

This briefing was produced by the Institute of Directors Ireland in association with McCann FitzGerald LLP for use in Ireland. McCann FitzGerald LLP is one of Ireland's premier law firms, providing a full range of legal services to many of Ireland's leading businesses. Clients include international organisations, major domestic concerns, emerging Irish companies and clients in the State and semi-State sectors.

Briefing: Corporate Enforcement Authority and Legal Privilege: Changes coming down the tracks

The recently published Companies (Corporate Governance, Enforcement and Regulatory Provisions) Bill 2024 (the "**Bill**") is designed to enhance and strengthen governance, enforcement and regulatory provisions in the Companies Act 2014 (as outlined in our recent [briefing](#)). This briefing examines proposed changes to the court process for determining whether documents seized by the Corporate Enforcement Authority ("**CEA**") are privileged.

Background to proposed changes

These changes follow challenges encountered by the CEA recently in an application to the High Court to determine whether legal professional privilege attached to emails of John Delaney (the former CEO of the FAI), which were seized from the FAI in 2020 (and which has only been finally resolved in recent months) ("*CEA v FAI*").¹

CEA v FAI arose after the CEA seized material, including potentially privileged material, from the FAI on 14 February 2020. Three days later the CEA issued a motion seeking a determination in relation to privilege, to which Mr Delaney was joined as a notice party. Mr Delaney initially claimed legal professional privilege in respect of approximately 29,500 documents, which was subsequently reduced to 2,805 documents. The High Court appointed an independent assessor to examine the material over which an assertion of privilege had been made by Mr Delaney and the FAI. The independent assessor upheld Mr Delaney's privilege claim in respect of 1,613 documents. Ultimately, the High Court rejected the conclusions of the Assessors and ruled that Mr Delaney had not made out his claim for privilege and therefore rejected his claim. The High Court's ruling was upheld by the Court of Appeal and earlier this year the Supreme Court refused to grant Mr Delaney leave to appeal.

1. High Court: Director of Corporate Enforcement v Cumann Peile na hÉireann (Respondent) and John Delaney (Notice Party) [2022] IEHC 593 linked [here](#); Court of Appeal: Corporate Enforcement Authority v Cumann Peile na hÉireann (Respondent) and John Delaney (Notice Party) [2023] IECA 226 linked [here](#).

Briefing prepared for Institute
of Directors Ireland | Corporate
Enforcement Authority and Legal
Privilege: Changes coming down
the tracks

The current position

In *CEA v FAI*, the CEA deployed its powers under the current regime, particularly under section 795 of the Companies Act 2014, which allows the CEA to seize potentially privileged material, provided that the confidentiality of the material can be maintained until the High Court rules on whether the material is privileged. Section 795 presently prescribes that the CEA must apply to the High Court, on notice and **within 7 days** of seizing the material, to determine whether the material is privileged. The High Court can make directions in relation to preservation of the material pending its ruling and may also appoint an independent assessor to prepare a report on the potentially privileged material.

The Changes Proposed

If enacted, the Bill will amend section 795 of the Companies Act 2014 as follows:

- The CEA will have 14 days (rather than 7) to apply for a privilege determination. The Explanatory Memorandum to the Bill says that the extension is in consideration of cases where thousands of documents may be at issue and where an examination of the documents to determine relevance may necessarily take some time. While the CEA was able to make an application within 3 days in *CEA v FAI*, a longer period is provided for in other Acts: for example, the Competition and Consumer Protection Commission has 30 days in which to make such an application and the Commission for Communications Regulation must make an application “as soon as reasonably practicable”.
- The Bill would explicitly allow for the appointment of more than one independent assessor to examine potentially privileged material and prepare a report for the court. This amendment would likely reduce the time required for producing a report to the Court in circumstances where the material is voluminous.

In *CEA v FAI*, the first assessor appointed advised the parties that, due to the complexity and volume of material, a second assessor should be appointed to assist in examining the material and to expedite the report. This was resisted by Mr Delaney who asserted that the subsection made clear that only one assessor could be appointed. The Court ultimately found that, as section 795 allows the Court to make such directions considered appropriate, the Court could appoint additional assessors if necessary. The Court also referred to the Interpretation Act 2005, which states that the use of the singular must be construed as also importing the plural. The Bill would, however, resolve any ambiguities in that regard.

A General Scheme of the Bill was published in March 2024, but the Bill does not include all of the provisions contained in the General Scheme. In particular, the General Scheme provided that the application for a privilege determination would be made on an *ex parte* basis, rather than on notice. The General Scheme stated that the rationale for such

Briefing prepared for Institute
of Directors Ireland | Corporate
Enforcement Authority and Legal
Privilege: Changes coming down
the tracks

an amendment was to prevent possible destruction of evidence yet to be seized where a person is tipped off to an investigation by virtue of their being on notice of the relevant motion – for example where the CEA comes into possession of material from a third party in relation to an individual. This amendment has not been retained in the Bill as introduced so, if enacted in its current form, such applications would continue to remain on notice.

Outlook

The Bill is currently progressing through relevant stages in the Dail and is expected to be enacted by the end of the year.

© McCann FitzGerald LLP
and IoD Ireland 2024. All
rights reserved.

This document is for general
guidance only and should not
be regarded as a substitute for
professional advice. Such
advice should always be taken
before acting on any of the
matters discussed.

Further information is available from:



Megan Hooper
Partner
+353 1 611 9158
megan.hooper
@mccannfitzgerald.com



Catherine Derrig
Partner
+353 1 607 1710
catherine.derrig@
mccannfitzgerald.com



Marie-Alice Cleary
Senior Associate
+353 1 607 1254
marie-alice.cleary
@mccannfitzgerald.com



Glen Rogers
Senior Associate
+353 1 511 1574
glen.rogers
@mccannfitzgerald.com

Alternatively, your usual contact in McCann FitzGerald LLP will be happy to help you further.