

Anti-Corruption Regulation

in 44 jurisdictions worldwide

2014

Contributing editor: Homer E Moyer Jr



Published by
Getting the Deal Through
in association with:

Advokatfirman Delphi
Afridi & Angell
Anagnostopoulos Criminal Law & Litigation
Anderson Mōri & Tomotsune
Andreas Neocleous & Co LLC
Angara Abello Concepcion Regala & Cruz Law Offices (ACCRALAW)
Assertia Pty Ltd
AZB & Partners
BDO AS
Bennett Jones LLP
BON, Advocates
Dr Kai Hart-Hönig Rechtsanwälte
ELIG Attorneys-at-Law
Goussanem & Aloui Law Firm
Governance Latam - Guillermo Jorge, Fernando Basch & Asociados
Greenberg Traurig SC
Hoet Peláez Castillo & Duque
Horn & Co Law Offices
Ivanyan & Partners
K&L Gates LLP
Kensington Swan
Kim & Chang
Kruk and Partners Law Firm
Lampert & Schächle Attorneys at Law Ltd
Lebray & Associés
Mamić Perić Reberski Rimac
Matheson
Mboya Wangong'u & Waiyaki Advocates
Miller & Chevalier Chartered
Moalem Weitemeyer Bendtsen Law Firm
Ndikum Law Offices
Norton Rose Fulbright (Asia) LLP
OECD
Oliva-Ayala Abogados
Orihuela Abogados | Attorneys at Law
Paz Horowitz Robalino Garcés
Peters & Peters
Plesner Law Firm
PLMJ – Sociedade de Advogados, RL
Schellenberg Wittmer Ltd
Sedgwick Chudleigh Ltd
Sofunde, Osakwe, Ogundipe & Belgore
Studio Legale Pisano
The Law Firm of Salah Al-Hejailan
Transparency International
Vasil Kisisl & Partners
Veirano Advogados

Anti-Corruption Regulation 2014

Contributing editor:
Homer E Moyer Jr
Miller & Chevalier Chartered

Getting the Deal Through is delighted to publish the eighth edition of *Anti-Corruption Regulation*, a volume in our series of annual reports that provide international analysis in key areas of law and policy for corporate counsel, cross-border legal practitioners and business people.

Following the format adopted throughout the series, the same key questions are answered by leading practitioners in each of the 44 jurisdictions featured. New jurisdictions this year include Algeria, Bermuda, Cameroon, Denmark, Ecuador, Malaysia, Peru and Portugal. There is also a new chapter on asset recovery, in addition to a global overview and the perspectives of Transparency International and the OECD.

Every effort has been made to ensure that matters of concern to readers are covered. However, specific legal advice should always be sought from experienced local advisers. *Getting the Deal Through* publications are updated annually in print. Please ensure you are referring to the latest print edition or to the online version at www.GettingTheDealThrough.com.

Getting the Deal Through gratefully acknowledges the efforts of all the contributors to this volume, who were chosen for their recognised expertise. We would also like to extend special thanks to contributing editor Homer E Moyer Jr of Miller & Chevalier Chartered for his continued assistance with this volume.

Getting the Deal Through

London
 February 2014

Global Overview	3	Canada	52
Homer E Moyer Jr Miller & Chevalier Chartered		Milos Barutciski Bennett Jones LLP	
Anti-corruption: progress on enforcement	9	China	59
Monty Raphael QC Transparency International UK		Amy L Sommers and Cecilia Dai K&L Gates LLP	
Fifteen years of the OECD Anti-Bribery Convention	10	Croatia	67
Nicola Bonucci and Leah Ambler OECD		Natalija Perić Mamić Perić Reberski Rimac	
Asset recovery: an essential tool in the fight against corruption	12	Cyprus	71
Stéphane Bonifassi Lebray & Associés		Panayiotis Neocleous and Costas Stamatiou Andreas Neocleous & Co LLC	
Algeria	14	Denmark	76
Khaled Goussanem and Salima Aloui Goussanem & Aloui Law Firm		Andreas Bernhard Kirk and Christian Bredtoft Guldmann Plesner Law Firm and Moalem Weitemeyer Bendtsen Law Firm	
Argentina	18	Ecuador	82
Fernando Basch and Guillermo Jorge Governance Latam · Guillermo Jorge, Fernando Basch & Asociados		Bruce Horowitz Paz Horowitz Robalino Garcés	
Australia	25	France	86
Jane Ellis and Rob Smith Assertia Pty Ltd		Stéphane Bonifassi Lebray & Associés	
Bermuda	33	Germany	91
Alex Potts and Chen Foley Sedgwick Chudleigh Ltd		Kai Hart-Hönig Dr Kai Hart-Hönig Rechtsanwälte	
Brazil	41	Greece	96
Luiz Navarro Veirano Advogados		Ilias G Anagnostopoulos and Jerina (Gerasimoula) Zapanti Anagnostopoulos Criminal Law & Litigation	
Cameroon	46	India	101
Philip Forsang Ndikum Ndikum Law Offices		Aditya Vikram Bhat and Richa Roy AZB & Partners	

Publisher

Gideon Robertson
gideon.roberton@lbresearch.com

Subscriptions

Rachel Nurse
subscriptions@gettingthedealthrough.com

Business development managers

George Ingledew
george.ingledew@lbresearch.com

Alan Lee
alan.lee@lbresearch.com


Dan White
dan.white@lbresearch.com



Published by
Law Business Research Ltd
 87 Lancaster Road
 London W11 1QQ, UK
 Tel: +44 20 7908 1188
 Fax: +44 20 7229 6910
 © Law Business Research Ltd 2014
 No photocopying: copyright licences do not apply.
 First published 2007
 Eighth edition 2014
 ISSN 1754-4874

The information provided in this publication is general and may not apply in a specific situation. Legal advice should always be sought before taking any legal action based on the information provided. This information is not intended to create, nor does receipt of it constitute, a lawyer-client relationship. The publishers and authors accept no responsibility for any acts or omissions contained herein. Although the information provided is accurate as of February 2014, be advised that this is a developing area.

Printed and distributed by
 Encompass Print Solutions
 Tel: 0844 2480 112



CONTENTS

Ireland	110	Norway	172	Switzerland	231
Carina Lawlor and Bríd Munnelly Matheson		Erling Grimstad BDO AS		Peter Burckhardt, Paul Gully-Hart and Roland Ryser Schellenberg Wittmer Ltd	
Israel	117	Peru	177	Turkey	238
Yuval Horn, Ohad Mamann and Alon Harel Horn & Co Law Offices		Sandra Orihuela Orihuela Abogados Attorneys at Law		Gönenç Gürkaynak and Ç Olgı Kama ELIG Attorneys-at-Law	
Italy	122	Philippines	182	Ukraine	245
Roberto Pisano Studio Legale Pisano		Francisco Ed Lim and Chryssilla Carissa P Bautista Angara Abello Concepcion Regala & Cruz Law Offices (ACCRALAW)		Yaroslav Teklyuk, Viacheslav Pieskov and Valeriia Tryfonova Vasil Kisil & Partners	
Japan	129	Poland	188	United Arab Emirates	252
Kenichi Sadaka and Kei Akagawa Anderson Mōri & Tomotsune		Jarosław Kruk and Aleksandra Matwiejko-Demusiak Kruk and Partners Law Firm		Charles Laubach Afridi & Angell	
Kenya	135	Portugal	194	United Kingdom	259
Godwin Wangong’u and CG Mbugua Mboya Wangong’u & Waiyaki Advocates		Alexandra Mota Gomes and Dirce Rente PLMJ – Sociedade de Advogados, RL		Monty Raphael QC Peters & Peters	
Korea	141	Russia	202	United States	274
Kyungsun Kyle Choi and Liz Kyo-Hwa Chung Kim & Chang		Vasily Torkanovskiy Ivanyan & Partners		Homer E Moyer Jr, James G Tillen, Marc Alain Bohn and Amelia Hairston-Porter Miller & Chevalier Chartered	
Liechtenstein	146	Saudi Arabia	209	Venezuela	282
Siegbert Lampert and Rudolf Schächle Lampert & Schächle Attorneys at Law Ltd		Robert Thoms and Sultan Al-Hejailan The Law Firm of Salah Al-Hejailan		Fernando Peláez-Pier and Gerardo Briceño Hoet Peláez Castillo & Duque	
Malaysia	151	Singapore	212	Appendix: Corruption Perceptions Index Transparency International	287
Edmund Bon and New Sin Yew BON, Advocates		Wilson Ang Norton Rose Fulbright (Asia) LLP			
Mexico	156	Spain	220		
Luis Rubio Barnetche, Bertha Alicia Ordaz-Avilés and Héctor Cuevas González Greenberg Traurig SC		Laura Martínez-Sanz and Jaime González Gugel Oliva-Ayala Abogados			
New Zealand	161	Sweden	224		
Hayden Wilson Kensington Swan		Olof Rågmark and Sofia Karlsson Advokatfirman Delphi			
Nigeria	168				
Babajide O Ogundipe and Chukwuma Ezediaro Sofunde, Osakwe, Ogundipe & Belgore					

Turkey

Gönenç Gürkaynak and Ç Olgu Kama

ELIG Attorneys-at-Law

1 International anti-corruption conventions

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

Turkey is a signatory to or has ratified the following European and international anti-corruption conventions.

Council of Europe

- Council of Europe Criminal Law Convention on Corruption of 27 January 1999 (signed 27 September 2001; ratified 29 March 2004);
- Council of Europe Civil Law Convention on Corruption of 4 November 1999 (signed 27 September 2001; ratified 17 September 2003); and
- Council of Europe Convention on Laundering, Search, Seizure and Confiscation of the Proceeds from Crime and on the Financing of Terrorism of 8 November 1990 (signed 28 March 2007).

International

- OECD Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions, 17 December 1997 (including OECD Recommendation for Further Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions) (signed 17 December 1997; ratified 26 July 2000);
- the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, 15 November 2000 (signed 13 December 2000; ratified 25 March 2003); and
- the United Nations Convention against Corruption, 31 October 2003 (signed 10 December 2003; ratified 9 November 2006).

In addition to multilateral treaties, Turkey has also been a member of the Group of States against Corruption (GRECO) since 1 January 2004, the Financial Action Task Force since 1991 and the OECD Working Group on Bribery.

2 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).

The main legislation applying to acts of corruption is the Turkish Criminal Code No. 5237 (Criminal Code), which entered into force on 1 June 2005 and which prohibits bribery, malversation, malfeasance, embezzlement and other forms of corruption such as negligence of supervisory duty, unauthorised disclosure of office secrets, fraudulent schemes to obtain illegal benefits, etc.

Apart from the Criminal Code, the core statutory basis of Turkish anti-corruption legislation can briefly be summarised and categorised as follows:

- Turkish Criminal Procedure Law No. 5271;
- Law No. 657 on Public Officers;

- Law No. 3628 on Declaration of Property and Fight Against Bribery and Corruption;
- Regulation No. 90/748 on Declaration of Property (Regulation No. 90/748);
- Regulation on Ethical Principles for Public Officers and Procedures and Principles for Application (published in the Official Gazette No. 25785 of 13 April 2005) (Regulation on Ethical Principles).

Foreign bribery

3 Legal framework

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

Prior to 2003, bribing foreign public officials was not considered a crime in Turkish law. In 2003, Turkish Criminal Code No. 765 (the former Criminal Code) was amended so that offering, promising or giving advantages to foreign public officials or officials who perform a duty of an international nature, in order that the official 'act or refrain from acting or to obtain or retain business in the conduct of international business' was also considered bribery (Law No. 4782 on Amending Certain Laws for Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions). The provision regulating bribery in the Criminal Code (article 252) was amended in July 2012 so as to broaden the scope of this amendment. The provision now provides that bribery is committed if a benefit is provided, offered or promised directly or via intermediaries, or if the respective individuals request or accept such benefit directly or via intermediaries (both of which would be in relation to the execution of that individual's duty to perform or not to perform) (article 252(9), Criminal Code):

- in order to obtain or preserve a task or an illegal benefit due to international commercial transactions to public officials who have been elected or appointed in a foreign country;
- judges, jury members or other officials who work at international or supranational courts or foreign state courts;
- members of the international or supranational parliaments; individuals who carry out a public duty for a foreign country, including public institutions or public enterprises;
- a citizen or foreign arbitrators who have been entrusted with a task within the arbitration procedure resorted to in order to resolve a legal dispute; and
- officials or representatives working at international or supranational organisations that have been established based on an international agreement.

If bribery of foreign public officials is committed abroad by a foreigner, and if this type of bribery is committed in order to perform or not to perform an activity in relation to a dispute to which Turkey, a public institution in Turkey, a private legal person incorporated pursuant to Turkish laws or a Turkish citizen is a party to, or in

relation to an authority or individuals, then an ex officio investigation and prosecution will be conducted into those individuals:

- who provide, offer or promise to bribe;
- who accept, request, or agree to the offer or promise for the bribe;
- who mediate such; and
- to whom a benefit is provided due to this relationship.

This is contingent on these individuals being present in Turkey (article 252(19), Criminal Code).

Additionally, Law No. 4782 on Amending Certain Laws for Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions (Law No. 4782), which was enacted on 2 January 2003, provides that:

to offer, promise or give any of the advantages stated in paragraph 1 above, whether directly or through intermediaries, to the selected or appointed officials or officers of the foreign public authorities and institutions that perform a legislative or administrative or judicial duty, or the officials who perform a duty of an international nature, in order that such official or officer act or refrain from acting or to obtain or retain business in the conduct of international business shall also constitute the crime of bribery.

While this law amended provisions that were stipulated in the former Turkish Criminal Code, which was abrogated with the enactment of the current applicable Criminal Code (Law No. 5252 on the Enforcement and Application Method of the Turkish Criminal Code) that makes it clear under article 3(1) that any reference that is made in the legislation to the provisions of the former Turkish Criminal Code that were abrogated are deemed to have been made to the corresponding provisions in the Criminal Code. Accordingly, prior to the foregoing amendment that was introduced with Law No. 4782, bribing foreign public officials was not considered a crime in Turkish law.

4 Definition of a foreign public official

How does your law define a foreign public official?

What must be understood by 'foreign public officials' is: 'officials or officers of a public authority or a public institution that carry out legislative or administrative or judicial work and who have been elected or appointed in a foreign country'. Similarly, those who conduct business that is of an international nature in a foreign country are also deemed to be 'foreign public officials'. The fact that these persons have been provided with a material benefit due to international commercial transactions for doing or not doing a job or in order to obtain an unjust benefit or retain such benefit is also considered to constitute bribery. In this respect, bribery is considered to have been committed when a material benefit or a promise is provided or made to a 'foreign public official' as a result of 'international commercial transactions'.

5 Travel and entertainment restrictions

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

Article 252 of the Criminal Code not only penalises the public official who receives a bribe (which could be in the form of gifts, travel expenses, meals or entertainment), but it also sanctions the individual who gives a bribe, irrespective of whether there is actually an agreement between them to enter into a bribe (article 252 (4), Criminal Code).

6 Facilitating payments

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

Unlike the anti-bribery provisions of the US Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, the relevant provisions of the Criminal Code clearly dictate the provisions of bribery and do not provide any exceptions regarding the facilitating payments. Facilitating payments, or grease payments, would constitute a crime in Turkey, even if they were to be done the way that is regulated as an exception under the US Foreign Corrupt Practices Act. To that end, compliance officers and in-house counsel would be well advised to hesitate in recognising a facilitating payment exception in Turkey.

7 Payments through intermediaries or third parties

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

As of July 2012, the Criminal Code sanctions an individual who acts as an intermediary for conveying the offer or the request to bribe to another party for accommodating the bribery agreement or for providing bribery (article 252 (5), Criminal Code).

8 Individual and corporate liability

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

While the Criminal Code allows for penalties to be sanctioned on real persons who commit a crime or are engaged in the committing of any such crime (ie, the Criminal Code does not stipulate that a company, having a legal personality, is to be the subject of penalties for crimes that it is involved in committing), companies can be subject to certain security measures, as described in detail in question 14. On the other hand, Law No. 5326 on Misdemeanours (Law No. 5326) also regulates criminal liability of legal persons that arises from the behaviour of anybody or representative in case of a misdemeanour, which is defined as unfairness as a result of which a legal administrative sanction is imposed on the perpetrator (article 2, Law No. 5326). Pursuant to article 8 of Law No. 5326, in order for a legal person to be liable for another person's behaviour, the natural person who commits an act that constitutes a misdemeanour as per Law No. 5326 must be a representative of the respective legal person, or must undertake to perform an act within the field of operations of the legal person. In such a case, the legal person may be subject to an administrative sanction, as well as the natural person who commits the misdemeanour (the natural person who commits the misdemeanour and the legal person will be sanctioned separately).

Article 43/A of Law No. 5326 specifically states that an administrative fine of between 10,000 and 2 million Turkish liras may be imposed upon the legal person if a natural person, who is not a representative of a legal person, but who has undertaken a task that falls within the field of operations of the legal person, commits, inter alia, bribery, as per article 252 of the Criminal Code, for the benefit of the legal person.

Individual liability under the Criminal Code is subject to the general principle of the individuality of the penalties under Turkish law (article 20, Criminal Code). This means that the sanctions that are applicable to natural persons under the Turkish criminal law framework can only be imposed on individuals who have committed the crime, and not to anyone else (including the company who may be the employer of an employee committing a crime). While lacking criminal capacity, legal persons, as per article 20(2), may be subject to security measures (article 60, Criminal Code).

9 Civil and criminal enforcement

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

Turkish laws that regulate bribery are subject to criminal enforcement, as the primary legislation regulating bribery (more specifically foreign bribery) is the Criminal Code. Hence, civil enforcement is not observed in the Turkish legal framework for bribery and corruption.

10 Agency enforcement

What government agencies enforce the foreign bribery laws and regulations?

There is no particular government agency that is responsible for enforcing foreign bribery laws in Turkey. The judiciary has full powers to apply the provisions stipulated under the relevant laws, as described in question 2, in relation to bribery and corruption.

11 Leniency

Is there a mechanism for companies to disclose violations in exchange for lesser penalties?

Pursuant to the Criminal Code, a person who gives or receives a bribe, but then informs the investigating authorities about the bribe before the initiation of an investigation, shall not be punished for the crime of bribery (article 254(1) and article 254(2)). However, this rule shall not be applicable to the person who gives a bribe to foreign public officials (article 254(4)).

12 Dispute resolution

Can enforcement matters be resolved through plea agreements, settlement agreements, prosecutorial discretion or similar means without a trial?

Turkish criminal enforcement does not allow for any dispute resolution mechanism other than through a litigious approach.

13 Patterns in enforcement

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

Not applicable.

14 Prosecution of foreign companies

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

The general principle under Turkish criminal law is that penal sanctions cannot be imposed on legal entities (article 20 of the Turkish Criminal Law), save for the analyses provided under question 8. In other words, the provisions of the Turkish Criminal Code are applicable to legal persons who have committed a crime as stipulated under the Criminal Code in the Republic of Turkey.

If a bribe creates an unlawful benefit to a legal entity, the entity shall be punished through three measures: invalidation of the licence granted by a public authority; seizure of the goods which are used in the commitment of, or the result of, a crime by the representatives of a legal entity; and seizure of pecuniary benefits arising from or provided for the commitment of a crime (article 253).

The principle of territoriality, hence, is a natural outcome of the applicability of sanctions under the Turkish Criminal Law regime. The Criminal Code has adopted the principle of the place where the crime is committed when determining whether a crime has been committed in Turkey, and hence, whether the Turkish Criminal Code is applicable. According to this principle, if the behaviour and the result that constitute the material elements of a crime are realised in Turkey, the crime is deemed to have been committed in Turkey (article

8(1) of the Criminal Code). Consequently, foreign companies (where they are subject to the above measures) and their legal personal representatives will be subject to the provisions of the Criminal Code only in the event that they commit a crime in the Republic of Turkey.

15 Sanctions

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

As per the Turkish criminal law regime, only acts that are committed in Turkey or that are deemed to have been committed in Turkey, as described in question 14, are subject to sanctioning. Therefore acts that are punishable as per the principle of territoriality regime, that are committed by individuals and companies and that would constitute a crime pursuant to domestic bribery rules (ie, the Turkish Criminal Code) will also be subject to certain sanctions.

The penalties for acts of corruption under the Turkish Criminal Code can be summarised as follows:

- Fraud is punished by (article 157, Criminal Code) one to five years' imprisonment and up to 5,000 days of judicial monetary fine. Qualified fraud is punished by (article 158, Criminal Code) two to seven years' imprisonment and up to 5,000 days of judicial monetary fine. The judicial monetary fine can vary between 20 and 100 liras. The judge determines the rate of the fine depending on the individual's economic and other personal status. Generally, penalties for fraud can only be imposed on natural persons, as companies, as legal entities, do not attract criminal liability (article 20, Criminal Code).
- Bribery (articles 252 et seq) warrants imprisonment of four to 12 years for the incumbent government official and bribe-giver, and appropriate measures (such as confiscation of property, cancellation of licences, etc) against legal entities benefiting from bribery, subject to attenuating and aggravating circumstances as set forth in the Criminal Code. In addition to the foregoing, the length of potential imprisonment can be increased by one-third to one-half if the individual who receives a bribe or offers bribe or agrees to act as such conducts judicial duty, or is an arbitrator, expert, notary public, or sworn financial consultant (article 252(7), Criminal Code).
- Malversation (articles 250 et seq) warrants imprisonment from five to 10 years for the defendant government official, subject to attenuating and aggravating circumstances as set forth in the Criminal Code.
- Depending on the form of the specific act, malfeasance (articles 255, 257, 259, 260, 261 et seq) may warrant various penalties against the defendant government official.
- Embezzlement (articles 247 et seq) warrants imprisonment from five to 12 years for the defendant government official, subject to attenuating and aggravating circumstances as set forth in the Criminal Code.

16 Recent decisions and investigations

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

The following is an account of recent foreign bribery cases and investigations:

- Turkcell's board of directors initiated internal investigations on allegations of bribery in Kazakhstan by its subsidiary KCell and the subsidiary's supplier, Swedish company Ericsson.
- In December 2010, the German media reported allegations that the German state-owned HSH Nordbank made payments to Turkish judges in 2009 to influence an action for damages filed against it by a Turkish company. According to reports, the bribes allegedly were paid via the German security company Prevent. These allegations reportedly resulted from an audit carried out by KPMG.

- Siemens AG and its Turkish subsidiary Siemens Sanayi ve Ticaret AS paid a fine of US\$800 million to the SEC and the American Ministry of Justice and €395 million to the German Ministry of Justice for the bribes given in order to win international tenders in December 2008. These two companies have also been the subject of another investigation which was opened in early 2011 by the Turkish Prime Ministry Inspection Board. The Under-Secretariat of Foreign Trade has also reportedly initiated an investigation into the matter, which has turned into a prosecution.
- Daimler AG, the manufacturer of Mercedes, paid a fine of US\$93.6 million to the Ministry of Justice and US\$91.4 million to the SEC for the bribes made by its subsidiaries in China, Croatia, Egypt, Greece, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Latvia, Montenegro, Nigeria, Russia, Serbia, Thailand, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan and Vietnam in April 2010.

Financial record keeping

17 Laws and regulations

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

As a general rule, the Turkish Tax Procedure Law No. 213 requires taxpayers to keep documentation for a period of five years after the end of the financial year to which the documentation relates (article 253).

Additionally, article 82(5) of the Turkish Commercial Code requires from those persons who are obliged to keep books and their successors or representatives to keep their books for a period of 10 years after their last entry and to keep other accounts and documentation, which must be kept, for a period of 10 years as of their respective dates.

However, a distinction can be made regarding the rules applicable to publicly traded companies and non-public companies. Publicly traded companies are required to keep their corporate books and financial records in accordance with the provisions set out in Communiqué on the Principles and Provisions Regarding Financial Tables and Reports in the Capital Markets (Series No. XI, 1) and Communiqué on General Explanation Regarding the Determination of Independent Auditing Obligations, Public Disclosure and Issuance of Financial Records and Reports for Companies and Corporations Subject to the Capital Markets Law (Series No. XII, 1). According to article 7 of Communiqué Series No. XII, 1, publicly traded companies are obliged to keep interim financial statement and income statement on a quarterly basis. The second quarterly records are subject to external auditing that is conducted by an independent auditing company.

Additionally, Communiqué on Accounting Standards (Series No. XI, 11) further sets out certain provisions regarding the auditing of books and records for companies subject to the regulation of the Capital Markets Board.

As per Law No. 6102, joint-stock companies subject to independent auditing will be required to set up and maintain a company website (for new companies, within three months of their incorporation), and must allocate a part of the website to required legal announcements; this obligation is also laid out under the aforementioned communiqué, under article 3 of its annex. According to article 5 of the Regulation on Company Websites (the Regulation), the companies which are subject to audit as per article 397 of Law No. 6102 have to establish websites within three months of being registered with the trade registry. The companies that have become subject to the said audit after the effective date of the Regulation must establish a website within three months. According to provisional article 1 of the Regulation, companies incorporated before 1 July 2013 must establish a website within three months, starting from 1 July 2013. The authorised bodies of companies who do not publish

their websites within three months of incorporation will be subject to a judicial fine of between 20 and 100 liras per day, depending on the court's discretion, for between 100 and 300 days. Therefore, the amount of the judicial fine will be between 2,000 and 30,000 liras by taking into account the minimum and maximum wage. Authorised bodies of companies who do not include the requisite information on their websites for the information society to have access to will be subject to a judicial fine of up to 100 days.

Non-public companies, which are limited liability companies and joint-stock companies under Turkish law, are primarily subject to the provisions of the Turkish Commercial Code in terms of maintaining their financial records and books. As a general rule, article 225 of the Turkish Commercial Code provides that each shareholder of a company has the right to request the auditing (internal auditing) of the company records and books, as well as requesting information on the actions of the respective company. An agreement to the contrary is regarded as void.

On a more specific note, article 210 of the Turkish Commercial Code stipulates that commercial auditors of the Ministry of Industry and Commerce audits joint-stock companies. As for limited liability companies, article 635 provides that the same provisions that apply to joint-stock companies now also apply to limited liability companies. What is perhaps one of the most striking changes brought about with Law No. 6102 is the new regime on the auditing of equity capital companies (particularly joint-stock companies, limited liability companies and groups of companies). This is a welcome change that, in essence, mirrors the regulations already observed in the US and EU. An audit of the separate or consolidated financial statements of the company is based on the company's accounting records (eg, its books, records and documents). Because the auditor must receive information from the relevant individuals regarding this data, Law No. 6102 grants the auditor the right to access comprehensive information in order to be able to completely and correctly understand the data to be audited. The board of directors' obligation of corporate governance disclosure is in essence one of the non-delegable duties and powers stipulated under article 375 of Law No. 6102. If such information is not disclosed, the board of directors may be held responsible, which is limited to the company, the respective company employees and the company's business and operations. The right to request the disclosure of such material and information goes hand in hand with 'disclaimer of opinion' stated under article 403(4) of Law No. 6102. If the board of directors refuses disclosure of such information and material, this can lead to a disclaimer of opinion, which is to be assessed on a case-by-case basis.

18 Disclosure of violations or irregularities

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

Section 5 of the Turkish Constitution of 1982, entitled 'Privacy and Protection of Private Life', and in particular article 22, preserves the secrecy of communication. The Turkish Civil Code, article 23 et seq, includes provisions regulating the protection of personal rights in general. Also, according to article 24, an individual whose personal rights are violated unjustly is entitled to file a civil action.

Therefore, in practice, corporations place provisions within their employment contracts that are to be signed by the employee and the officer of the corporation, indicating what items constitute the 'property of the corporation' and these generally include computers, memory disks, and any kind of document, whether printed or not, in order to prevent any ambiguity in relation to employee claims regarding what may constitute personal data.

Second, while the principle of confidentiality prevails in matters relating to accounting (article 5 of Turkish Tax Procedure Law No. 213), the disclosure of violations (such as a forged document or misleading document) constituting accounting irregularity to the relevant public organisation and union and professional associations,

which are established with Law No. 3568 on Independent Accountants and Financial Advisers, will not be a breach of the confidentiality principle. The Ministry of Finance is responsible for determining the procedure regarding the disclosure of such information.

Additionally, information and documents that are requested in relation to civil and administrative investigations conducted by public officials can be disclosed pursuant to Turkish Tax Procedure Law No. 213.

The obligation to keep financial records and books as stipulated in the Turkish Commercial Code must be fulfilled in accordance with the provisions of the Turkish Tax Procedure Law No. 213 (specifically article 215, requiring that the books be kept in Turkish; article 216, requiring that the books be kept in ink; article 217, requiring that any misinformation should be corrected by way of appropriate markings).

Furthermore, publicly held companies are subject to the provisions of the Communiqué on the Principles and Provisions Regarding Financial Tables and Reports in the Capital Markets (Series No. XI, 1) (article 2(2)).

The Communiqué on General Explanations Regarding the Determination of the Obligations for Preparing Financial Statements and Tables, Announcing Them to the Public and Independent Auditing Obligations of Partnerships and Associations Subject to the Capital Markets Law (Series No. XII, 1) provides that annual and mid-year financial tables and reports that are to be made public must comply with standard principles and forms foreseen by the Capital Markets Board and that those financial statements and tables that are contrary to these principles and forms shall be prohibited from being disclosed to the public (article 3(a)).

19 Prosecution under financial record keeping legislation

Are such laws used to prosecute domestic or foreign bribery?

All the rules and legislation described above under article 17 and article 18 shall be applied to each company's record and book-keeping. A company's failure to perform its obligations under the relevant legislation would lead to the company and its directors being liable towards the authorities, if they carry indications of domestic or foreign bribery.

20 Sanctions for accounting violations

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

Article 341 of the Turkish Tax Procedure Law No. 213 defines what must be understood from loss of tax, although the definition does not distinguish between losses of tax as a result of bribery, be it domestic or foreign. Accordingly, loss of tax is when tax is not computed on time or is computed incompletely, as a result of the inability to fulfil or incompletely fulfil the relevant taxation duties borne by the taxpayer or the responsible individual. In this regard, article 343 sets out the minimum penalty for committing a loss of tax as no less than 8 liras for each document, bond and bill.

Article 112(2) of the Capital Markets Law No. 6362 stipulates that the persons who intentionally prepare financial tables and reports that do not reflect the truth, falsely open an account, conduct any types of accounting fraud or who prepare false or misleading independent auditing and evaluation reports or the responsible board of directors members or responsible managers for issuers who allow for these to be prepared may be punished according to the Criminal Code. The first paragraph of the same article also provides that the persons who intentionally keep books and records as required by the law irregularly, or not within the time periods stipulated by law shall be punished with up to two years' imprisonment and up to 5,000 days of judicial monetary fine.

The General Communiqué on Tax Procedure Law (Series No. 229) regulates, inter alia, the penalty imposed in the event of

committing fraud, the description of what is to be understood from gross fault and special irregularities (such as invoicing a service or good that has not been purchased and not issuing a retail sales certificate).

Issuing fake invoices and irregularity on invoices (such as obtaining an invoice for a donation that was not given) are penalised according to the provisions of the Criminal Code (article 207 – imprisonment from one to three years) and the Turkish Tax Procedure Law No. 213 (article 353 – penalty of 10 per cent of the difference between the actual value of the invoice and the value forged, but that is no lower than 180 liras).

21 Tax-deductibility of domestic or foreign bribes

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

In order to assess the net profit, article 40 of the Income Tax Law No. 193 regulates those expenses that can be deducted from income tax. These expenses are: general expenses that are incurred to generate and maintain commercial income, accommodation expenses for staff and employees at the workplace or for the equipment of the workplace, treatment and medical expenses, insurance premium and retirement allowance, damages, costs and compensation that is paid as per an agreement, judicial decision or a legal provision (subject to its being related to the respective work), work and residence expenses that are related to the respective work and that are reasonable in relation to the scope and nature of the relevant work, expenses relating to vehicles used in relation to the work, real tax, duties and charges amortisations indicated in the Turkish Tax Procedural Law. Expenses other than those enumerated under the foregoing article cannot be deducted from tax and any indication of other expenses in company and financial records will violate both the Turkish Tax Procedure Law No. 213 and the Turkish Criminal Law, depending on the facts.

Domestic bribery

22 Legal framework

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

Bribing domestic public officials under the Criminal Code is regulated both for individuals who provides benefit to public officials or other persons whom they indicate, as well as for public officials who benefit for themselves or provide benefit to other persons (Article 252(1) and Article 252(2), Criminal Code). In both cases, bribery takes place in relation to the execution of their duty to perform or not to perform directly or via intermediaries. Both the persons granting the benefit and the government official are subject to criminal liability, irrespective of whether there are actually agreements between them to enter into a bribe. Sanctions – albeit reduced ones – are imposed on parties proposing to bribe their counterparts, even if the counterparts do not agree to such proposal (article 252(4), Criminal Code).

23 Prohibitions

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

See question 5.

24 Public officials

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

The Criminal Code defines 'public official' as any person who performs a public activity through appointment or selection on an unlimited, permanent or temporary basis (article 6(1c)). This general definition of public official is extended for the purposes of the crime of bribery. The following persons are also considered public officials:

- officials of professional institutions that are public institutions, such as chambers of commerce and industry or the union of bar associations;
- officials of companies that have been incorporated by the participation of public institutions or entities, or professional organisations that are public institutions;
- officials of foundations that carry out their activities within a body of public institutions or entities, or professionals;
- officials of cooperatives; and
- officials of publicly traded joint-stock companies (article 252(8)).

25 Public official participation in commercial activities

Can a public official participate in commercial activities while serving as a public official?

Law No. 657 on Public Officials prohibits public officials from being involved in any commercial activity. Therefore, throughout their employment with the government, public officials can neither be employed by nor provide consultancy services to any private entity (article 28).

26 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 receiving of such benefits?

See question 27.

27 Gifts and gratuities

Are certain types of gifts and gratuities permissible under your domestic bribery laws and, if so, what types?

Article 29 of Law No. 657 explicitly regulates the prohibition of public officials receiving gifts and providing benefits. According to this article, it is prohibited for public officials to directly or via an intermediary request gifts and accept gifts for the purpose of taking advantage, even if such act is not taken on duty, or to request to borrow money from their employers or receive such money. Pursuant to the second paragraph of the same article, the Public Officials Council of Ethics is authorised to determine the scope of the prohibition of receiving gifts and, where necessary, request a list, at the end of each calendar year, of gifts that were accepted by public officials who are at least at general director level or an equivalent high-level official.

The Regulation on the Ethical Behaviour Principles of Public Officials (the Regulation) prohibits public officials from receiving gifts or obtaining further benefits for themselves, their relatives, third parties or institutions from individuals or legal entities, in relation to their duties. The Regulation does not set any monetary limit on such gifts or benefits. According to Resolution No. 2007/1 of the Council of Ethics for Public Officials, the receipt of gift or hospitality, irrespective of its monetary value, constitutes a violation of the rule set forth by both Law No. 657 and the Regulation.

However, article 15 of the Regulation provides that the following items do not fall within the scope of the rule stipulated thereunder:

- gifts donated to institutions or received on the condition that they are allocated to public service, registered with the inventory list of the relevant public institution and announced to the public;
- books, magazines, articles, cassettes, calendars, CDs or similar material;
- rewards and gifts received within public contests, campaigns or events;
- souvenirs given in public conferences, symposiums, forums, panels, meals, receptions and similar events;
- advertisement and handcraft products distributed to everyone and having symbolic value; and
- loans extended by financial institutions on market conditions.

In addition to the foregoing, Notice No. 2004/27 on the Public Officials Council of Ethics regulates the duties and obligations of the Council of Ethics, which was established with Law No. 5176 on the Establishment of the Public Officials Council of Ethics and Certain Laws. According to the notice, the Council of Ethics determines the scope of the prohibition on receiving gifts and can request, if need be, at the end of each calendar year, a list of the gifts that have been received by senior-level public officials who are at least of a general manager level or equivalent.

28 Private commercial bribery

Does your country also prohibit private commercial bribery?

As of July 2012, the Criminal Code regulates private commercial bribery. Accordingly, (i) if a benefit is provided, offered or promised; (ii) if the respective individuals request or accept such benefit; (iii) if such is mediated; and (iv) if benefit is provided to another individual due to the foregoing relationship, the general provisions regulating domestic bribery are applicable to individuals acting on behalf of the following entities, irrespective of whether the individual is a public official, and in relation to the execution of the respective individual's duty to directly or, via intermediaries, perform or not perform:

- occupational organisations that are public institutions;
- companies that have been incorporated by the participation of public institutions or entities, or occupational organisations that are public institutions;
- foundations that carry out their activities within a body of public institutions or entities, or occupational organisations that are public institutions;
- associations working in the public interest;
- cooperatives; and
- publicly traded joint-stock companies (article 252(8), Criminal Code).

29 Penalties and enforcement

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

Please refer to questions 14 and 15 respectively for the sanctions imposed on companies and individuals violating domestic bribery rules.

30 Facilitating payments

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

See question 6.

31 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 decisions and investigations include:

- The research-focused health-care company Roche was made subject to a lawsuit on the grounds that it refrained from paying taxes in Turkey and that it received specialist advice from an accounting company in order not to pay taxes. It was alleged that in order to win a tender, Roche allegedly told its pharmaceutical warehouse to bid lower prices than the tender price and, in any case, win the tender. Afterwards, the pharmaceutical warehouse issued an invoice to Roche as a 'service invoice' in order to compensate for its losses as a result of this practice. This way, part of the invoiced amount was received by the pharmaceutical warehouse to compensate for its losses, while the remaining amount was shared between the executives of Roche, gaining

unfair benefit. In this way, it was believed by the authorities that Roche also evaded tax.

- The Ankara Public Prosecutor's Office reportedly received a mutual legal assistance request from the United States in 2010 concerning allegations that the Turkish subsidiary of the US company 3M had engaged in bribery to secure sales of goods and services to Turkish public institutions. The parent company reportedly initiated an internal investigation.

- In an ongoing investigation that contains allegations with regard to money-laundering, bribery and gold smuggling, sons of three cabinet ministers, along with the general manager of state-owned Halkbank and a business tycoon known for gold trade have been initially detained as suspects through the course of the investigation. Subsequently three cabinet ministers have resigned in face of the allegations.

ELİG

Attorneys at Law

Gönenç Gürkaynak
Ç Olgu Kama

gonenc.gurkaynak@elig.com
olgu.kama@elig.com

Çitlenbik Sokak No. 12
Yıldız Mahallesi
Beşiktaş 34349
Istanbul
Turkey

Tel: +90 212 327 17 24
Fax: +90 212 327 17 25
www.elig.com

GETTING THE DEAL THROUGH

Annual volumes published on:

Acquisition Finance	Life Sciences
Air Transport	Mediation
Anti-Corruption Regulation	Merger Control
Anti-Money Laundering	Mergers & Acquisitions
Arbitration	Mining
Asset Recovery	Oil Regulation
Banking Regulation	Outsourcing
Cartel Regulation	Patents
Climate Regulation	Pensions & Retirement Plans
Construction	Pharmaceutical Antitrust
Copyright	Private Antitrust Litigation
Corporate Governance	Private Client
Corporate Immigration	Private Equity
Data Protection & Privacy	Product Liability
Dispute Resolution	Product Recall
Dominance	Project Finance
e-Commerce	Public Procurement
Electricity Regulation	Real Estate
Enforcement of Foreign Judgments	Restructuring & Insolvency
Environment	Right of Publicity
Foreign Investment Review	Securities Finance
Franchise	Shipbuilding
Gas Regulation	Shipping
Insurance & Reinsurance	Tax Controversy
Intellectual Property & Antitrust	Tax on Inbound Investment
Investment Treaty Arbitration	Telecoms and Media
Islamic Finance & Markets	Trade & Customs
Labour & Employment	Trademarks
Licensing	Vertical Agreements



For more information or to purchase books, please visit:
www.gettingthedealthrough.com



Strategic research partners of the ABA International section



THE QUEEN'S AWARDS
FOR ENTERPRISE:
2012



Official Partner of the Latin American Corporate Counsel Association

Published by Getting the Deal Through
in association with Transparency International

