international operational platform for the exchange of technical information and the sharing of good practices. In December 2021, the ANAC, with contributions from the NCPA members, released a study entitled 'Using innovative tools and technologies to prevent and detect corruption', which aims to bring together practical examples and best practices in the use of information and communication technologies for the prevention of corruption.

The bill to strengthen the fight against corruption submitted to the French National Assembly in October 2021 provides for the extension of the AFA's jurisdiction to subsidiaries of foreign companies exceeding the abovementioned thresholds and includes several proposals to reform the AFA's functioning.

In addition, other administrative bodies have been created, dealing with tasks that may relate to corruption issues. An agency for the Management and Recovery of Seized and Confiscated Assets in criminal matters (AGRASC) was created by Law No. 2010-768 of 9 July 2010. AGRASC is notably in charge of the recovery of assets seized in the course of criminal proceedings and of the conduct of pre-judgment sales of confiscated assets when they are no

longer needed as evidence or if they may lose value. Tracfin, an agency charged with dealing with and taking action against illegal financial circuits, is the sole centre for collecting suspicion reports made by the regulated professions subject to the anti-money laundering measures. It notably receives all suspicion reports that may concern acts of corruption.

These agencies, as well as the High Authority for Transparency in Public Life and the Public Finance General Directorate, play a key role in detecting offences, in particular bribery offences. They deal with the Public Prosecutor's Office, which gives instructions to the enquiry services and ensures they cooperate fully.

Law stated - 31 December 2022

Patterns in enforcement

Describe any recent shifts in the patterns of enforcement of the foreign bribery rules.

On 9 December 2021, the OECD Working Group on Bribery adopted its France Phase 4 report, according to which 'France has undertaken major legislative and institutional reforms since Phase 3 in 2012 and made significant progress in enforcing the foreign bribery offence. However, these recent advances are being jeopardised by structural resource issues affecting the entire criminal justice system. Furthermore, two recent bills, one of which will impose a three-year limit on preliminary investigations into economic and financial crimes [Law No. 2021-1729 of 22 December 2021 has entered into force since then], including foreign bribery, raising concerns about France's ability to make further progress'.

The OECD Working Group on Bribery welcomed the significant increase in the number of investigations opened: 108 between late 2012 and September 2021 while only 33 had been opened between 2000 and late 2012.

As a matter of fact, the judgments issued since 2017 in cases involving breaches of the duty of probity – notably corruption of foreign public officials – suggest that French courts are increasingly severe as regards sanctions imposed, with higher fines and more recourse to non-suspended prison sentences.

However, the OECD emphasised the relatively low number of cases resolved in light of the country's economic situation and trade profile as well as the number of foreign bribery allegations reported in the media. Therefore, it made the following recommendations:

- take the necessary legislative measures to extend the duration of preliminary investigations in foreign bribery cases allowing the effective enforcement of the foreign bribery offence;
- preserve the role and expertise of the National Financial Prosecutor's Office in the investigation, prosecution and resolution of foreign bribery cases;
- ensure that sufficient resources for fighting white-collar crime are allocated to the relevant components of the criminal justice system;
- clarify the conditions for triggering corporate liability and continue efforts to develop effective and coordinated non-trial resolutions for natural and legal persons; and
- preserve the role, mandates, and resources currently assigned to the AFA in the development and monitoring of compliance measures by companies.

In December 2022, France is expected to submit to the Working Group on Bribery an oral report on its implementation of some recommendations that are essential to preserving the progress made since Phase 3 as well as, in December 2023, a written report on the implementation of all recommendations and its enforcement efforts. The follow-up reports will be publicly available.

Law stated - 31 December 2022

Prosecution of foreign companies

In what circumstances can foreign companies be prosecuted for foreign bribery?

As a general rule, criminal procedure may be initiated in France against the perpetrator of an offence if French law is applicable, which is the case if:

- the offence is committed in France (article 113-2 of the Penal Code);
- any of the constituent elements of the offence are committed in France (article 113-2 of the Penal Code);
- the perpetrator of the offence is French and a similar offence exists in the country in which such an offence is committed (article 113-6 of the Penal Code);
- the victim is French (article 113-7 of the Penal Code); or
- an international convention designates the French courts as having jurisdiction (articles 689, 689-1 and 689-8 of the Code of Criminal Procedure).

Thus, foreign companies may be prosecuted if the offence, or one of its constituent elements, is committed in France or if the victim is French.

With respect to acts of corruption and influence-peddling of foreign public officials committed abroad, the Sapin II Law extended jurisdiction of French judges by removing, for such offences, the application of the dual criminality requirement of article 113-6 of the Penal Code and of article 113-8 of the Penal Code, which only authorises the prosecutor to initiate prosecution for offences committed abroad by French citizens if the victim has filed a claim or if the authorities of the country in question have issued an official complaint.

Law stated - 31 December 2022

Sanctions

What are the sanctions for individuals and companies violating the foreign bribery rules?

First, French civil law considers corruption acts to be void because their consideration or purpose is immoral and illegal (Court of Cassation, Commercial Chamber, 7 March 1961, Civil Bulletin III).

Second, individuals who commit the offence of active (article 435-3 of the Penal Code) or passive (article 435-1 of the Penal Code) bribery in the international as well as in the domestic arenas may be imprisoned for a term of up to 10 years, and sentenced to pay a fine up to €1 million, which are the maximum penalties for misdemeanours, it being specified that the amount of the fine may be increased to an amount equal to double the proceeds generated by the offence.

Other penalties may be imposed on individuals. Indeed, they may notably be prohibited from holding public office or from engaging professional or social activity in the performance of which, or in connection with the performance of which, the offence was committed for a period of up to five years (article 435-14 of the Penal Code). Any item that is a proceed of the infraction may also be confiscated.

As far as legal entities are concerned, they are subject to a fine of €5 million, which may be increased to an amount equal to double the proceeds generated by the offence (article 435-15 of the Penal Code). Among other things, legal entities may also face a prohibition against performing for a period of up to five years one or more professional or social activities, a placement under judicial supervision for an equal period or the closure of one or more establishments of the company used to commit the offence, as well as the exclusion from public contracts for a period of up to five years.

The Sapin II Law introduced a new penalty that can be ordered on legal entities convicted for bribery or influence-peddling. This penalty consists of the implementation, by the legal entity, for a period of up to five years, of a compliance programme, under the supervision of the AFA.

The penalties provided for active bribery of foreign or international judicial officials are the same as for bribery of foreign public officials. In cases of influence-peddling involving foreign public officials (articles 435-4 and 435-2 of the Penal Code), officials of a public international organisation (articles 435-2 and 435-4 of the Penal Code) or international judicial staff (articles 435-8 and 435-10 of the Penal Code), individuals are liable for a term of imprisonment of up to five years and a fine of €500,000 – which may be increased to an amount equal to double the proceeds generated by the offence – as well as various supplemental penalties (articles 435-14 of the Penal Code). Legal entities are liable for a fine of €2.5 million – which may be increased to an amount equal to double the proceeds generated by the offence – as well as various supplemental penalties (article 435-15 of the Penal Code).

Law stated - 31 December 2022

Recent decisions and investigations

Identify and summarise recent landmark decisions or investigations involving foreign bribery.

In the past, few of the convictions handed down in corruption cases were on the grounds of bribery of foreign public officials. For example, in 2015, the Paris Court of Appeal overturned the High Court's decision – which had held a French company liable to pay a fine of €500,000 – by acquitting the company of active bribery of a foreign public official, in view of alleged bribes paid to public officials in Nigeria between 2002 and 2003 to obtain a contract. The court stated that there was insufficient proof that the payments were intended as bribes (Paris Court of Appeal, 7 January 2015, No. 12/08695, which has become final).

More recently, courts seem to judge cases on the grounds of corruption of foreign public officials more severely.

In the famous ill-gotten gains case, the 32nd Criminal Chamber of the Paris High Court sentenced the vice-president of an African country to three years' imprisonment and a fine of €30 million, notably for laundering the proceeds of corruption, specifying that both penalties were suspended (High Court of Paris, 32nd Criminal Chamber, 27 October 2017). The court also ordered the seizure of many assets in France, for an amount of several million euros, except for an apartment bought for €25 million, the seizure of which will have to await the outcome of a proceeding pending (at the time of writing) before the International Court of Justice. The Paris Court of Appeal has increased the sentences since the €30 million fine was no longer suspended (Paris Court of Appeal, 10 February 2020). This decision was confirmed by the Court of Cassation in a recent decision (Court of Cassation, Crim. Ch., 7 September 2022, No. 21-86.002).

In another case, the Paris Court of Appeal convicted a Swiss company, a French company and three individuals for corruption of foreign public officials as well as two individuals for aiding and abetting corruption of foreign public officials. The legal entities were ordered to pay fines of, respectively, €300,000 and €750,000, the latter being the maximum penalty at the time of the events, and individuals were sentenced to pay fines ranging from €15,000 to €75,000 (Paris Court of Appeal, 26 February 2016, No. 13/09208). On 14 March 2018, the Court of Cassation rejected the appeals lodged against the Court of Appeal of Paris' decision by the abovementioned companies and individuals (Court of Cassation, Criminal Chamber, 14 March 2018, No. 16-82.117).

On 21 December 2018 (Paris High Court, 21 December 2018, No. 060170092027), the Paris High Court decided not to apply the principle of non bis in idem to a deferred prosecution agreement ratified by an American court as the prosecuted acts had partly been committed in France. More precisely, the Paris Court ruled that the accused legal entity, a French oil and gas major company, was guilty of having bribed an Iranian public official in order to obtain a significant gas contract and consequently sentenced the company to a fine of €500,000. The Court applied the principle of proportionality of penalties in the event of a prior conviction abroad and did not follow the Public

Prosecutor's requisitions, who had requested the conviction of the accused entity to an ancillary penalty of confiscation of €250 million. It also results from this judgment that it is not necessary, under French law, for the offence of bribery to be established, that the public official has his or herself a decision-making power within the entity that attributed the contract at stake, which is highly questionable.

Furthermore, in a decision dated 16 June 2021 concerning a French-American global telecommunications equipment company, the Court of Cassation held the holding company criminally liable for the corruption of foreign public officials by three employees of its subsidiaries, although not having participated directly in the corrupted acts, with respect to the group policy established by the holding company (Court of Cassation, 16 June 2021, No. 20-83.098).

One of the major innovations of the Sapin II Law was the introduction of the public interest judicial convention.

Multiple conventions have been concluded since then, which include several matters of corruption with French companies.

On 31 January 2020, a leading manufacturer in the aerospace sector concluded agreements with the French National Financial Prosecutor's Office, the UK Serious Fraud Office (SFO) and the US Department of Justice to resolve investigations into allegations of corruption of foreign public officials. Further to these agreements – the largest ever entered into by the PNF and the SFO – the manufacturer paid a total of approximately €3.6 billion plus interest and costs to the French, UK and US authorities to avoid prosecution. It is to be noted that in the course of this international cooperation, the PNF took particular care to fully comply with the French blocking statutes when sharing documents and information with the DOJ and the SFO. On 17 November 2022, the same company concluded a new public interest judicial convention (CJIP) with respect to wrongdoings that had been committed at the same time that the others, but which were investigated in a distinct judicial investigation. The company agreed to pay a €15.8 million public interest fine in this second CJIP.

On 26 February 2021, a CJIP was concluded with a major French multinational transport and logistics company in order to resolve investigations into allegations of corruption of foreign public officials in Togo, and resulted in the payment of €12 million to settle the case. The directors of the company had agreed to enter into an appearance on prior recognition of guilt (CRPC). Surprisingly, the Court refused to approve the said CRPC on the grounds that the seriousness of the facts justified a referral to the Criminal Court.

On 7 July 2022, the President of the Paris Court validated two CJIPs concluded by the National Financial Prosecutor's Office and two French companies regarding the offence of bribery of foreign officials. The CJIP concluded on 9 June 2022 followed a preliminary investigation involving executives of a French engineering conglomerate charged with bribery of public officials to obtain contracts with a major Angolan state-owned company operating in the oil industry. The company committed to pay a public interest fine of €3.5 million. The CJIP concluded on 20 June 2022 followed a preliminary investigation on alleged bribes estimated at €6 million that would have been paid by the company at the request of its local subcontractor to corrupt a government official in the framework of a project designed to establish a new national identification system in Bangladesh. The company committed to pay a public interest fine of nearly €8 million.

Law stated - 31 December 2022

FINANCIAL RECORD-KEEPING AND REPORTING

Laws and regulations

What legal rules require accurate corporate books and records, effective internal company controls, periodic financial statements or external auditing?

Most companies must provide the court registry with annual accounts, an annual report and an auditors' report on their annual accounts. Furthermore, listed companies are required to publish several financial information reports punctually

on a quarterly basis.

It is an offence for the chairs, directors or executive officers of a limited company as well as for the managers of a limited liability company to publish or present to shareholders annual financial statements that do not provide, for each financial year, an accurate view of the results of the company's operations during the financial year or of its financial position and assets at the end of such period (articles L241-3 and L242-6 of the Commercial Code).

Listed companies may also be prosecuted before the French Financial Markets Authority (AMF) if they disclose financial information that is false, inaccurate or deceptive (article 223-1 of the AMF General Regulation).

Law stated - 31 December 2022

Disclosure of violations or irregularities

To what extent must companies disclose violations of anti-bribery laws or associated accounting irregularities?

Pursuant to article 40 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, all public officials and civil servants, including the French Anti-Corruption Agency (AFA), who, in the performance of their duties, become aware of a felony or misdemeanour have to inform the Public Prosecutor's Office and provide it with all information related thereto. Moreover, statutory auditors are required to report to the Public Prosecutor criminal acts of which they become aware (article L823-12 of the Commercial Code).

Subject to the above, there is no general duty for legal entities to disclose violation of anti-bribery laws, neither is there any incentive to do so, whereas such incentives exist for individuals and customs agents. In our view, the new settlement procedure introduced by the Sapin II Law is not a sufficient incentive for legal entities to disclose potential wrongdoings as the Public Prosecutor, regardless of the disclosure of the violation of anti-bribery laws and the cooperation of the legal entity, has entire discretion as regards the proposal of the conclusion of a public interest judicial convention and the amount of the public interest fine.

That being said, the Sapin II Law enhanced protection for whistle-blowers by creating:

- a general status for whistle-blowers, protecting them, when fulfilling certain conditions, from an extensive list of retaliatory measures, which has been broadened by Law No. 2022-401 of 21 March 2022 (article 10-1, III of the Sapin II Law);
- an obligation for public and private companies that employ at least 50 employees to adopt an internal whistle-blowing system; and
- a new specific protection for whistle-blowers in the financial sector (articles 6 to 16 of the Sapin II Law).

Law stated - 31 December 2022

Prosecution under financial record-keeping legislation

Are such laws used to prosecute domestic or foreign bribery?

Corruption offences generally lead legal entities to use accounting stratagems, notably using fake invoices, to conceal benefits unlawfully obtained or sums unlawfully paid in their financial statements. As a consequence, the financial statements do not accurately reflect the company's results. In theory, they can be prosecuted on these grounds.

However, in practice, officers charged for corruption acts will essentially also be prosecuted on the grounds of misuse of corporate assets (article L242-6 of the Commercial Code) as use of company funds and assets for illicit purposes is necessarily inconsistent with the corporate interest (Court of Cassation, Criminal Chamber, 19 September 2007, No.

07-80.533).

Law stated - 31 December 2022

Sanctions for accounting violations

What are the sanctions for violations of the accounting rules associated with the payment of bribes?

For the offences provided by articles L241-3 and L242-6 of the Commercial Code, individuals may be punishable by up to five years' imprisonment and a fine of up to €375,000, as well as supplemental penalties (articles L242-6, L243-30 and L249-1 of the Commercial Code), whereas legal entities risk a fine of up to €1.88 million (article 131-38 of the Penal Code).

Before the AMF, legal entities as well as their executives held liable for dissemination of false information may face a financial penalty of up to €100 million, or of an amount equal to up to 10 times the gains generated (article 621-15 of the Financial and Monetary Code).

Law stated - 31 December 2022

Tax-deductibility of domestic or foreign bribes

Do your country's tax laws prohibit the deductibility of domestic or foreign bribes?

It goes without saying that bribes are not deductible from taxable income under French law. The General Tax Code expressly provides that sums paid or benefits granted, directly or indirectly, to a public official or a third party to induce or reward such official to act or refrain from acting in the performance of his or her official duties so as to obtain or retain a contract or other improper advantage in international commercial transactions, are not deductible.

In a recent case in which a French company had paid US\$140 million to the US authorities, the state council stated that if the offence of bribery is committed by an employee of a legal entity, the culpable intent of the legal entity is not needed for adding back into its taxable income the amounts paid (state council, 4 February 2015, No. 364,708).

Law stated - 31 December 2022

DOMESTIC BRIBERY

Legal framework

Describe the individual elements of the law prohibiting bribery of a domestic public official.

The required elements of the law prohibiting bribery of a domestic public official are the same as those for bribery of a foreign public official.

Law stated - 31 December 2022

Scope of prohibitions

Does the law prohibit both the paying and receiving of a bribe?

Both the paying and the receiving of a bribe are prohibited under French law, the former being considered active bribery whereas the latter is considered passive bribery.

Moreover, the mere fact of making a proposal or accepting a request for an advantage suffices for the commission of the offence of active bribery and the mere fact of requesting or accepting a proposed advantage suffices for the commission of the offence of passive bribery.

Law stated - 31 December 2022

Definition of a domestic public official

How does your law define a domestic public official, and does that definition include employees of state-owned or state-controlled companies?

Similarly to bribery of foreign public officials, French law is very broad and applies to all persons who:

- hold public authority;
- have a public service mission; or
- hold a public elected office.

French criminal law also prohibits bribery of judicial staff, which includes judges, court clerks, experts, mediators and arbitrators.

Law stated - 31 December 2022

Gifts, travel and entertainment

Describe any restrictions on providing domestic officials with gifts, travel expenses, meals or entertainment. Do the restrictions apply to both the providing and the receiving of such benefits?

Both the paying and the receiving of a bribe are prohibited under French law, the former being considered active bribery whereas the latter is considered passive bribery. Pursuant to the French Anti-Corruption Agency's (AFA) recommendations, gifts, accommodations, entertainment, customer travel, donations, sponsorships and facilitation payments are identified as major risks of bribery. According to the case law, bribes may consist of a non-cash benefit or a service.

On 15 September 2022, the AFA released a guide entitled 'Public officials: the risks of breaches of probity concerning gifts and invitations', providing guidance to help public players and officials to identify the risk scenarios to which they may be exposed when accepting gifts and entertainment, and to protect themselves against them by defining a set of appropriate rules.

Law stated - 31 December 2022

Facilitating payments

Have the domestic bribery laws been enforced with respect to facilitating or 'grease' payments?

Facilitation payments are not a defence under French law and individuals and legal entities may be sentenced even if the amounts at stake are small.

Law stated - 31 December 2022

Public official participation in commercial activities

What are the restrictions on a domestic public official participating in commercial activities while in office?

A domestic public official who takes, receives or retains, directly or indirectly, any interest in an undertaking or in a transaction for which he or she is, at the time of the act, wholly or partly responsible for ensuring the supervision, administration, liquidation or payment is criminally responsible and may be punished by imprisonment of up to five years and a fine of up to €500,000, which may be increased to double the proceeds generated by the offence (article 432-12 of the Penal Code).

Law stated - 31 December 2022

Payments through intermediaries or third parties

In what circumstances do the laws prohibit payments through intermediaries or third parties to domestic public officials?

Unlawful payments are prohibited whether they are made directly or indirectly. Therefore, criminal liability is incurred even if the payments are carried out through intermediaries or third parties, should the perpetrator have knowledge that such intermediary or third party used the same payments to pay bribes. Such an intermediary or third party may also be prosecuted, as the principal perpetrator of the offence or as an accomplice.

Law stated - 31 December 2022

Individual and corporate liability

Can both individuals and companies be held liable for violating the domestic bribery rules?

Prior to the enactment of Law No. 2004-204 of 9 March 2004, adapting the justice system to changes in criminal behaviour, a specific provision was required to extend criminal liability to legal entities for a given offence. Since then, legal entities may be held liable in the same way as individuals for all criminal offences, including corruption ones, even if not expressly provided by law.

That being said, legal entities are criminally liable only for offences committed 'on their behalf' by their 'corporate bodies or representatives' (article 121-2 of the Penal Code). Legal entities' prosecution does not preclude individuals from also being prosecuted as perpetrators or accomplices where appropriate, at the discretion of the Public Prosecutor.

Law stated - 31 December 2022

Private commercial bribery

To what extent does your country's domestic anti-bribery law also prohibit private commercial bribery?

Active and passive bribery of private individuals by other individuals is punishable by a five-year term of imprisonment and a fine of €500,000, which may be increased to double the proceeds generated by the offence (articles 445-1 and 445-2 of the Penal Code), as well as ancillary penalties (article 445-3 of the Penal Code), whereas legal entities are

liable for a fine of €2.5 million, which may be increased to double the proceeds generated by the offence, as well as ancillary penalties (article 445-4 of the Penal Code).

Law stated - 31 December 2022

Defences

What defences and exemptions are available to those accused of domestic bribery violations?

French law does not provide for any specific defence. In this respect, the fact of a company having set up a very strong compliance programme that goes beyond legal requirements would not prevent the company from being prosecuted or convicted for foreign bribery.

A bill to strengthen the fight against corruption was submitted to the French National Assembly in October 2021. While this bill provides for the creation of a mechanism similar to the Anglo-Saxon 'failure to prevent bribery', it does not provide for a defence in the event that the compliance mechanisms put in place by the company are robust.

Law stated - 31 December 2022

Agency enforcement

What government agencies enforce the domestic bribery laws and regulations?

The Sapin II Law led to the creation of the AFA, the main duty of which is to monitor that certain legal entities (French companies that employ at least 500 employees and have an annual turnover or consolidated turnover of at least €100 million, as well as companies that belong to a group that employs at least 500 employees, and whose parent company is headquartered in France and have an annual turnover or consolidated annual turnover of at least €100 million) implement programmes to prevent and detect acts of corruption and influence-peddling. This authority has been empowered to refer cases to its Enforcement Committee to prosecute and punish non-compliant legal entities. Legal entities that do not fulfil this obligation may be punished by a financial penalty up to €1 million, whereas individuals may face a financial penalty up to €200,000 (article 17 of the Sapin II Law).

To that purpose, the AFA agents may order the production of any document, as well as any helpful information, and to keep a copy thereof (article 4 of the Sapin II Law). They may also verify such information on the spot.

Thus, the AFA has jurisdiction only regarding French companies and their domestic and foreign subsidiaries, which explains why its president, Charles Duchaine, a former investigating magistrate, is promoting the expansion of the AFA's jurisdiction over foreign legal entities.

In addition, other administrative bodies have been created, dealing with tasks that may relate to corruption issues. An agency for the Management and Recovery of Seized and Confiscated Assets in criminal matters (AGRASC) was created by Law No. 2010-768 of 9 July 2010. AGRASC is notably in charge of the recovery of assets seized in the course of criminal proceedings and of the conduct of pre-judgment sales of confiscated assets when they are no longer needed as evidence or if they may lose value. Tracfin, an agency charged with dealing with and taking action against illegal financial circuits, is the sole centre for collecting suspicion reports made by regulated professions subject to the anti-money laundering measures. It notably receives all suspicion reports that may concern acts of corruption.

These agencies, as well as the High Authority for Transparency in Public Life and the Public Finance General Directorate, play a key role in detecting offences, in particular bribery offences. They deal with the Public Prosecutor's Office, which gives instructions to the enquiry services and ensures they cooperate fully.

Law stated - 31 December 2022

Patterns in enforcement

Describe any recent shifts in the patterns of enforcement of the domestic bribery rules.

The OECD was particularly critical towards France in its 2012 Phase 3 Report on Implementing the OECD Convention in France. Although the OECD softened its tone in its Follow-up to the Phase 3 Report and Recommendations, December 2014, it pointed out that 'France [was] insufficiently in compliance with the Anti-Bribery Convention'.

However, the French legal framework has been considerably enhanced, especially with the adoption of the Sapin II Law. Most observers agree that it constitutes progress in the prevention, detection and repression of breaches of probity, including bribery of foreign officials.

Law No. 2013-1117 of 6 December 2013 extended the scope of extraordinary measures (such as surveillance, infiltration, wiretapping, recording conversations and filming certain vehicles or premises) to corruption offences (article 706-1-1 of the Code of Criminal Procedure). The creation of a specialised National Financial Prosecutor also helps to effectively combat bribery.

Furthermore, the judgments issued in 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020 and 2021 in cases involving breaches of the duty of probity suggest that French courts are increasingly severe as regards sanctions imposed, with higher fines and more recourse to non-suspended prison sentences.

The 2021 AFA report, published on 20 May 2022, has shown that prosecutors handled 834 proceedings relating to probity offences in 2020 – an increase of 15.5 per cent from 2014 – which led to 359 sentencing decisions against individuals (among which 33.4 per cent were convictions for bribery and 10.6 per cent for influence-peddling) and four convictions for legal entities. Moreover, it is important to highlight that the rate of acquittals is particularly high for probity offences: 22.7 per cent, which is three times higher than the rate of acquittals for all litigation cases combined (excluding road traffic litigation) in the same year. Also, in 2020, 32 per cent of decisions related to probity offences were appealed, which corresponds to a rate almost five times higher than the appeal rate (7 per cent) observed for all types of litigation (excluding road traffic litigation).

Law stated - 31 December 2022

Prosecution of foreign companies

In what circumstances can foreign companies be prosecuted for domestic bribery?

As a general rule, a criminal procedure may be initiated in France against the perpetrator of an offence if French law is applicable, which is the case if:

- the offence is committed in France (article 113-2 of the Penal Code);
- any of the constituent elements of the offence are committed in France (article 113-2 of the Penal Code);
- the perpetrator of the offence is French and a similar offence exists in the country in which such an offence is committed (article 113-6 of the Penal Code);
- the victim is French (article 113-7 of the Penal Code); or
- an international convention designates the French courts as having jurisdiction (articles 689, 689-1 and 689-8 of the Code of Criminal Procedure).

Thus, foreign companies may be prosecuted if the offence, or one of its constituent elements, is committed in France or if the victim is French.

Sanctions

What are the sanctions for individuals and companies that violate the domestic bribery rules?

Individuals who commit the offences of active and passive bribery of domestic public officials and judicial staff may be imprisoned for a term of up to 10 years, as well as be ordered to pay a fine of up to €1 million. The fine may be increased to double the proceeds generated by the offence (articles 433-1-1°, 432-11-1°, 434-9 of the Penal Code). From 20 September 2019, individuals who commit any such offences that affect the revenue collected or the expenditure incurred by any institution or office of the European Union and who are in an organised gang may be ordered to pay a fine of up to €2 million.

Ancillary penalties may also be imposed, such as prohibition from holding public office, from engaging in the professional or social activity in the performance of which, or in connection with the performance of which, the offence was committed, for a period of up to five years, or from directing, administering, managing or controlling a company in any capacity, permanently or for a period of up to 15 years.

Lastly, publication of the judgment may be ordered and the item that was used or was intended to be used to commit the offence, or any item that is a proceed of the offence, may be confiscated (articles 433-22, 433-23, 432-17, 434-44 of the Penal Code).

Legal entities are liable for a fine of up to €5 million, which may be increased to double the proceeds generated by the offence, and ancillary penalties (articles 433-25 and 434-47 of the Penal Code).

Law stated - 31 December 2022

Recent decisions and investigations

Identify and summarise recent landmark decisions and investigations involving domestic bribery laws, including any investigations or decisions involving foreign companies.

Recent cases show the determination of judicial authorities to punish domestic bribery.

For example, on 12 June 2018, the Paris Court of Appeal sentenced the former director of Lyon's judicial police, on the grounds notably of passive bribery and influence-peddling, to four years' imprisonment (18 months of which is suspended) and to a permanent ban on practising in police ranks (Paris Court of Appeal, 12 June 2018; this decision has, to our knowledge, become final).

In addition, two French companies concluded with the National Prosecutor, respectively on 14 and 15 February 2018, public judicial interest conventions in relation to domestic bribery acts. They agreed to pay a public interest fine of €2.7 million and €800,000, respectively, as well as implement a compliance programme within, respectively, an 18-month and two-year period under the AFA's supervision. Each of them also agreed to pay €30,000 for compensation of the damages undergone by a third company. In this case, the two French companies were found to have corrupted one employee of a third company, by offering the latter trips and payment of expenses to conclude and maintain commercial contracts with the company. Both convictions were validated by the High Court of Nanterre on 23 February 2018.

In April 2019, the French Court of Cassation confirmed the conviction of a sub-prefect to three years' imprisonment, a fine of €20,000 and the definitive prohibition from performing any public function. The Court considered that the individual concerned had intervened with a municipality and the Prefect to have a case investigated more quickly in favour of a real estate promotor. The corruption pact was established by the obtaining of the Prefect's favourable

opinion and the payment made into her husband's account of €200,000 (Court of Cassation, 3 April 2019, No. 17-87.209).

On 18 October 2019, a French politician accused of passive bribery in connection with his mandate as mayor of a Parisian suburban city, and a promotor accused of active bribery in relation to a real estate project in the same city, were both acquitted. The Paris High Court judged that there was insufficient evidence of neither the existence of a corruption pact nor the obtaining of undue advantages by the mayor. However, the Court has sentenced the latter to five years' imprisonment as well as 10 years of ineligibility for aggravated laundering of tax fraud. On 13 September 2019, he had been sentenced by the same court to four years' imprisonment as well as 10 years of ineligibility for tax fraud. In both cases, the Court ordered the immediate imprisonment of the mayor, which shows the increasing severity of French judges in cases involving breaches of the duty of probity. Both sentences were confirmed by the Paris Court of Appeal, respectively on 4 March 2020 and 27 May 2020. The Court of Cassation confirmed his guilt on 30 June 2021 (Court of Cassation, 30 June 2021, No 20-83.355).

On 2 March 2021, a French former President was found guilty of corruption and influence-peddling, and sentenced to three years in prison, two of them suspended. He is the first former French president to be sentenced to a custodial sentence. He has appealed, which leaves him still presumed innocent.

In a decision handed down on 21 January 2022 by the 32nd Chamber of the Paris High Court, four individuals belonging to the same former French President's inner circle were convicted of favouritism, misappropriation of public funds, complicity and concealment of these offences. This judgment followed an investigation relating to the alleged irregularity of public contracts concluded between the Presidency of the French Republic and several polling firms, in violation of the rules of the Public Procurement Code. While four out of six defendants were convicted in this case, the former French President was never involved as he remained covered by presidential immunity guaranteed by the French Constitution. However, he was summoned to appear as a witness during a hearing, where he refused to answer questions from the Court's President.

On 7 September 2022, the President of the French Rugby Federation was charged before the 32nd Chamber of the Paris High Court with passive bribery and influence-peddling offences. The Public Prosecutors requested against the two defendants a three-year imprisonment penalty, including one non-suspended year, and fines amounting to €50,000 against the French Rugby Federation President and €200,000 against his co-defendant. The judgment will be rendered on 13 December 2022.

On 8 November 2022, three former prisoners of the Fresnes prison were on trial before the Créteil High Court for bribery of a public official, the former prison director, prosecuted for passive bribery. The Prosecutor requested against the public official a four-year imprisonment penalty. The judgment will be rendered on 11 January 2023.

Law stated - 31 December 2022

UPDATE AND TRENDS

Key developments of the past year

Please highlight any recent significant events or trends related to your national anti-corruption laws.

The corruption scandals in France do not overshadow its willingness to strengthen its legislative arsenal to fight corruption, as noted by the OECD in its Phase 4 report.

The bill tabled on 19 October 2021 marks this desire to strengthen the fight against corruption by:

- extending the scope of article 17 to small subsidiaries of large foreign groups;
- transferring the tasks of advising and controlling public actors to the High Authority for Transparency in Public

Life (HATVP), which would be given a sanctions committee;

- tightening up the conditions for referring cases to the French Anti-Corruption Agency's sanctions committee by requiring a prior formal notice;
- supervising internal investigations that are also subject to criminal proceedings;
- guaranteeing access to the criminal file in the context of the negotiation of a public interest judicial convention (CJIP); and
- strengthening obligations in the area of lobbying, in particular by increasing the frequency of declarations and penalties for non-compliance with these obligations.

The Wasserman Law No. 2022-041 of 21 March 2022 is in line with this desire, strengthening the protection of whistleblowers, defused by the Sapin II Law.

Firstly, Law No. 2022-401 has reorganised the reporting process. A whistleblower is no longer obliged to make a priority report within his or her organisation but may choose to do so either internally to the line manager, employer or any designated adviser, or externally to an administrative, judicial or professional authority (article 8, II of the Sapin II Law).

Secondly, to facilitate reports, Law No. 2022-401 improved whistle-blowers' protection by extending the list of prohibited retaliation measures such as intimidation, and damage to reputation, especially on social networks (article 10-1, III of the Sapin II Law).

The non-liability of whistleblowers who report was also extended. They cannot be held liable for the damage caused by their good faith report, nor criminally liable for having intercepted and taken away confidential documents containing information to which they had lawful access (article 10-1 of the Sapin II Law).

On 3 October 2022, France issued Decree No. 2022-1284 governing procedures for collecting and processing whistleblowers' reports, which provides guidance on the application of Law No. 2022-401 to companies of more than 50 employees, state administrations and municipalities of over 10,000 inhabitants, which are under an obligation to set up appropriate alert-management procedures to escalate reports from members of their personnel or external staff (article 8 of the Sapin II Law).

However, these recent advances are undermined by structural resource problems throughout the criminal justice system. However, here again, France wants to correct these problems to make the fight against corruption more effective.

Recently, Law No. 2021-1729 of 22 December 2021 for confidence in the judicial institution regulated the time limits for preliminary investigations, which are now limited to two years for ordinary cases. An extension of one year can be authorised by the Public Prosecutor. Nonetheless, these time limits may be suspended, in particular in the event of a request for international judicial assistance.

More recently, in a case where the Court of Appeal had invalidated the prosecution of individuals for bribery, considering that the reasonable time limit had not been respected and that the right to a fair trial, the adversarial principle and the balance of the rights of the parties had been infringed, the Court of Cassation, in its most solemn session, ruled on 9 November 2022 that the excessive length of a procedure cannot lead to its invalidation when each of the acts of the procedure is regular (Court of Cassation, 9 November 2022, No. 21-85.655).

Law stated - 31 December 2022

Jurisdictions

	Australia	Holding Redlich
	China	Herbert Smith Freehills LLP
	France	Bougartchev Moyne Associés AARPI
	Greece	ANAGNOSTOPOULOS
	Hong Kong	Herbert Smith Freehills LLP
	Israel	Herzog Fox & Neeman
	Italy	Studio Legale Pisano
	Japan	Anderson Mōri & Tomotsune
	Netherlands	Sjöcrona Van Stigt
	Russia	Noerr PartGmbH
	Singapore	Eugene Thuraisingam LLP
	Sweden	NORDIA LAW
	Switzerland	Schellenberg Wittmer
	Ukraine	GOLAW
	United Arab Emirates	Charles Russell Speechlys
	United Kingdom	White & Case
	USA	Miller & Chevalier Chartered